



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

--	--	--

THE GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE, 1731-1785:

A CHAPTER IN SHAKESPEARE SCHOLARSHIP

By

Martin James Wood

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

1984

3/8/84

© Copyright by
MARTIN JAMES WOOD
1984

ABSTRACT

THE GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE, 1731-1785: A CHAPTER IN SHAKESPEARE SCHOLARSHIP

By

Martin James Wood

The history of Shakespeare textual scholarship, which traces the evolution of printed editions of Shakespeare's dramatic works from inaccurate and often incomprehensible early editions to the versions now considered settled and authoritative, has always concentrated primarily on eighteenth-century editors such as Rowe, Johnson, Steevens, and Malone. The contributions of other scholars and dedicated amateurs have largely gone unnoticed. One indispensable resource for identifying the work of these forgotten contributors, the Gentleman's Magazine of eighteenth-century London, has long been recognized as an essential aid to the study of contemporary English literary, cultural, political, and social history. With regard to Shakespeare's text, however, it has been ignored. To correct this oversight, the present dissertation locates and examines all suggestions, emendations, explanatory notes, and conjectural readings for Shakespeare which were sent to or reprinted in the pages of the Gentleman's Magazine during the years 1731-1785. These entries are reprinted in the dissertation according to the plays they concern, and are followed immediately by responses of contemporary editors and scholars; by notes tracing their

later inclusion in important scholarly and variorum editions; by supplemental references to linguistic and historical dictionaries; and finally by a brief account of their representation in or influence upon a major modern edition of Shakespeare. As it turns out, more than half of the entries in the magazine have left a distinct trail in the progress of his text, although only a very few have since been properly attributed to the persons who first suggested them. Many of the rest now survive as corrections by Steevens, Malone, or other scholars, who merely borrowed them from the accounts in the Gentleman's Magazine. The dissertation also includes an appendix listing all other references to Shakespeare that appeared in the magazine during the fifty-five years of the study. Together these findings not only establish the magazine's influence on Shakespeare scholarship in eighteenth-century England, but also provide additional evidence of its continuing importance to literary and historical scholars.

This dissertation is dedicated with great respect
to
Professor Arthur Sherbo

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My work on this project was made much easier by the tireless assistance of Jannette Fiore and Anne Tracy, Librarians in Special Collections at Michigan State University. Professors Jay Ludwig and Douglas Peterson offered frequent and indispensable comments and suggestions during my composing process. Professor Robert Uphaus has for many years been a valued teacher, friend, and ally; even without his extraordinary efforts during the course of this dissertation, he would have secured forever my highest esteem. My colleague Carol Hale has been at once my most demanding critic and my dearest friend; the effect of her advice and counsel can be seen on every page. Finally, I owe my deepest thanks to Professor Arthur Sherbo. From the inception of this project through its latest drafts, he offered guidance and expertise with great generosity; furthermore, he made available the results of his unpublished research on neglected Shakespeareans, particularly Thomas Holt White, without which my own research would be woefully incomplete. His published work is a model for the pages that follow; his approval will be the best measure of my success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	I.	Introduction	1
Chapter	II.	The Comedies	31
Chapter	III.	The Histories	87
Chapter	IV.	The Tragedies	112
Chapter	V.	The Romances	175
Chapter	VI.	Conclusion	192
Appendix			207
Bibliography			217

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the middle quarters of the eighteenth century a new species of literary inquiry appeared, an inquiry for which the necessity is now as patently obvious as its origin is widely misunderstood. The new species was Shakespeare textual scholarship, and its origin lay in the combined effect of two seemingly unrelated forces. The first was the appearance of the pioneering scholarly editions of Shakespeare's plays by Alexander Pope, Lewis Theobald, Sir Thomas Hanmer, and William Warburton. Clearly enough these stand as progenitors of the new species, marking out the territory where their offspring would eventually thrive. Less obvious is the effect of the second force: the rise of a literate and relatively prosperous middle class whose new demand for reading material was matched only by its ability to purchase printed copy in many new forms. At first, this demand was variously satisfied by the newspaper and by the novel, or roughly speaking, the historical and the literary forms of print. My concern lies rather with that peculiar composite of both, the magazine. I am specifically interested in the first of this type, Edward Cave's Gentleman's Magazine, Or Traders Monthly Intelligencer.

The Gentleman's Magazine had the good fortune to arrive

on the literary scene at the one time when its potential to influence Shakespeare scholarship was very high. I will argue that because of its propitious circumstances, because of the special talents of its early contributors, especially Samuel Johnson and John Hawkesworth, and because of its policy of printing the correspondence of dedicated amateurs, the Gentleman's Magazine participated significantly in the establishment of Shakespeare's text. I will demonstrate its significance through a long series of excerpts from its pages, and through the traces left by these items in the succeeding editions of Shakespeare's works. But I will show also how its influence has attracted little direct attention, and how, consequently, scholars today are generally unaware of its important contribution.

Before I make any further suggestions about the importance of the Gentleman's Magazine to the rise of Shakespeare scholarship, I need to discuss briefly the magazine itself. Its general history has been portrayed in varying degrees of detail by John Nichols, who edited the magazine after 1778, and by Walter Graham and C. Lennart Carlson, scholars of the present century; therefore I will limit my outline to the kind of sketch made by a host of writers after them. Conceiving of his project literally as a "magazine," in 1731 Cave introduced a publication intended to store up the best of what had been printed elsewhere each month. His magazine was by all accounts a rapid and impressive success. John Abbott calls the magazine "a document so rich that a fair

reconstruction of the period could be made from its files alone" (111). Part of its richness springs from its diversity; Abbott notes how the Gentleman's Magazine (hereafter the GM) "appealed even more than the Spectator to the intellectual eclecticism of the middle class" (86). Efforts at the reconstruction of which Abbott speaks benefit immeasurably from what the Reverend Andrew Kippis, a later contributor to the magazine, called its ability to preserve "a multitude of curious and useful hints, observations, and facts, which otherwise might never have appeared; or, if they had appeared in a more evanescent form, would have incurred the danger of being lost" (Carlson v). But they were not lost, and the magazine has become increasingly recognized as an invaluable aid for any who would study the period. James Kuist has recently written, "Certainly the frequent references to the GM by contemporaries and historians alike suggest that among the periodicals of its day this one has been found by its readers to deserve our attention" (3).

The success of the GM, given its intended audience, should come perhaps as no surprise; its early contents supplemented reprints of the most popular periodicals--such enduring titles as the Craftsman, the Free Briton, the Grub-Street Journal--with miscellaneous pieces on every conceivable topic and lists of demographic and financial statistics. Thus the magazine had something for everyone at a time when nearly everyone wanted everything he could read. Cave appreciated the potential demand for his service when

he wrote in his first issue's Introduction that the newspapers "of late are so multiplied, as to render it impossible unless a man make it a business, to consult them all." Cave made it his business, and he thrived. Carlson notes that miscellanies had existed before, both in their seventeenth-century form, "essentially learned and literary" (35), and in the historical or poetical form closer to the GM's time. The earlier miscellanies faded because they had not looked to the newly emerging middle class for their audience, Carlson argues; in using the focus of the newer journals the GM actually "represented the culmination of a tradition, rather than the inception of one" (53). As Donald Keesey has written, comparing the GM to the miscellanies, Cave "did substantially the same thing; he simply did it more thoroughly" (6). His product became, in Robert Mayo's words, "for twenty-five years the leading magazine of any class in England" (159).

Whether the GM's success is measured by the number of its volumes, readers, or imitators, that success surely helped attract the services of the period's finest young literary minds. Samuel Johnson wrote to Cave in 1734 with a proposal for his own literary employment with the magazine, and actually began to write for it in 1738 (Boswell 1:77). John Hawkesworth joined him there in 1740, a time during which, Abbott notes, "the brightest hope for one who would live by his pen lay at St. John's Gate, Clerkenwell, the home of the Gentleman's Magazine" (20). Coinciding with the

advent of these two, the GM began to shift its emphasis from newspaper reprints to more original material. Carlson asserts that in 1735 the magazine regularly began to include correspondence from readers, who sent at first mostly theological essays, but by the middle of the next decade many theatrical ones as well. While the majority of dramatic essays appear to have come not from numerous correspondents but from one regular associate, Carlson is still correct to notice an increased emphasis on theatrical or literary matters. This newest attention, he writes, appeared along with "the beginning of a period of new and awakening critical activity on the part of the theatrically-minded in general" (137). So closely did Johnson's arrival coincide with this new emphasis that mere chance is an unacceptable explanation.

According to Joseph Wood Krutch, Johnson's initial proposal to Cave was to "supply poems, inscriptions, etc., never published before, as well as short dissertations, critical remarks on authors ancient and modern, etc." (43). This was an entirely original proposal "since the magazine at the time was almost exclusively political and newsy," and Krutch's remark that "it also suggested a direction which the magazine was presently to take" does not, I think, state Johnson's influence clearly enough. The magazine had been neither literary nor original; Johnson suggested it become both, and it gradually did so beginning in 1735--the year after Johnson's proposal. Carlson writes, "In Cave's later years his magazine became increasingly learned, scientific,

and literary" (27). Cave died in 1754, so his "later years" coincide pretty well with the years of Johnson's greatest influence at the magazine. Carlson notes further that Johnson's contribution after 1738 was far more than that of a mere writer, since "from 1738 to 1745 he seems to have had editorial supervision of the magazine" (21); Arthur Sherbo observes that he "was virtually editor of the GM in 1742" (Editor 23).

As if to endorse the new course plotted first by Johnson, Hawkesworth's efforts, after his arrival in the early 1740's, guided Cave's publication even more intently on a literary venture. He reviewed books and plays from that period until the early 1770's, writes Abbott, though he never signed his name; and when Johnson relinquished his own supervisory status to pursue other interests, it was Hawkesworth who took up the reins. He advanced from a supervisor of poetry columns to one who "helped direct the magazine as a whole." When he succeeded Johnson, he made of the GM "one of the most important literary reviews of the age" (87). In 1756 Hawkesworth assumed a post that could have been called "literary editor," and in general helped turn the GM into a forum for literary discussion (20). Charles Gray, Sherbo, Keeseey, Donald Eddy, and Abbott have demonstrated that Hawkesworth was the magazine's reviewer for all his years there after 1748, responsible for all the numerous reviews signed "X" and a good many more besides.

Johnson's participation in Shakespeare scholarship is

well known, and his work at the GM during the years he was planning his edition, as I shall soon argue, suggests that the GM was already involved itself. What is not known at all is Hawkesworth's major role in that scholarship. Outside of a few essays in his Adventurer, Hawkesworth's corpus demonstrates little that would qualify him to be considered as a respectable scholar of Shakespeare. In the chapters that follow, I hope to rectify this oversight. His editorial work at the GM both informed and shared in the magazine's contribution to Shakespeare studies. Meanwhile, Johnson remained important within the GM, occupied though he was with his own major projects; Keesey reports how "two modern Johnson scholars [Donald Greene and Sherbo] have claimed for him no fewer than ten of the magazine's dramatic reviews for the period between 1750 and 1754" (23). Thus Abbott concludes that during the early 1740's--when the GM began strongly to become a literary forum--Cave relied upon the services of his "main co-adjutors" Johnson and Hawkesworth (106).

Having largely assumed the general interests of men like Johnson, the GM was eventually to share some of their specific preoccupations as well. Cave and Johnson cooperated in many early literary performances, such as Johnson's Account of the Life of Mr. Richard Savage (1744); indeed "it may be assumed that the first meeting" between Savage and Johnson "took place at St. John's Gate" (Krutch 80). But the publication there of Johnson's Miscellaneous Observations on the Tragedy of Macbeth (1745) may have been

the venture closest to Johnson's heart, since it accompanied Johnson's announcement of his intention to edit Shakespeare. That twenty years were to pass before his edition appeared can stand as testimony both to his loathing to do the work and to his profound desire to see the work finally done. Johnson wanted badly to edit Shakespeare, to correct the insufficient scholarship of those who had gone before him. It is no coincidence that Johnson's interests subsequently became reflected in the pages of the GM. In the press generally, Keesey has found, "Shakespeare was receiving considerable attention during this period," and over the coming years the GM "printed several articles--some of them quite detailed and learned--dealing with Shakespeare's work" (14).

Equally important are the GM's frequent reviews of the many books on Shakespeare that made their appearance in the next thirty years. The reviewer for these was almost surely Hawkesworth. Nichols probably erred when he reported that 1765 was the year when Hawkesworth added "his own concise, but valuable critical remarks, and afterwards a regular Review" (lvi) to the magazine's contents. Abbott now argues convincingly that Hawkesworth was discussing books in some length by 1748, that the expansion of the review was obvious by December 1750, and that "by May 1752 specific attention is called to the critical nature of the section with the title, 'Books publish'd . . . with Remarks'" (98). Thus, at a time when interest in Shakespeare was stirring,

when Samuel Johnson wished to edit the plays, when the GM had begun to focus more frequently upon literary interests, and when John Hawkesworth was its book reviewer, the periodical began to make available--to a greater segment of the reading public than any other publication could boast--learned articles and essays on Shakespeare criticism and Shakespeare textual scholarship.

ii

It is no longer necessary to argue, as D. Nichol Smith was obliged to in 1903, that eighteenth-century England admired Shakespeare as much as any other period (Essays xiii). Ronald B. McKerrow claims that because scholarship has gone far beyond the work of the period's critics, we may be tempted to "let them and their too numerous quarrels rest in peace"; but he hastens to add that the Shakespeare we know today is "largely the Shakespeare of Rowe, Pope, Theobald, Johnson, and the other eighteenth-century editors" (103-4). Shakespeare's status had been a good deal less certain than it is today, not only because of the notorious neoclassical "rules" Shakespeare was supposed to have disregarded, but also because he was a relatively recent writer. Large differences in language did not dispel from early eighteenth-century minds the notion that Shakespeare was an author only just now passed away, one whose dramas should not be treated as anything other than plays to be performed, and of course altered as the need arose. The notion of a

correct text for Shakespeare simply did not occur to the public that purchased books.

Printers contributed to this problem by setting their type from the most readily available versions of Shakespeare's plays. The earliest texts of some of them, the various quarto editions printed in his own lifetime, were hard to locate and obtain for use as copy, and scarcely seemed necessary to the printers anyway. After all, the folio versions of the plays were much easier to come by, and appealed more to the eye. The first of these, printed in 1623 by Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount, was no longer commonly available by 1700, but three new folio editions had succeeded it. What is hard for us to understand in retrospect is that Shakespeare was, for the early eighteenth century, merely a very good recent playwright. A newer edition is--must be--a better edition; spelling and punctuation conventions were changing, words were becoming obsolete, or their meanings altered, and readers wanted their texts to reflect these trends toward "normal modernization" (McKerrow 105). When the Second Folio appeared in 1632, the Third in 1663 and 1664, and finally the Fourth in 1685 (well into the period of John Dryden's career), readers and libraries alike gladly replaced the old with the new. No less a library than the Bodleian actually sold its copy of the First Folio for a pittance when the Third became available. Nichol Smith writes, "No one at this time gave any thought to the authority of the First Folio" (Shakespeare 30). And even as late as 1765, Thomas Tyrwhitt could

write, in his Observations and Conjectures Upon Some Passages of Shakespeare, "As I had formerly read Him [Shakespeare], with more attention to his text, than is usually given to the works of a modern Author. . . ." At the beginning of the century especially, textual authority was hardly an issue.

Neoclassic principles were an issue, however; Brian Vickers notes the well-documented effect of the returning Stuart King and his Court from their long stay in France after the Civil War, and in particular their effect on Shakespeare's reception. Cultural reverberations from the return "produced a tension between an idolatry for our greatest dramatist and the highly developed critical concepts of rules, decorum, propriety, the unities, and so on--that amalgam of Aristotle and Horace borrowed from the French seventeenth century (who had themselves borrowed it from the Italian sixteenth century) which was to determine Neoclassical attitudes to Shakespeare for several generations" (1:4). This tension, Vickers suggests, was more readily resolved by changing the poet than "the taste of the age" (5). Such turn-of-the-century neoclassicists as Thomas Rymer and Jeremy Collier criticized Shakespeare, often bitterly, for supposed violations of decorum and poetic rules, and for his failure to observe "poetic justice." The innocent Cordelia simply should not have been killed. For critics such as these, Vickers writes, Shakespeare "had to be attacked more often than praised" (2:1).

It must not be conceived that no Neoclassicists defended Shakespeare; those who did, Vickers notes, readily found such strategies as blaming his faults on his era, ignoring them for the richness of his characters, or cherishing them for their testimony that his genius was possible because he knew no rules (9). But his detractors were legion, and they cried for alterations. Their efforts certainly changed the texts. The argument can be made, however, that the large changes wrought upon Shakespeare by deliberate adaptation and alteration were scarcely more drastic than some of the small changes that crept into the text by omission and error, and which proved much harder in the end to identify and correct. There was virtually no Shakespeare textual scholarship before the eighteenth century, Vickers reports, and no real "editing." Regarding the three reprintings of the First Folio, with successive and often clumsy correction, "it is too early to speak of 'editing' Shakespeare, if by that we mean a systematic review of the text and the authorities for it," or any attempt to gloss unfamiliar words or usages (1:11).

The eighteenth century began with major changes in editors' approaches to texts. When Nicholas Rowe first attempted what we would now call a scholarly edition of Shakespeare, the opportunity lying before him was without precedent, and was to be forever without equal. Rowe could not have known in 1709 that the playwright then generally considered a recent and rough-hewn genius would be universally acknowledged at the century's end to be the premier

English poet. Although Rowe certainly appreciated Shakespeare's merit, and judged him worthy, finally, of a complete and corrected edition of his plays, the editor could not have predicted the enormous scholarly response his own effort would stimulate. Vickers has called him "the most disseminated Shakespeare critic before Johnson," and while Rowe's approach to editing was a selective, intrusive, "liberal" view, nonetheless "as the century advanced the norm adjusted itself to Rowe" (2:9).

Rowe had the pioneer's privilege. All of Shakespeare lay open to him; his entire landscape comprised the scattered quartos and the four Folio editions, and though they were not exactly virgin territory, neither were they settled lands by any means. Compositors' errors, compounded with each successive Folio, needed now to be detected and the original readings restored. But Rowe was more interested in producing a readable and performable edition of the plays than in establishing any kind of authority for his text. As Nichol Smith has put it, "Rowe had no suspicion of the textual problems awaiting his successors" (Essays xxviii). Emulating the Folio publishers before him, he took the most recent edition, the Fourth Folio, as his copy-text. He revised what he found there, but his emendations were less the result of an exhaustive survey than of a desultory glance. In other words, he did what the printers before him had done. As McKerrow has put it, the edition was just another example of the "normal modernization still conti-

nuing" (105). But, however leisurely his effort, Rowe did refer to the earliest editions, and in this exertion he was the first. For Hamlet and Romeo and Juliet he consulted the quartos as well, adding lines that had been omitted in the Folios (Vickers 15). He made corrections in the text where he could amend an error, and conjectures when he could not. That there were fewer of the former and more of the latter than a full collation could have justified is far less important than his having "made the first start" (Krutch 284). His most important contribution was to give the text "the shape of a modern edition," adding dramatis personae, correct entrance and exit directions, act and scene divisions, localities, and an account of Shakespeare's life (Vickers 2:15).

What Rowe did not do was to improve very much "the mangled condition of Shakespeare," as Theobald put it in his 1733 edition. The next attempt after Rowe's was Alexander Pope's. As he was embarking on his project, his friend Francis Atterbury wrote him,

I have found time to read some parts of Shakespeare which I was long acquainted with. I protest to you, in an hundred places I cannot construe him, I don't understand him. The hardest part of Chaucer is more intelligible to me than some of those Scences, not merely thro the faults of the Edition, but the Obscurity of the Writer: for Obscure he is, & a little (not a little) enclin'd now and then to Bombast, whatever Apology you may have contriv'd on that head for him [Vickers 2:7].

In some ways Pope did better than Rowe, and in others worse. He consulted more quartos, but what he restored, and what

new passages he elected to omit depended more upon his own taste than any settled editorial philosophy. Such emendations "have caused him to be looked on as an injudicious meddler" (McKerrow 118). Not that there was any learned theory of editing to be found in his day; those critics who did comment upon Rowe's edition, Charles Gildon for one, did not discuss textual matters. Criticism was moving forward--Addison began to argue against the tenets of strict Neoclassicism, "poetic justice" in Spectator No. 40, for example--but textual scholarship was not yet in the air. Some, like George Sewall, called for Shakespeare's plays just as Shakespeare wrote them, but he was arguing against adaptation, and probably did not really consider the implications of textual authority (Vickers 2:15, 272, 327).

If Pope's faults were many and his emendations arbitrary, at least his concern for a corrected text was one worth sharing. He had "a wrong idea of his duties," notes Nichol Smith, but "he made a great advance on Rowe," creating in some senses "our first thorough edition" (Shakespeare 33, 35). He was the first to make an appreciable use of the the quartos, for example. Writing in his Preface against "the many blunders and illiteracies of the first Publishers" of Shakespeare's works, Pope calls attention to the poor quality of the quartos due to

the excessive carelessness of the press. Each page is so scandalously false spelled, and almost all the learned or unusual words so intolerably mangled that it's plain there either was no Corrector to the press at all or one totally illiterate. If any were supervised by [Shakespeare] himself I should fancy the two parts of

Henry IV, and Midsummer-Night's Dream might have been so, because I find no other printed with any exactness; and (contrary to the rest) there is very little variation in all the subsequent editions of them.

Pope goes on to blame all the additions and deletions he does not care for on the poor taste of the actors who put Shakespeare's work through the press (Vickers 410). Then he makes a statement which, however little he heeded it himself, nonetheless represents a fair if early notion of an editor's proper duties:

This is the state in which Shakespeare's writings lye at present, for since the above-mentioned Folio [1623] all the rest have implicitly followed it without having recourse to any of the former, or ever making the comparison between them. It is impossible to repair the Injuries already done him; too much time has elaps'd, and the materials are too few. In what I have done I have rather given a proof of my willingness and desire than of my ability to do him justice. I have discharg'd the dull duty of an Editor to my best judgment, with more labour than I expect thanks, with a religious abhorrence of all Innovation, and without any indulgence to my private sense or conjecture. The method taken in this Edition will show it self. The various reading are fairly put in the margin so that every one may compare 'em, and those I have prefer'd into the Text are constantly ex fide Codicum, upon authority [Vickers 2:414].

Pope's first edition appeared in 1723. By 1726 it had come under attack from various writers, none so able or determined as Lewis Theobald, whose treatise Shakespeare Restored: Or, a Specimen of the Many Errors, As well Committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope In His Late Edition of this Poet was printed that year. He set out to offer emendations of his own, but with Pope's example before him he

was able to announce a more defensible format, intending

to quote the Passages as they are read, with some part of their Context, in Mr. Pope's Edition; and likewise to prefix a short Account of the Business and Circumstances of the Scenes from which the faulty Passages are drawn; that the readers may be inform'd at a single View, and judge of the Strength and Reason of the Emendation without a Reference to the Plays themselves for that purpose. But this will be in no kind necessary where Faults of the Press are only to be corrected. Where the Pointing is wrong, perhaps that may not be alone the Fault of the Printer, and therefore I may sometimes think myself obliged to assign a Reason for my altering it. . . . Wherever our Poet receives an Alteration in his Text from any of my corrections or Conjectures I have throughout endeavor'd to support what I offer by parallel Passages, and Authorities from himself.

Theobald's significant aim was to assist the reader in determining how much is Shakespeare, how much editor, in any given passage. To complete this ambition Theobald said he "distinguish'd the Nature of my Corrections by a short marginal Note to each of them." And he expressed severe objections to emendations which "substituted a fresh reading" when "there was no Occasion to depart from the Poet's text." For all of these considerations, he wrote, "an Editor of Him [Shakespeare] ought to be a Critic upon him too" (Vickers 2:427, 432, 431). Theobald was thus the first truly conservative editor of Shakespeare, and unfortunately the last for quite some time. In a letter of 8 April 1729 to William Warburton, who would have done well to heed it, Theobald outlined the function of the careful editor, pledging "to make the smallest deviations that I can possibly from the text; never to alter at all where I can by any means explain a passage into sense; not ever by any

emendations to make the Author better when it is probable the text came from his own hands " [458].

Theobald's first edition of Shakespeare appeared in 1733, followed by a second in 1740. J. Isaacs writes, "His edition of 1733 makes him the great pioneer of serious Shakespeare scholarship" (306). Oddly enough, despite his attacks on Pope, and despite the fact that he listed Pope's as one of the "Eiditions of No Authority," he based his text on Pope's, and as Nichol Smith notes, that edition served as Theobald's authority "far too much" (Shakespeare 40). The gains he made in the discipline of textual scholarship stagnated in the next few years as Hanmer and Warburton issued their own editions in 1744 and 1747. These were strongly characteristic of the "selective theory of editing" (McKerrow 130), the species of editing according to taste that Theobald had argued against. Nichol Smith is correct to speak of Theobald as moving the art of textual scholarship forward, and Hanmer somewhat backward, even if he does caution, "It is easy to underestimate the value of Hanmer's edition" (Essays xxviii). And even Warburton's edition has its redeeming qualities. He provoked a vigorous negative response, and, as Vickers argues, "in answering him, critics were in fact engaged in the process of restoring Shakespeare's text" (4:40).

It was during this period of textual backsliding that the GM began to move into the field of literary criticism and scholarship. Its editors and correspondents turned

their attention gradually to Shakespeare's unintelligible lines, taking up the matter of emendations, conjectures, illustrations (we would call them "explanations"), and parallel passages in Shakespeare's sources in a grand effort to "restore" their poet's words. This was the time when Johnson, soon to have his Miscellaneous Observations on Macbeth published by Cave, was effectually editor of the magazine, when Johnson and Hawkesworth were Cave's "coadjutors," when Hawkesworth was beginning to review books--some of them on Shakespeare--and to reprint selected portions in the magazine. Guided by these two men of letters, the GM was helping to educate its readers in their growing desire to appreciate England's greatest poet. At the GM, Johnson refined the editorial skills that were to produce the first Shakespeare combining the strengths of all its predecessors. When Johnson left, Hawkesworth began his reviews, and encouraged readers to participate by printing their suggestions, their etymologies, their anecdotes. Isaacs writes, "From the 1760's onward scholarship moved with lightning pace"; a tremendous amount of new material was becoming available, and an "interlocking of scholars and new fact" catalyzed the new discipline (309). Thanks largely to Hawkesworth, one medium through which this material was transmitted was the Gentleman's Magazine.

The Gentleman's Magazine contains, as has been shown, the most important collection of literary and critical articles and letters of any periodical during the crucial early years of Shakespeare scholarship. Its editorial format virtually guaranteed that excerpts from significant and controversial publications, as well as correspondence from amateurs and critics who were as yet unpublished, would find their way into its pages. Many of these items, as the following chapters will show, have played a direct part in establishing Shakespeare's text. Few, however, are known to scholars today. The frenzy with which the effort moved forward those early years helped hide the traces of many who contributed. Later, when the furor subsided, subsequent editors made their way as best they could through the confusion. As Horace Howard Furness lamented in the Preface to his 1913 New Variorum Edition of A Midsummer Night's Dream, "The successive winnowings are all forgot, to which the text has been subject for nigh two hundred years. Never again can there be such harvests as were richly garnered by Rowe, Theobald, and Capell, and when to these we add Steevens and Malone of more recent times, we may rest assured that the gleanings for us is of the very scantiest, and reserved only for the keenest and most skilful eyesight" (10:xxi).

Some of these fruitful emendations reached their first large audience in the GM; many saw print nowhere else, and have since been forgotten. For these latter contri-

butions, oblivion is not necessarily a just fate; the rescue of but a few insightful pieces of textual scholarship will justify the effort exerted to find them. In other instances, suggestions of dubious merit may nevertheless contribute to our understanding of the progress of Shakespeare scholarship, and therefore deserve inclusion in a thorough study. For still others, the contributors have remained unknown or, worse, been wrongly identified; Steevens and Malone are today remembered for emendations they borrowed from amateurs with names like Kynaston and Holt White. Here of course the record should be set straight. All oversights, in other words, regarding Shakespeare textual scholarship during this unique period must be corrected by any available means. Such is the purpose of this dissertation.

The GM contributions to Shakespeare studies actually should come under four heads, only one of which concerns textual scholarship and, hence, is discussed in the chapters below. First, articles and letters of literary criticism often appeared, many of them about Shakespeare's plays. Second, a great exchange of information, much of it anecdotal or traditional, occupied many columns devoted to readers' queries and responses. For each item from these two categories, complete references to GM volume and page numbers appear in the Appendix following chapter 6. The third type of contribution comprises the emendations, illustrations, and identifications of source passages which together form a comprehensive approach--given the state of

the art then--to textual scholarship. Within this category, readers' suggestions, editors' reviews, and authors' treatises all found places in the GM.

I have collected every emendation and every explanatory note to be found in the pages of the GM from 1731 through 1785, the year after Johnson's death. These constitute the primary entries in the chapters ahead. I have also consulted the variorum editions of Shakespeare, particularly the New Variorum Series begun by Furness in 1871, to learn whether the items selected by the GM editors have become part of the received body of Shakespeare scholarship, and whether their authors have received proper credit. The reports in the variorum editions, together with other pertinent sources as needed, make up the secondary commentary in the entries below.

There appears also in the GM a fourth species of Shakespeare scholarship I have not included in my discussion. Two major contributors, Thomas Holt White and Sir Walter Rawlinson, along with a few less active correspondents, reported many passages they considered parallels to various classical verses. The dispute over what these similarities meant--whether Shakespeare did or did not read and imitate the classical authors--inspired two important treatises, one on each side of the issue. Peter Whalley's 1748 Enquiry into the Learning of Shakespeare, which was reviewed and excerpted in that year's GM, took the position that Shakespeare was familiar with the classics, and indeed had

written a translation of Ovid (18:113). On the other side was Richard Farmer's Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare, published in 1767 and reviewed in that year's GM (37:121). Farmer argued that Shakespeare's apparent familiarity with classical authors could actually be traced to translations by his contemporaries. Rawlinson had read Farmer's book, but defended his "imitations" by noting "that most of the following extracts are made from authors of whom it does not appear there was any translation in the days of Shakespeare; which precludes all possibility of his having come at a knowledge of such authors through the medium of his mother tongue. Where translations were to be had (as Dr. Farmer has amply proved) he would not barely imitate, but borrow." Rawlinson offered his examples "as instances at least of a close coincidence, if not amounting to certain marks of imitation" (50:518). As contributor "A.C.'s" response to Holt White reveals, even contemporaries were favoring the agency of "coincidence" over "imitation." "A.C." argues at some length that "there are innumerable thoughts that must be common to mankind in all ages," and asks whether the statement "This is fine weather" can be counted a case of plagiarism (55:499). I have excluded the parallels from my discussion because their utility is finally very slight to the establishment of text. As with other references in the GM to Shakespeare, however, I have listed the page references for these suggested parallels in the Appendix, where interested readers may now find them.

The Gentleman's Magazine began in 1731; my investi-

gation stops with Johnson's death because with him ended an era in the development of textual editing techniques. Johnson was the last, more or less, of those editors influenced by the practice McKerrow has called "the selective theory of editing" (130). Those who came after, notably George Steevens, Edmond Malone, Isaac Reed, and the younger James Boswell, adhered distinctly to a more modern school, practicing more thorough and more careful collation, and less imaginative revision. To extend my kind of investigation much beyond 1785 would invoke the law of diminishing returns. The original items in the early GM came mostly from individual correspondents, many of whom probably pursued Shakespeare as a hobby, and who had to yield the arena now to those who made a business of him. For the myriad small contributions our only record is the GM. Their suggestions constitute about half of the entries in the following chapters.

Often, as I have noted, the GM examined the books written by those for whom Shakespeare's text was a professional interest; the entries on them are often much more complex. The contents of these books were often excerpted in reviews, at first by Hawkesworth, and after 1773, by John Duncombe. For these, of course, the GM is not our only source, but a true picture of the magazine's contribution to Shakespeare scholarship cannot faithfully be drawn without including them. In the most important of these instances, the review of Thomas Tyrwhitt's Observations and Conjectures

(1765), I consulted the original text to perform my own collations, for naturally the GM and the New Variorium (hereafter NV) promulgate error themselves. Perhaps more important than the book excerpts themselves, however, are the comments of the reviewers, Hawkesworth and Duncombe; these too have become entries below. And then, because of Johnson's connection with Hawkesworth and the GM generally, and because Johnson's figure in particular looms too large and casts too long a shadow to be taken lightly, I have frequently examined his work as well. Invariably I consulted his own words when other critics referred to his opinion; my own such references are made to the Yale volumes of Johnson on Shakespeare, edited by Arthur Sherbo. Finally I examined each controverted passage in a modern edition to see how it has come through the last century. My selection is the Riverside edition, chosen for its admirably conservative textual policy, its excellent Textual Notes, and its ready availability.

All of this information is arranged below in a manner designed to make it most useful. Thus a typical entry quotes the Shakespeare lines in question; then the GM reviewer's comments, if any; other pertinent commentary, if any, from the author of the suggested emendation, or from Johnson, or both; occasionally a definition from the OED; the NV annotation; and finally the current judgment as represented in the Riverside edition, if that judgment differs from or sheds light upon the commentary it follows.

I have arranged the passages together with others from

the same play, regardless of the relative dates of the original entries in the GM, so the emendations for each play can be comprehended at once. No other arrangement promised accessibility to all readers. Unfortunately, this has required me to abandon all attempts at narrative continuity in chapters 2-5; it is my hope that the increased usefulness of the discussions will lessen the effect of this disadvantage. Plays are arranged in chapters according to their type as the Riverside editors have classified them: Comedies, Histories, Tragedies, and Romances. Order within each type also reflects the Riverside practice.

My copy-text throughout is that of the First Folio (1623); in the rare event that this Folio does not contain the passage or lines under discussion, I identify the copy-text explicitly. I found I could not rely on all commentators' quotations of Shakespeare, nor on the GM version thereof. As I have said, the various eighteenth-century editors themselves generally found their source text in whatever edition had appeared most recently. For the twin purposes, then, of external authority and internal consistency, I accepted Johnson's judgment when he said of the Folios, "I collated them all at the beginning, but afterwards used only the first" (Yale 7:96). At times this means I must backtrack to explain precisely which text a commentator had been reading, but that is a small price to pay for consistency and predictability.

I have, however, introduced some slight changes to make

readers' location of references more simple. The names of some characters have been silently changed, for example, to conform to modern usage, since most readers can find "Touchstone" sooner than "Clowne," or "Countess" sooner than "Old Lady" in All's Well. Lineation and act and scene divisions follow the Riverside edition. Certain publication conventions, as for example the use of italic type where we would use single marks of quotation today, have been silently altered to reflect modern practice. Finally, I have silently regularized the spelling of Shakespeare's name throughout.

For all the plays save twelve, NV is the variorum text consulted. The remaining plays still await the completion of their NV editions, so for these twelve, I consulted Isaac Reed's 1813 edition; because it remains largely the work Reed inherited from Steevens, it is frequently known as Reed's 1813 Steevens, or the Second Variorum. Only Pericles, then generally considered not to be Shakespeare's, prompted no emendations in the magazine within the years I have specified, and hence is absent below.

Along the way I have attempted to identify anonymous or pseudonymous authors, including the many who sign their correspondence with initials. Success rate in this endeavor has not been high. Such attributions as are possible have come about, in general, because of the work of the Nichols family of publishers. John Nichols' Rise and Progress of the Gentleman's Magazine (1821) and, more recently, the invaluable work, The Nichols File of "The Gentelman's Maga-

zine," edited by James N. Kuist (1982), provide lists identifying all authors the Nichols associates were able to track down. Authors not identified may be assumed to be missing from these lists. Proper credit is given with each successful identification, including of course those few I was able to attribute myself.

Omitted from consideration below are those plays included in the Third and Fourth Folios, and hence thought by some eighteenth-century critics to be Shakespeare's work, but now known not to be his; of these, only The History of Thomas, Lord Cormwell and Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham received any significant attention in the Gentleman's Magazine, and then only because Malone included them in his Second Supplement.

Short Titles and Editions

In the text to follow, the Gentleman's Magazine will be referred to as the GM. References will be in the form of volume, page (in parentheses). To assist the memory, readers may note that the year of the volume and that volume's number are always related by the number 30, such that Volume 1 contains the 1731 issues, Volume 2, 1732, Volume 18, 1748, Volume 35, 1765, and so on. After 1782 the magazine expanded its format so as to require two parts for each volume, Part 1 comprising January through June, and Part 2 the rest of the year. Therefore, for Volumes 53, 54, and 55, it will be necessary to refer to volume and part,

for example (53,2:933). The New Variorum series, begun in 1871 and as yet incomplete, will be referred to as NV; a complete list equating volume numbers, plays included, and dates of publication, will be found in the Bibliography. In general all editions will be indicated by italics, for example, F1 for the First Folio, Q2 for a Second Quarto; Johnson's 1765; 1813; Riverside; and so forth. Additionally, the following short titles will be used, including the volume and page number of their first notice in the GM:

Enquiry--Enquiry into the Learning of Shakespeare, Peter Whalley (18:133).

Essay--Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare, Richard Farmer (37:121).

Dictionary--A Dictionary of the English Language, &c., Samuel Johnson, 1755.

Observations--Observations and Conjectures upon Some Passages of Shakespeares, Thomas Tyrwhitt (35:582).

On Shakespeare--Critical Observations upon Shakespeare, John Upton (16:224).

Reliques--Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, Thomas Percy (35:181).

Remarks--Remarks, Critical and Illustrative, on the Text and Notes of the Last Edition of Shakespeare, Joseph Ritson (53,2:593).

Revisal--A Revisal of Shakespeare's Text [Benjamin Heath], (35:65).

Supplement--Supplement to the Edition of Shakespeare's
Plays, &c., Edmond Malone (50:375).

Second Supplement--Appendix to the Supplement to the Edition
of Shakespeare (unpublished), Edmond Malone (53,1:505).

Finally, a list of contemporary editions and treatises on Shakespeare may prove useful. The four Folios and all quartos appeared before the eighteenth century; this list begins with Rowe.

Rowe (first)	1709
Rowe (second)	1714
Pope (first)	1725
Theobald (<u>Restored</u>)	1726
Pope (second)	1728
Theobald (first)	1733
Theobald (second)	1740
Hanmer	1744
Anonymous	1745
Warburton	1747
Whalley (<u>Enquiry</u>)	1748
Heath (<u>Revisal</u>)	1765
Percy (<u>Reliques</u>)	1765
Johnson	1765
Tyrwhitt (<u>Observations</u>)	1765
Johnson	1765a
Farmer (<u>Essay</u>)	1767
Capell	1768
Johnson	1768
Johnson and Steevens	1773
Johnson and Steevens	1778
Malone (<u>Supplement</u>)	1780
Malone (<u>Sec. Supplement</u>)	1783
Ritson (<u>Remarks</u>)	1783
Johnson and Steevens	1785
Heron [Pinkerton] (<u>Letters</u>)	1785
Malone	1790
Steevens	1793
Rann	1794?
Reed's Steevens	1803
Reed's Steevens	1813
Boswell's Malone	1821

CHAPTER II

THE COMEDIES

THE COMEDY OF ERRORS

III.i.105 Balthazar. For slander lives vpon succession;
For euer hows'd, where it gets possession.

Malone's Supplement, published in 1780 and reviewed in the GM for that year, was intended as a companion volume to the most recent Johnson-Steevens edition, the 1778, and contained new observations on Shakespeare, both critical and textual. Regarding this passage, Malone declares, "Possession is pronounced as a trisyllable; and therefore the line should be printed: 'where it,' &c.," instead of the "where't" he finds in the 1778.

Immediately following his quotation of Malone's remark, the GM reviewer, who is presumably John Duncombe, adds his opinion: "We think it should also be printed 'housed,' &c" (50:376). It is difficult to comprehend how Duncombe believes that the two syllables of "housed" can "also" fit into this line of pentameter if "possession" commands three syllables.

Evidently this particular couplet has met with frequent

revision; since the days of F1, editors seem to have tinkered with the verses to make them match. Johnson concentrates upon the first line, finding it two syllables shy (Yale 7:355). For his part, Reed ignores the Malone proposal and Duncombe's addition as well. For 1813 he adopts the reading of F2, which adds "once" after "where" (20:394-5). Thomas Tyrwhitt, who always used F2, is given credit in the 1813 for finding this reading.

Riverside mentions no problem with the couplet, printing the lines as they appear in F1 (92).

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW

Ind.ii.17 Sly. Am not I Christopher Slie, old
Sies sonne of Burton-heath . . . Aske Marrian Hacket
the fat Alewife of Wincot, if shee know me not:

Joseph Ritson's Remarks, published in 1783, attracted the notice of that year's GM, which reprints his observations on this passage and several others in a large excerpt for the book review department. He is referred to only as "Mr. R." throughout the review. On this present passage Ritson quotes Steevens ("read 'Barton-heath'; Barton and Woodman-cot, vulgarly Woncot, being both in Gloucestershire, near the residence of Justice Shallow") and Thomas Warton (who mentions "Wilncotte" as the full name of a village in

Warwickshire with which, he says, Shakespeare was well acquainted; "the house kept by our genial hostess still remains, but is at present a mill."). Ritson's only contribution here, amid much sarcasm, informs the public, "Burton-Dorset is a village in Warwickshire." His remarks about Warton's familiar reference to the "genial hostess" and to what villages Shakespeare knew very well are stinging indeed. The GM reviewer, presumably Duncombe, evidently feels that this is Ritson's characteristic tone, for he writes, "These Remarks can proceed from no other than the virulent pen of Wartono-Mastix, the modern Zoilus, who, however just his criticisms, by the manner in which he conveys them, cannot fail to disgust his readers and irritate his opponents" (53,2:593-4).

1813 quotes Ritson's contribution, but Malone appears to have settled the matter by noting, "as Dr. Farmer and Mr. Steevens have observed," that "among Sir A. Cockayn's Poems there is an epigram on Sly and his ale, addressed to Mr. Clement Fisher of Wincot." Malone notes further that there is a village in Warwickshire called "Barton on the Heath" (9:30).

Riverside reports that parish records of Wincot, "a small village about four miles from Stratford," locate a family of Hacketts there in the 1590's (112).

I.i.10 Lucentio. Pisa renowned for graue Citizens

Gaue me my being, and my father first

A Merchant of great Trafficke through the world:

Vincentio's come of the Bentiuolij,

Vincentio's sonne,

Most commentators, writes Reed in his 1813, accept Pope's emendation of the last line quoted, "Vincentio his son," as though it were the sole text; Reed himself has adopted it (9:40). Thomas Tyrwhitt, whose Observations was reviewed in the 1765 and 1766 GM, begins here with Pope's version and suggests that the passage be read and pointed thus,

and my father first,

A merchant of great traffic thro' the world,

Vincentio, come of the Bentivolii.

Vincentio his son,

thus beginning a new sentence with the last line. The GM review continues by quoting Tyrwhitt, "'Vincentio his son,' is the same as 'Vincentio's son'" (36:24).

1813 incorporates the emendation into its text, with proper attribution (9:40).

Riverside attributes the significant change, "Vincentio's come" to "Vincentio, come," to Hanmer; about Tyrwhitt's altered punctuation it is silent (140).

I.ii.28 Grumio. Nay 'tis no matter sir, what he leges in
Latine.

Tyrwhitt reads, "what be leges." Johnson had left the line alone; Hawkesworth understands why as he comments in the 1766 GM review that Petruchio's Italian has been misunderstood by Grumio, and that the whole humor in the passage consists in poking fun at Grumio's ignorance of Latin. Tyrwhitt's suggestion, notes Hawkesworth, would not underscore the humor at all, but overturn it (36:23). "Alas! poor Shakespeare," he writes, appropriating the line with which Tyrwhitt had closed his Observations (54).

1813 quotes Tyrwhitt's observation without including Hawkesworth's commentary from the GM. Steevens remarks, "I suppose, what he alleges in Latin. Petruchio has just been speaking Italian to Hortensio, which Grumio mistakes for the other language." Next Reed quotes [John] M.[onck] Mason as arguing in favor of Tyrwhitt and against Steevens; lastly, Reed prints Steevens' reply, "I was well aware that Italian was Grumio's native language, but was not, nor am now, certain of our author's attention to this circumstance" (9:54-5).

Riverside notes, "'leges: alleges" (117).

THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA

I.ii.92 Lucetta. There wanteth but a Meane to fill your
Song.

"Omega," a perceptive critic whose identity remains unknown, writes to the 1784 GM to comment on three separate passages in this play. He explains "mean" by writing, "The 'tenor' part is so called in the old books of psalmody" (54,1:407). "Old" was the correct epithet even in "Omega's" time; OED lists this usage as occurring no more recently than 1721.

1813 cites Steevens for the "tenor" gloss, evidently unaware of "Omega's" precedence (4:193).

I.ii.130 Lucetta. What, shall these papers lye, like Tel-
Tales here?

Julia. If you respect them; best to take them
vp.

Lucetta. Nay, I was taken vp, for laying them
downe.

Yet here they shall not lye, for catching cold.

Julia. I see you haue a months minde to them.

Referring to "a month's mind," "Omega" writes in the same correspondence as above, "If I mistake not, the expression is still used in the same sense, i.e. you want to have them, have a liking to them" (54,1:407).

1813 quotes several commentators, including Johnson and Steevens, to the effect that the phrase is used in connection with obsequies and remembrance (4:196-7). Johnson reprints Zachary Grey's gloss ("an 'anniversary' in times of popery"), and remarks that the phrase "in the ritual sense signifies not desire or inclination, but remembrance, yet I suppose this is the true original of the expression" (Yale 7:163). OED reports that the phrase meant, allusively, "an inclination, a fancy, a liking," from Shakespeare's time well into the nineteenth century. Now whether Johnson meant that the "true original" was "inclination" or Grey's "anniversary" is not immediately clear; if "Omega" understood him to mean the former, then perhaps his note comes in response to Johnson's. In any event, Reed appears unaware of "Omega's" contribution.

Riverside glosses "month's mind" as "strong desire" (150).

II.i.169 Speed. All this I speak in print, for in print I found it.

For his third note in the 1784 GM, "Omega" provides the following explanation for "in print": "Exactly--with precision." He goes on to report that the expression is still used with reference to matters of dress, arrangement of furniture, and mode of speaking (54,1:407). Although few eighteenth-century references are listed, OED reports instances of "Omega's" definition from Lyly's time until as

late as 1881, including this very passage in Two Gentlemen. Furthermore, the specific reference "Omega" makes to dress and furniture is exactly what OED finds from 1621 onward.

According to 1813, Steevens is the one who suggests "with exactness" as the meaning of the phrase. "Omega" remains unacknowledged (4:212).

Riverside notes, "speak in print: speak precisely" (153).

II.iv.209 Proteus. 'Tis but her picture I haue yet beheld,
And that hath dazel'd my reasons light:
But when I looke on her perfections,
There is no reason, but I shall be blinde.

The Reverend John Kynaston, who invariably signed his frequent contributions with the letter "Q," writes to the 1775 GM to correct a couple of "trivial errors" in Johnson's edition (surely the 1773). One such error he finds here, where Johnson has called the use of the word "picture" a "slip of attention, for he had seen her in the last scene, and in high terms offered her his service" (Yale 7:166). Kynaston responds, "Protheus uses the word "picture" figuratively"; here it means, he writes, "her exterior form only." In the following line, accordingly, "her perfections" refer to her "graces of mind" (45:368-9). While OED does not specifically support this extension of the meaning of "picture," Kynaston is probably right about what Shakespeare

had in mind. The attribution to Kynaston of the "Q" letters can be found in the 1791 GM, in a letter from "R.B." (61,2:1021). Kynaston's obituary appears in the 1783 volume, where he is described as "a gentleman whose friendly labours have frequently embellished our magazine," and as "this valuable correspondent" (53,2:627-8).

1813 records Steevens as suggesting "outward form" for "picture," and Malone, "perfections of mind" for "perfections." Nowhere is Kynaston's clear precedence mentioned (4:227-8).

Riverside notes, "picture: outer show" (156).

LOVE'S LABOURS LOST

V.ii.332 Berowne. To shew his teeth as white as Whales bone.

Thomas Holt White, brother to the naturalist Gilbert White of Selbourne, was another frequent correspondent to the GM. His contributions, almost always signed "T.H.W." (Kuist 155; Nichols lxxvii), treated of topics ranging from botany to Shakespeare. For the passage above, Holt White finds, in King Alfred's "Preface" to Orosius, that the sea mammal now called a walrus was once known as a "horse-whale," and he assumes therefore that the "bone" Berowne refers to is the walrus tusk. White sent this suggestion to the 1785 GM

(55,1:277). Holt White's remarks later appear, properly attributed, in Reed's and Steevens' 1803 (5:334).

NV acknowledges Holt White's contribution, but without mention of the GM or of "T.H.W.," the signature he always used (14:262). Doubtless Furness found the note in Steevens.

Riverside's explanation follows this lead, but without attribution (205).

V.ii.782 Queen. But more deuout then these are our respects

Haue we not bene, and therefore met your loues

In their owne fashion, like a merriment.

[Riverside's copy-text for Love's Labours Lost is the first quarto edition, which appeared in 1598. Q1 reads, "then this our respects"; Hanmer altered the Q1 phrase to read, "than this in our respects."]

Tyrwhitt, whose source text is always F2, suggests we read,

But more devout than these are your respects

Have we not seen.

Tyrwhitt's solution to the crux, then, is to have the Queen accuse Berowne and the others of disrespect. This excerpt from Observations appears in the 1766 GM (36:22).

Furness quotes Tyrwhitt for the NV, without mention of the GM, adding that perhaps simply transposing "these are" to "are these" would be alteration enough (14:307-8).

Riverside adopts Hanmer's emendation, placing his "in" within the usual brackets (210). Hanmer was evidently alone among his contemporaries in following Q1.

V.ii.896 Song. And Cuckow-buds of yellow hew.

In a review of his Enquiry in the 1748 GM, Peter Whalley is quoted as writing, "Shakespeare plainly intended to distinguish each flower by an epithet expressive of its colour, but the cuckow has no tincture of yellow." He offers his opinion that, since crocuses are yellow, the "celebrated 'cuckow' song" should read, "crocus buds." Whalley observes as well "that much of the obscurity of Shakespeare's plays, in common with the comedies and satires of antiquity, is caused by allusions familiar to all at the time of writing, but since irretrievably lost." The alliterative excesses in the fourth act of the present play, for example, are a satire upon the writing of Lyly, according to Whalley (18:113).

NV mentions not only the Whalley observation, but also Steevens' response: "Crocus buds is a phrase unknown to naturalists and gardeners" (14:316). The GM is unmentioned, so Furness must have read Whalley's remarks in the original text.

Riverside reports J. W. Lever's discovery that Shakespeare took this flower's name from John Gerard's Herbal (printed

1597). No one, however, seems to have identified positively what flower the name designates (212).

V.ii.920 Song. While greasie lone doth keele the pot.

Matthew Wendall writes to the April 1760 GM to discuss the meaning of "keel." Wendall (who signs his name "M. W---l" in this letter) quotes the definition "cool" in Johnson's Dictionary, from the Saxon caelan, but suggests instead that we read "Cale" or "Kale," the "chief winter-wort." He argues that Joan appears to be a cook, so her duty is not to cool but to boil the pot. Once it is boiling, she is more likely to add vegetables like kale to the pot than to cool it (30:169). In May, however, correspondents "T.A." and "Eboracensis" write separate letters to report that the cooking term "keel" is still used in Yorkshire ("Eboracensis" signifies "one of Yorkshire" in the old denomination for that district). It means specifically to cool a boiling pot with the ladle, often by removing some of the pottage and gradually pouring it back in (30:219).

Not long after this exchange, Rawligh Witlim sends a letter to the June issue that provides much the same definition, but includes considerable sarcasm (30:276-7). Witlim supports his definition from Johnson's Dictionary and from Nathan Bailey's Dictionarum Britannicum of 1730. Finally, Wendall writes back in September, this time under his full name (see also Sherbo, Additions 233, for the attribution to

Wendall of the April letter). Here he accepts the correction of the various correspondents, but objects to Witlim's unscholarly tone (30:405-6). Years later, an "M.Y.R." writes to the 1785 GM to correct Wendall's April 1760 letter, evidently not having seen the three subsequent communications (55,2:952).

By the time the Love's Labours Lost volume of the NV appeared, Murray's New English Dictionary (now OED) had been completed; Furness simply lists its definition for "keel," which is similar to those above (14:318). Thus the dispute remains unrecorded, save in the GM.

A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM

I.i.93 Lysander. You haue her fathers loue, Demetrius:

Let me haue Hermiaes: do you marry him.

The GM excerpts from Tyrwhitt's Observations include his suggestion that we read, "Let me have Hermia," deleting the possessive inflection (36:24).

NV lists Tyrwhitt's emendation in the textual collation notes without any further comment (10:15). Indeed, while the suggestion certainly seems an equally sensible reading, it is difficult to see how it is any better than the original version, which has at least the advantage of authority.

Riverside follows Q1 (1600) throughout the play; here, the

F1 version is the same.

II.i.45 Robin. When I a fat and beane-fed horse beguile,
Neighing in likenesse of a silly foale.

Writing to the 1785 GM, Holt White wonders whether "filly foal" might not be a better reading (55:278).

Although Holt White receives no credit, NV lists "filly" as the reading of Steevens, Malone, and virtually every nineteenth-century editor. It is also the reading of Q1 (1600). According to NV, the folios, Q2, Rowe, and most editors after him, through and including Johnson, read "silly" (10:55). One wonders what prompted the later editors to switch to the Q1 version, if it was not Holt White's note in the GM.

Riverside follows Q1.

II.i.111 Queen. The Spring, the Sommer,
The childing Autumne, angry Winter change
Their wonted Liueries,

Holt White writes about the word "childing" in the 1785 GM. He quotes a fragment from Fairfax's translation of Tasso, "B. 18 Stanza 26," as follows: "Childed an hundreth nymphes." He notes further that the term is an old one in botany, used "when a small flower grows out of a large one"

(55:278). As usual, he signs his letter "T.H.W." This commentary was reprinted by Steevens in his 1793, correctly attributed to Holt White, after which it appears in the Variorums.

Furness employs the Fairfax quotation in the NV, giving Holt White the credit for it (10:68). There is no doubt that Furness discovered the explanation in the Shakespeare editions he collated, and not in the GM, for he does not know who "T.H.W." was; see the notes for III.ii.149 below.

Riverside differs somewhat and follows OED in glossing "childing" as "fruitful (literally, pregnant)" (228). OED quotes this line from Midsummer Night's Dream among its usage examples.

II.ii.45 Lysander. O take the sence sweet, of my innocence,
Loue takes the meaning, in loues conference,

Tyrwhitt proposes to alter "takes" to "take" (36:22), substituting the subjunctive for the indicative mood. In his original treatise he writes, "That is, Let love take the meaning" (Observations 34).

NV's textual notes list Tyrwhitt's reading as the only variant ever offered for "takes"; Warburton had suggested transposing "conference" and "innocence" (10:105). Johnson was able to paraphrase the lines without resorting to Warburton's transposition: "In the conversation of those who

are assured of each other's kindness, not suspicion but love takes the meaning" (Yale 7:149). Tyrwhitt had thought Johnson's reading "intelligible," but proposed his alteration to make the line "connect well with the former" (Observations 34).

Riverside explains the line much as Johnson does.

III.ii.149 Helena. Can you not hate me, as I know you doe,
But you must ioyne in soules to mocke me to?

The 1766 GM review reports that Tyrwhitt would read "ill souls" for "in souls" (36:22). Holt White's later suggestion of "shoals" for "souls" appears in a letter to the 1785 magazine (55,1:278).

NV actually cites "T.H.W." in the GM for the "shoals" emendation; had any of the later eighteenth-century editors mentioned Holt White's suggestion, Furness would probably have discovered who "T.H.W." was. As it is, Steevens et al happened to ignore this entry, so Furness remained in the dark.

Also listed among the collations for these lines is Tyrwhitt's reading, with the important distinction that Furness faithfully sets off "ill souls" in commas (10:146), marking it off as the appositive phrase Tyrwhitt intended it to be (Observations 33). The GM editor was not so careful.

Riverside prints the original lines without comment.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE

The 1765 GM reprints a lengthy excerpt from Thomas Percy's newly published Reliques (without printing its title--the work is only referred to as "a collection of old English Ballads"). In one entry, Percy (his name is misprinted 'Perey') quotes his discussion of the source of this play, which he claims is the ballad "Gernutus the Jew of Venice":

Others have supposed that it was taken from an incident related by Leti in his life of Pope Sixtus Vth, said to have happened upon Drakes's having plundered Saint Domingo in Hispaniola; but Drake's expedition was not made till 1585, and it is certain that a play of The Jew 'representing the greediness of worldly chusers, and bloody minds of usurers,' had been exhibited at a play-house, called the Bull, before the year 1579. The ballad, which was probably prior to this play as well as Shakespeare's, appears by the first stanza to come from an Italian writer, who may reasonably be supposed to have been a novelist, so that perhaps it is upon the whole quite probable that Shakespeare copied the same original with the authors of the ballad, and the play of The Jew [35:182].

Years before, GM correspondent "T.S." had written about the

Sixtus V story. His letter, printed in May of 1754, came in response to an article he had seen in a recent number of the Connoisseur, which (as it turns out) was written by Percy. "T.S." believes the ballad comes from an Italian novel also--it declares as much in the first stanza--but wonders which one. He also wonders about the source of that part of the story concerning Portia and the caskets (24:221). In July of the same year, "Paleophilus" writes to give Warton the credit for discovering the reference to the novel in the first stanza of the ballad. Nonetheless, he writes, Warton argues that the novel does not exist, because it has not been heard of since; Warton believes Shakespeare took the plot from the ballad (24:311).

According to NV, Percy printed a copy of the entire ballad in The Connoisseur for 16 May 1754; Furness believes Percy got the hint for this source from Warton's Observations on the Fairy Queen of that year. Furness also reprints Percy's commentary on Leti's Sixtus V story, but reports at length that later scholars have discredited this (7:287-297).

Riverside follows modern scholarship in assuming a blend of two different folk tales, one of which Shakespeare probably found in Ser Giovanni's Il Pecorone of 1558, and the other, probably in the Gesta Romanorum, translated in 1577. Riverside also identifies the author of Percy's "worldly chusers" quotation as Stephen Gosson, writing in 1579 (250).

discrepancy between Heath's and Riverside's attribution of "Mynheers."

III.i.17 Evans. To shallow Ruiers to whose falls: melodious
Birds sings Madrigalls:

The 1765 GM review of Percy's Reliques quotes him as attributing this song not to Shakespeare, as was customary, but to Christopher Marlowe. The song, "The Passionate Shepherd to his Love," together with Sir Walter Raleigh's "The Nymph's Reply to the Shepherd," were both "generally imputed to Shakespeare himself." But Marlowe and Raleigh truly wrote them, Percy argues, "for so says Isaac Walton in the compleat angler, a book of great credit, first printed in 1653, and the same also passed for Marlowe's in the opinion of his contemporaries." On the other hand, Percy also includes Pericles among other works generally imputed to Shakespeare in his lifetime, but, he writes, "of which he is known not to have been the author" (35:182).

1813 notes that Warburton was among those attributing Marlowe's lines to Shakespeare, and gives Percy credit for finding the true authors' names in Walton's Compleat Angler (5:111).

Riverside notes Shakespeare's debt to Marlowe (304).

III.ii.87 Host. I will to my honest Knight Falstaffe, and
drinke Canarie with him.

Ford. I thinke I shall drinke in Pipe-wine first
with him, Ile make him dance.

In an excerpt for the Observations review, the 1766 GM prints Tyrwhitt's reading of "drink horn-pipe wine." Evidently, he can make no sense of the expressions "drink in" or "Pipe-wine," and sees here yet another opportunity for a jest on the cuckold's horns. Following this entry, the GM reviewer, probably Hawkesworth, notes his own preference for the original reading. He recalls that "pipe" is also "a vessel in which wine is kept: Pipe-wine is kept in a pipe, and Ford here, by a conceit common to Shakespeare, alludes to pipe[,] the instrument of dancers music, and immediately adds, I'll make him dance" (36:23).

Although 1813 takes notice of Tyrwhitt's emendation, Reed agrees with Johnson's decision to retain the original reading. Tyrwhitt's suggestion, and Hawkesworth's reply, evidently prompted Johnson to take notice of the lines. After he had passed over them in silence in his 1765, Johnson prepared a note for the 1773; there he identifies the quibble in the word "pipe," both a vessel for wine and a musical instrument, as the whole point of the line (Yale 7:335), just as Hawkesworth had. Reed adduces the commentary of several critics to show that "drink in" is used to indicate copious consumption (5:124). OED does not specifically support

"drink in" for this sense, but its citation of "drink off," "drink up," and "drink out" with this meaning lends credence to Reed's claim. Neither Johnson nor Reed acknowledge Hawkesworth's precedence.

Riverside ignores "drink in" but follows the F1 reading, glossing "pipe-wine" much as Johnson does (306).

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

I.i.78 Messenger. I see (Lady) the Gentleman is not in your bookes.

In his 1784 letter to the GM, "Omega" explains "in your books" to mean "in your good graces--has not your good opinion" (54,1:407).

NV does not mention "Omega" or the GM in its notes for this line; the opinions it records are more concerned with the origin of the phrase than its meaning. "In your favor" is the meaning generally agreed upon (12:16).

Riverside notes, "books: i.e., good books, favor" (333).

I.i.257 Benedick. hang me in a bottle like a Cat, &
 shoot at me, and he that hit's me, let him be clapt on
 the shoulder, and cal'd Adam.

In another entry in the 1765 GM review of his Reliques, Percy

identifies the "Adam" of this passage as Adam Bell, one of "three noted outlaws, whose skill in archery rendered them as famous in the N. of England, as Robin Hood and his fellows were in the midland counties." Percy also adds a description of a cruel game wherein cats suspended in a bag are beaten from beneath by clowns (35:181).

NV says that Theobald was the first to identify Benedick's Adam as Adam Bell, and that Percy's Reliques also properly attributes the identification to Theobald (12:35). The GM account of Percy's work makes no mention of Theobald here.

Riverside identifies Adam as above but without attribution (335).

I.i.280 Benedick. and so I commit you.

 Claudio. To the tuition of God. From my house, if
I had it.

 Pedro. The sixt of Iuly. Your louing friend,
Benedick.

 Benedick. . . . ere you flout old ends any
further, examine your conscience, and so I leaue you.

Thomas Holt White sent a lengthy communication to the 1783 GM in which he discusses this among many other Shakespeare passages. After adducing two possible explanations from Johnson, White remarks, "Johnson's note on this passage does not explain it, 'so I commit you,' &c. is spoken in ridicule

of the formal endings of letters, that were in use in Shakespeare's time" (53,2:934).

In its notes for this passage, NV also reprints Johnson's suggestions ("Before you endeavor to distinguish yourself any more by antiquated allusions, examine whether you can fairly claim them for your own," or "examine, if your sarcasms do not touch yourself"), but fails to mention Holt White's improvement upon them (12:39).

Riverside's gloss paraphrases both definitions, Johnson's and Holt White's, without attribution (335).

II.iii.131 Leonato. for shee'll be vp twenty times
a night, and there will she sit in her smocke, till she
haue writ a sheet of paper:

In a letter to the 1780 GM, Dr. Samuel Henley provides an historical speculation on these lines. Shakespeare included this passage, Henley writes, intending to appear flattering to Queen Elizabeth. Her enemy Queen Mary was supposed to have remarked, in a famous letter to her pretended lover Bothwell, that she was naked as she was writing. The letter, Henley notes, is now known to have been forged (50:22). Henley signs his GM letter "S.H.," according to his customary practice (Kuist 78).

NV makes no mention of any historical scandal connected with these lines, nor of Henley's discovery of one. Riverside is

equally silent.

V.i.15 Leonato. If such a one will smile and stroke his
beard,

And sorrow, wagge, crie hem, when he should grone,

The Revisal excerpts in the 1765 GM review attend to these lines, first noting the suggested readings of Warburton ("and sorrow waive") and Theobald ("sorrow wage"), and then offering Heath's own proposal:

And sorrowing, cry hem, when he should groan.

Heath explains, "i.e. while he is under the influence of sorrow, disguise it" (35:67). Tyrwhitt's Observations also provides an entry in the GM on this line. The 1766 volume reprints his reading of "gagge" for "wagge," and his further observation that "to cry hem, is to cry courage" (36:22). Tyrwhitt finds "cry hem" in this sense also in 1 Henry IV, II.vii, and links it etymologically to the "less intelligible" form, "cry aim," found elsewhere in Shakespeare (Observations 30).

NV cites Heath for his reading, and notes that the nineteenth-century editor Halliwell adopted it for his text. Furness finds that Thomas Warton employed the same emendation, but believes that Warton came upon it independently. Tyrwhitt is cited for his offering as well. In fact, many have commented at length upon the line; Furness concludes,

"Let us unflinchingly consign this line to any limbo that will receive it." The GM is not mentioned (12:239).

Riverside explains "sorrow wag" substantially as Johnson does, without attribution (355).

V.i.142 Prince. I thinke he be angrie indeede.

Claudio. If he be, he knowes how to turne his girdle.

Holt White in the 1783 GM mentions Johnson's and Steevens' lack of success at explaining Claudio's apparent threat. According to him, Johnson admits awareness of the proverbial phrase "turning the buckle of one's girdle," but confesses his ignorance of its meaning; Steevens, on the other hand, compares it to an Irish saying about "tying up one's brogues," and declares that he takes Claudio's speech to mean "If he is in a bad humour, let him employ himself till he is in a better." White then offers his own interpretation: "Large belts were worn with the buckle before, but in wrestling the buckle was turned behind, to give the adversary a fair grasp at the belt; therefore turning the buckle behind was a challenge" (53,2:933).

White's remarks became a note in Steevens' 1793 (4:529).

NV reports that several nineteenth-century editors have adopted Holt White's reading. Furness certainly found the citation through Steevens; the GM is not mentioned (12:253).

in the same letter as above to "Hasted's History of Kent, folio, vol. II. p. 244." He adds, "Guthrie's remark, in Johnson and Steevens, may stand" (54,1:407).

The Guthrie remark appears in NV as having come from the 1765 Critical Review (20:407). William Guthrie rejects Warburton's "post or butt" definition and offers a more specific description: a block or stake of wood upon which were hung trophies and shields until contestants had knocked them all down with lances, leaving only the block. Furness does not mention "Omega" (8:43).

II.i.5 Duke Senior. Heere feelee we not the penaltie of

Adam,

The seasons difference,

"Omega's" extended commentary continues here as he retains the F1 reading, which had been emended by Theobald to read, "Here feel we but the penalty." "Omega" chooses instead merely to alter the punctuation:

Here, feel we not the penalty of Adam,

The season's difference?

Or, in other words, "Omega" asks, "Do we not here feel?" (54,1:407).

NV reports that Theobald's emendation, "but," has been adopted by most editors. Again, no reference appears either to

"Omega" or to his reasonable suggestion (8:61).

Riverside retains the folio reading, without "Omega's" punctuation, but mentions Theobald's emendation as one adopted by many editors (376).

II.iii.27 Adam. This is no place, this house is but a
butcherie;

"Omega" writes that "no place" should be taken to mean no place "of safety, of refuge" (54,1:407).

NV includes Knight's gloss, "this is no abiding-place," among its notes; while it comes closest to "Omega's" of those given, "Omega" himself remains unacknowledged (8:80).

Riverside notes, "place: dwelling place," (377).

II.vii.143 Jacques. His Acts being seven ages.

In its book review department for the June issue, the 1783 GM reprints portions of Malone's "Second Appendix" to his 1780 Supplement. Malone's title is confusing; since there was no "First Appendix," the 1783 document is now known as the Second Supplement. It is "unpublished" in any real sense, because only fifty copies were produced, and those privately. The GM reviewer (probably Duncombe) remarks, "A copy of this unpublished pamphlet having accidentally fallen into our hands, we are enabled to give our readers some account of

it." Here the GM quotes Malone's criticism of Warburton's opinion that seven acts was "no unusual division" for plays of Shakespeare's time. Except for one of Chapman's plays, rarely is a play found divided into seven acts, Malone reports. Surely, he writes, "it is not necessary to suppose that our author alluded here to any such precise division of the drama. His comparisons seldom run on four feet. It was sufficient for him that a play was distributed into several acts, and that (long before his time) human life had been divided into seven periods" (53,1:505). Malone then cites the 1613 Treasury of Ancient and Modern Times as reporting a division of man's lifetime into seven ages in the works of the Greek author Proclus.

NV quotes Malone for all of the above, and adds a great deal more of his complete note, which the GM had also printed. The GM is not named (8:122).

II.vii.182 Song. The heigh ho, the holly

An anonymous correspondent writes a letter to the 1768 GM concerning the holly tree, and makes a brief reference to this song. He suggests that we read, "Then heigh to the holly," the tree being a logical place of solace and refuge for the exiles (38:615). Then, for the 1784 volume, in a lengthy article on the holly tree, "T.A.W." reproduces the 1768 observation, revealing that he himself had written it (54,1:22). The Nichols File attributes the later article to

Thomas Holt White; in fact this is the earliest contribution so attributed (Kuist 155). Thus "T.A.W." is a misprint for "T.H.W.," the signature of the same Holt White who commented on Shakespeare's plays extensively in later volumes of the GM. The 1768 article is not mentioned in The Nichols File, but by Holt White's own testimony ought to be acknowledged as his.

NV is unaware of Holt White's suggestion, as is Riverside and, evidently, most everyone else.

III.i.3 Duke. I should not seeke an absent argument

Of my reuenge, thou present:

"Omega" explains "absent argument" in a paraphrase, "i.e. past cause--remote reason" (54,1:407).

Furness, who usually appears unaware of "Omega" anyway, only cites Johnson to explain this phrase; evidently none but "Omega" felt the line needed an alternative elucidation (8:135). "An 'argument,'" Johnson writes, "is used for the 'contents' of a book, thence Shakespeare considered it as meaning the 'subject,' and then used it for 'subject' in yet another sense" (Yale 7:251).

Riverside follows Johnson (382).

III.ii.184 Celia. O Lord, Lord, it is a hard matter for
friends to meete; but Mountaines may bee remoou'd with
Earthquakes, and so encounter.

"Omega" asks, "Should we not read, 'is it?'" (54,1:407).

NV quotes Steevens' allusion to the proverb, "Friends may
meet, but mountains never greet" (8:156). In this light
"Omega's" suggestion would appear to dilute the humor.

III.ii.339 Rosalind. As the Conie that you see dwell where
shee is kindled.

Malone's Supplement excerpts in the 1780 GM include his
citation of Henley's explanation of "kindled": "Rather 'kind-
led,' led by her own kind or kindred" (50:376). Following
this entry, the GM reviewer remarks, "'Kindled' is a tech-
nical term for the generation of rabbits." The reviewer--
presumably John Duncombe--appears to be the first to make
this observation on the passage.

NV quotes Skeat's Etymological Dictionary on "kindle": "bring
forth young." Furness goes on to note that the Cambridge
editors (1863) find the word divided by a hyphen at a line-
end in F4 (1685) and in both Rowe editions, which is probably
what led Pope to print "kind-led" in mid-line. Whether
Pope's edition provided the impetus for Henley's mistake is
difficult to say, since NV mentions neither Malone, Henley,

nor Duncombe or the GM on this point (8:172). OED agrees with Skeat's definition, and quotes this line.

V.iv.64 Touchstone. According to the fooles bolt sir, and
such dulcet diseases.

One of Holt White's GM letters mentions this passage, and quotes Johnson's confession, "This I do not understand. For 'diseases' it is easy to read 'discourses'; but perhaps the fault may lie deeper." White then offers his own emendation, "Dull set Distics, or Distiches," and quotes the dull, familiar adage,

A fool's bolt
Is soon shot.

This emendation appears in the 1783 volume (53,2:934).

NV does not refer to Holt White's suggestion; Furness is probably unaware of it since it is not mentioned in the later Steevens or Malone editions. The explanations Furness quotes indicate that most editors read the passage as it stands in F1, arguing only about their consequent interpretations (8:271).

Riverside glosses "dulcet diseases" as the "pleasing discomfort" one feels from a jester's barbs (398).

TWELFTH NIGHT, OR WHAT YOU WILL

II.ii.31 Viola. Alas, O frailtie is the cause, not wee,
For such as we are made, if such we bee:

According to the GM review, Tyrwhitt suggests we read,

For such as we are made of, such we be,

meaning, one assumes, that we can be no better than the frail flesh of which we are made (36:23). Incidentally, Tyrwhitt's copy-text, F2, emended "O frailtie" to "our frailtie," which he follows faithfully (Observations 44).

NV notes that Tyrwhitt's suggestion has been widely adopted; Furness himself endorses it as well (13:104).

Riverside admits the emendation into its text, within brackets, but attributes it to "Thirlby" (416, 440). Dr. Styan Thirlby supplied many emendations for Theobald, so his is probably the earlier note.

II.iii.78 Toby. There dwelt a man in Babylon, Lady, Lady.

The 1765 GM account of Percy's Reliques includes his identification of this line as a scrap from the ballad, "Constant Susannah," of which his book prints one stanza (35:182).

NV quotes Percy's identification among others' (13:121).

Riverside provides the identification without attribution (418).

II.iii.101 Toby. Farewell deere heart, since I must needs
be gone.

This line, the Clown's reply to it, and the next ten or so verses, Percy reports, come from the ballad, "Corydon's Farewell to Phyllis" (35:182).

NV quotes Percy's identification (13:124).

Again, Riverside identifies without attributing (418).

II.v.62 Fabian. Though our silence be drawne from vs with
cars, yet peace.

For "cars," Tyrwhitt suggests we read "cables"; this item appears in a portion of the review carried over to the GM "Supplement for 1765" (35:617).

NV notes that the folios, other than the first, read "cares," and so do Rowe, Pope, Theobald, Warburton, and Capell. Johnson's text also reads "cares," but he believes "carts" to be "the true reading" (Yale 7:318). According to Furness, Tyrwhitt prints F1's "cars" for his source reading, but this is incorrect; Tyrwhitt always used F2, so in Observations itself the source reading is "cares" (27). The GM correctly represents his copy-text as "cares." Coleridge reads, with

Tyrwhitt, "cables," but none other in the NV has done so (13:164).

Riverside includes a long note on the passage, but little of it is pertinent. "Cables" is not mentioned (421).

IV.ii.63 Clown. Nay I am for all waters.

Correspondent "T.P." writes to the 1750 GM to criticize Warburton's edition, and to announce the imminent appearance of the best edition to come, but he does not specify whose edition that will be. In his remarks, he takes Warburton to task for his comments on this passage. "T.P." writes, "So foolish was I as to think this taken from the Italian proverb, Ho mantello d'ogni acqua, 'I have a cloke for all waters, applied, says Torriano, to one that can turn himself to any kind o'thing. No, says our great critic, 'it is a phrase taken from the actor's ability of making the audience cry either with mirth or grief'" (20:252 [page number misprinted as 522]).

NV cites [Zachary] Grey's friend Mr. Smith, in Grey's Critical, Historical, and Explanatory Notes (1754), for this explanation, complete with Italian translation. "T.P." is probably a pseudonymous signature for Mr. Smith; two other notes corroborating this fact appear in the chapters to follow (pages 113 and 189 below). Furness mercifully omits Warburton's note from the discussion (13:264).

Riverside glosses the phrase, which it says is "of unknown origin," much as "T.P." paraphrases it above (433).

THE HISTORY OF TROILUS AND CRESSIDA

I.iii.62 Ulysses. I giue to both your speeches: which were
such,

As Agamemnon and the hand of Greece
Should hold vp high in Brasse: and such againe
As venerable Nestor (hatch'd in Siluer)
Should with a bond of ayre, strong as the Axletree
In which the Heauens ride, knit all Greekes eares
To his experienc'd tongue:

As the 1766 GM excerpts from his Observations show, Tyrwhitt suggests that in this passage Nestor be not "hatched" but "thatched in silver," since the kind of engraving Tyrwhitt knows as "hatching" has nothing to do with silver and is of no use here. He objects also to the "bond of air," and revises "air" to "awe." The GM reviewer, presumably Hawkesworth, records his opinion that by "bond of air" Shakespeare meant Nestor's eloquence, which captivated the Greeks with sound alone. Hawkesworth does not discuss "hatched," however (36:22).

NV cites Tyrwhitt's emendations, but notes that Tyrwhitt had withdrawn "thatched" before the Johnson-Steevens 1778 because

he had discovered that engraving (hatching) in silver was "common in sword-hilts." As for "awe," NV quotes Steevens from the same edition declaring the "bond of air" to mean Nestor's compelling voice. Hawkesworth's comment thereon remains unmentioned (26:72). But Hawkesworth himself may have borrowed the idea. Although NV quotes only the final two sentences of what Johnson had to say here, his entire note even in the first edition (1765) would seem to have obviated the need for any further comment:

Ulysses begins his oration with praising those who had spoken before him, and marks the characteristic excellencies of their different eloquence, strength and sweetness, which he expresses by the different metals on which he recommends them to be engraven for the instruction of posterity. The speech of Agamemnon is such that it ought to be engraven in brass, and the tablet held up by him on the one side, and Greece on the other, to shew the union of their opinion. And Nestor ought to be exhibited in silver, uniting all his audience in one mind by his soft and gentle elocution. Brass is the common emblem of strength, and silver of gentleness. We call a soft voice a "silver" voice, and a persuasive tongue a "silver" tongue.. . . To "hatch," is a term of art for a particular method of engraving. Hacher, to cut, French [Yale 8:913].

ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL

I.i.126 Parolles. It is not politicke, in the Commonwealth of Nature, to preserve virginity. Losse of Virginitie, is rationall encrease,

Tyrwhitt would read, "national increase," evidently wishing to complete the "commonwealth" metaphor (35:617).

After citing Tyrwhitt, 1813 quotes from Steevens' explanation, "'rational increase' may mean the regular increase by which rational beings are propagated" (8:215).

Riverside follows Steevens (506).

I.iii.41 Countess. Such friends are thine enemies knave.
Clown. Y'are shallow Madam in great friends,

Tyrwhitt suggests we read "my" for "in," so that the clown is not labelling her friendless, but rather confessing himself grateful to those who take advantage of him (35:617).

1813 quotes Malone, who substitutes "e'en" for the disputed word. He writes, "The corruption of this passage was pointed out by Mr. Tyrwhitt. For the emendation now made, I am answerable." Malone also notes several other places in Shakespeare where exactly this homonymic substitution has occurred (8:236).

Riverside attributes Malone's "e'en" to Hanmer, and considers it "perhaps" a right reading. Tyrwhitt is ignored (509).

II.iii.20 Lafeu. I may truly say, it is a noueltie to the world.

Parolles. It is indeede if you will haue it in shewing, you shall reade it in what do ye call there.

Earlier editors had placed a comma after "indeed"; following this custom, Tyrwhitt goes on to read not "in shewing" but "a shewing" (35:617).

1813 cites Tyrwhitt both for the emendation offered in the GM and also for a dash between "showing" and "you." Evidently Reed considers "in showing" to require no further illustration after he quotes Henley, who had written that the phrase means "in a demonstration" (8:278).

Riverside notes, "in showing: visible, i.e. set forth in print" (516).

IV.ii.12 Diana. My mother did but dutie, such (my Lord)

As you owe to your wife.

Bertram. No more a'that:

I prethee do not striue against my vows:

I was compell'd to her, but I loue thee

In the January, 1776 GM, John Kynaston writes, "To the instances of inattention which have escaped Dr. Johnson in

his excellent edition of Shakespeare (remarked page 368, August Magazine,) permit me to add one more." He notes here that Johnson could not properly explain the passage above because he assumed that Bertram speaks of his marriage vows, or of his vows of love to Diana. Kynaston considers Johnson's emendations to be weak. He had suggested, "do not drive against my vows," and "do not shrive--against my voice/I was compell'd"; the latter offered, Johnson writes, "without much confidence" (Yale 7:394). Kynaston sees no reason for emendation, glossing "do not strive against my vows" as "do not oppose--do not urge any argument against" the vows Bertram had made never to acknowledge his wife Helena as his wife. The phrase here "is properly used for 'to oppose,' or to 'plead against'" (46:26). OED supports such a meaning, now obsolete, with a quotation as recently as 1600, from Haklyut's Voyages.

1813 quotes Steevens, "'Against his vows,' I believe, means--'against his determined resolution never to cohabit with Helena'; and this 'vow,' or 'resolution,' he very strongly expressed in his letter to the Countess." Clearly, Kynaston anticipated Steevens by almost 20 years, but neither Steevens nor Reed mentions Kynaston or his pseudonym "Q" (8:341).

Riverside explains "vows" much as Kynaston and Steevens do, without attribution (529).

IV.v.64 Countess. My Lord that's gone made himsele much
sport out of him, by his authoritie hee remaines heere,
which he thinkes is a pattent for his sawcinesse, and
indeede he has no pace, but runnes where he will.

Trying to make sense of "he has no pace, but runs where he will," Tyrwhitt writes, "should we not read--no place, that is, no station, or office in the family?" (35:617). As recorded in the GM review, Tyrwhitt claims to focus his observations only on those passages "passed over in silence, or attempted without success" by Johnson (35:583). This is something of an inference on the reviewer's part, since Tyrwhitt's exact words are "by former Commentators" (Observations 2); but it is quite clear that Johnson is indeed his main foil. This particular passage was "passed over in silence" in the 1765.

1813 prints Tyrwhitt's suggested emendation, and follows it with a note from Johnson: "A 'pace' is a certain or prescribed walk, so we may say of a man meanly obsequious, that he has learned his 'paces,' and of a horse who moves irregularly, that he has 'no paces.'" As is his invariable practice, Reed fails to name the editions from which he has adduced textual or explanatory notes (8:377); Johnson in fact wrote most of this note for the 1773, and the remainder (from "and" to "paces") for the 1778 (Yale 7:399). Obviously, both notes are responses to Tyrwhitt's suggestion.

Riverside follows Johnson, without attribution (535).

MEASURE FOR MEASURE

I.i.5 Duke. Since I am put to know, that your owne Science
Exceedes (in that) the lists of all aduice
My strength can giue you:

Most eighteenth-century editions read "not to know," following Rowe, who evidently could not make sense of "put to know." In a correspondence in the 1784 GM (54,1:407), "Omega" explains "not to know" as meaning "not to learn--need not be told (being convinced)."

1813 uses the F1 reading, reprinting Steevens' explanation for it, "I am compelled to acknowledge." "Omega's" interpretation of a discarded reading is not mentioned (6:187).

Riverside notes, "put to know: forced to recognize" (550).

I.i.50 Duke. No more euasion:

We haue with a leauen'd, and prepared choice
Proceeded to you;

As recorded in the 1765 GM, Heath reproduces line 51 thus:

We have with a prepar'd and leaven'd choice

and then discusses emendations for "leaven'd." After quoting Warburton's "levell'd," Heath suggests we omit the "and leaven'd"; in its place we should read simply "unleaven'd,"

meaning, he writes, "uncorrupt" (35:67).

1813 overlooks Heath's suggestion. Reed limits his remarks to indicating a preference for Johnson's gloss of "mature" for "leaven'd," evidently deeming the original word a better companion to "prepared" than Warburton's reading (6:196).

Riverside notes, "leaven'd: i.e. pervaded by the gradual working of judgment (like the action of yeast in bread)" (551).

I.ii.120 Claudio. Thus can the demy-god (Authority)

Make vs pay downe, for our offence, by waight

The words of heauen; on whom it will, it will,

On whom it will not (soe) yet still 'tis just.

Henley sends the 1780 GM several conjectures regarding this play because he had heard that Steevens and Malone "are continuing their illustrations of this incomparable author." Should his remarks "appear to be worthy of their notice," he writes, "they are very much at their service." For the passage above he alludes to a conjecture by a "Dr. Roberts" which he wishes to reject in favor of the original text. The Reverend Mr. Roberts of Eton was one of many who responded to Steevens' appeal for notes to an upcoming edition, the 1773 (Sherbo, Editor 108, note 15); Roberts suggests we read "swords of heaven" (1813 6:206-7). Henley writes, "Notwithstanding Dr. Roberts's ingenious conjecture, the text is

certainly right" (50:21-2). He reasons that the "words" referred to are those found at Romans 9:15,18 ("For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. . . Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will hardeneth").

1813 quotes this entire argument, attributing it correctly to Henley, but not mentioning the GM (6:206-7); Reed or Steevens must have found the note in Malone's edition (1790).

Riverside notes that the passage is explained by a reference to the biblical verses above, but does not attribute the discovery to Henley (553).

I.ii.128 Claudio. Our Natures doe pursue

Like Rats that rauyn downe their proper Bane,

A thirsty euill, and when we drinke, we die.

"Omega" writes, in the 1784 GM, that "raven" means to "devour greedily." "I mention this," he adds, "because I think I have seen a different explanation in Johnson and Steevens" (54,1:407). OED supports "Omega's" gloss.

Johnson himself had evidently passed over this line without comment (Yale 7:179), but Steevens defined "ravin" as "prey," according to Reed, who provides his own definition in the 1813, "eagerly or voraciously devour." Despite the very close similarity of their glosses, Reed makes no mention of

"Omega" (6:207).

Riverside employs "Omega's" formulation precisely ("devour greedily"), but without attribution to him (553).

I.iv.29 Isabella. Sir, make me not your storie.

The first entry reproduced in the 1783 GM review of Malone's Second Supplement contains his comment on the passage above. He suggests we read, "Mock me not:--your story." Malone continues, "So in Macbeth: 'Thou com'st to use thy tongue--thy story quickly." Lucio's reply to Isabella, "'Tis true," is now "pertinent and clear", Malone feels. "I have observed that almost every passage in our author, in which there is either a broken speech, or a sudden transition without a connecting particle, has been corrupted by the carelessness of either the transcriber or compositor."

1813 reprints Johnson's and Steevens' explanations of the passage as it originally stood. Johnson, for example, had paraphrased, "Do not, by deceiving me, make me the subject for a tale" (Yale 7:181). Reed then quotes Malone's conjecture substantially as above (6:220). The GM is not mentioned.

Riverside retains the F1 reading, and glosses "story" as a "theme for jesting or deception" (555).

II.i.204 Escalus. Master Froth, I would not haue you
acquainted with Tapsters; they will draw you Master
Froth, and you wil hang them:

Heath wishes to make the Froth/Tapster quibble more complete
by emending the passage to read, "and you will hang on them."
The suggestion is reprinted without comment in the 1765 GM
(35:67), but it must be noted that this reading would also
weaken the "draw/hang" quibble on criminal sentences.

1813 reprints Johnson's observation of the "cluster of
senses" for the word "draw," but does not mention Heath's
emendation (6:220).

Riverside suggests no emendation, and although it lists two
alternative explanations for "you will hang them," both carry
on the criminal-sentence metaphor suggested by "draw" (558).

III.i.59 Isabella. Therefore your best appointment make
with speed,
To Morrow you set on.

In his correspondence cited above, "Omega" also discusses a
problem with the phrase here, "set on." He asks, "Should we
not read 'out'?" (54,1:407).

1813 ignores "Omega" here and elsewhere. This passage is not
in any event a "great crux"; if anyone else has commented on
this phrase, Reed is not aware of it (6:297).

Riverside notes, "set on: set forth" (566).

IV.i.1 Song. Take, oh take those lips away,
that so sweetly were forsworne,

The 1765 Reliques review quotes Percy as writing that Mariana's song is the first stanza of a ballad which appears in its entirety in Beaumont and Fletcher's Bloody Brothers. Although its authorship is not certain, Percy reports, "Sewel and Gildon have printed it as Shakespeare's" (35:183).

1813 notes that Theobald had found the ballad in Beaumont and Fletcher first. But Percy can obviously claim precedence in the Sewel and Gildon reference, for which 1813 gives Steevens the credit. Percy is not mentioned in either instance (6:338).

Riverside evidently believes the song to be Shakespeare's, since no note appears.

IV.i.72 Duke. To bring you thus together 'tis no sinne,
Sith that the Iustice of your title to him
Doth flourish the deceit.

In another passage from Henley's long letter mentioned above, he rejects as "inaccurate" Warburton's gloss for "flourish" ("embroidery"--1813). Henley thinks that Steevens came closer when he compared this passage to a similar instance in

Twelfth Night, "empty trunks o'erflourished." Henley provides the specific definition, "flowers impressed on waste printed paper and old books, with which trunks, etc., are commonly lined" (50:22). Henley may think his definition more accurate than Warburton's, but it hardly illuminates the passage, which seems to demand a sense of "excuse" for "flourish."

1813 records Henley's part in the debate, as well as Steevens' later surmise that Henley's definition may not have obtained as early as Shakespeare's time (6:344). Since the GM is not mentioned, we may assume again that Reed found Henley's note in the prior editions.

Riverside notes, "flourish: make fair, justify" (573). But like my "excuse" gloss above, this one assumes a license unsupported by OED.

IV.ii.43 Abhorson. Euerie true mans apparrell fits your
Theefe.

In the same letter, Henley discusses this passage, asserting that "true man" is not always placed in opposition to "thief" as Steevens had suggested in his earlier editions. In Genesis 42:11, Henley reports, "true man" stands opposed to "spies." This seems less an illumination of Shakespeare than a criticism of Steevens, however.

1813 makes note of Steevens' correction by Henley. Once

again, the GM remains unmentioned (6:349).

Riverside follows Steevens, but makes no attribution to him (573).

IV.ii.88 Duke. How now? what noise? That spirit's possesst
with hast,

That wounds th'vnsisting Posterne with these strokes.

Continuing the 1780 letter, Henley responds to various proposed emendations for this passage, all of which evidently assume Rowe's "unresisting" to be the original reading. Henley comments, "'Unresisting' after all seems to be the true reading, and stands better in connexion with 'wounds' than any of the proposed emendations" (50:22).

Henley appears not to have considered Johnson carefully, who writes, "The three folios have it "unsisting postern," out of which Mr. Rowe made "unresisting," and the rest followed him. Sir Tho. Hanmer seems to have supposed "unresisting" the word in the copies, from which he plausibly enough extracted "unresting," but he grounded his emendation on the very syllable that wants authority" (Yale 7:203). That Henley can consider Rowe's unmetrical and unilluminating reading to be the true one against the unanimity of the Folios is rather curious. However, Johnson also confesses his puzzlement at "unsisting." OED finds no other instance of this word's occurrence.

1813 appropriately ignores Henley, reproduces all of Johnson's commentary here, and finally notes that Sir William Blackstone took "unsisting" to mean "never at rest," an explanation Reed says Steevens adopts (6:352-3).

Riverside is satisfied with no one emendation (574).

IV.ii.100 Duke. This is his Lords man.

Provost. And heere comes Claudio's pardon.

The GM review of Tyrwhitt's Observations includes his conjectures upon this passage. On the grounds that the Provost, who had just remarked that he expects no countermand, is unlikely suddenly to alter his opinion, Tyrwhitt proposes that the two speakers' names have been switched here, so that each man should actually recite the other's line (36:22).

Following this entry, the GM reviewer, probably Hawkesworth, declares that he is not persuaded by this reasoning. He argues, generally, that since the Provost has also just said, "Happely You something know," he is willing to believe in, if not to expect, a stroke of good fortune for Claudio.

1813 mentions Tyrwhitt's suggestion, then records Johnson's comment that "Either reading may serve equally well." Johnson defends this opinion with the same reason Hawkesworth gives for rejecting Tyrwhitt's emendation (6:354). Reed overlooks Hawkesworth's comment, however, and neglects to say

that Johnson's note appears in his 1773 (Yale 7:204); Hawkesworth and the GM have thus anticipated Johnson's opinion by several years.

Riverside adopts Tyrwhitt's conjecture and reassigns the speeches; furthermore "Lords" in line 100 is changed to "Lordship's" following Rowe. Both changes are properly attributed and enclosed within the customary brackets (574, 586).

IV.iv.23 Angelo. But that her tender shame
Will not proclaime against her maiden losse,
How might she tongue me? yet reason dares her no,
For my Authority beares of a credent bulke,

Henley's letter to the 1780 GM treats of this passage. He observes that Warburton "is evidently right" in preserving the F1 reading, though he is wrong in his explication of it ("The circumstance dares her to reply no to me, whatever I say" [1813 6:375]). "The expression is a provincial one," Henley writes, "and very intelligible." Reason itself "defies her to do it, as by this means she would not only publish her 'maiden loss,' but also as she would certainly suffer from the imposing credit of his station and power" (50:22).

In addition to providing Warburton's explication, 1813 notes Theobald's substitution of "note" for "no"; Hanmer's "her: No"; and Steevens' "not." Henley's explanation is given as

well. Reed finally admits into his text Malone's suggestion:

Yet reason dares her?--no:

For my authority . . .

Malone asserts that this use of "dare" is "yet a school-phrase" (6:375-7).

Riverside follows F1, and notes, "dares her no. Not satisfactorily explained, but the sense is clear: reason forbids it" (578).

V.i.353 Lucio. show your knaues visage with a poxe
 to you: show your sheepe-biting face, and be hang'd an
 houre: will't not off?

Henley here argues that Johnson "is much too positive" in asserting that "an hour" is an expression of "no particular use here"; "The Poet evidently refers to the ancient mode of punishing by the collistrigium, or the original pillory," writes Henley, "made like that part of the pillory at present which receives the neck, only it was placed horizontally, so that the culprit hung suspended in it by his chin, and the back of his head" (50:22).

1813 cites Henley substantially as above (6:405), without mention of the GM. Evidently this is another instance in which either Malone or Steevens found Henley's remarks

"worthy of their notice," and used them, whence Reed found them.

There is no evidence that Riverside is aware of Henley's conjectures, and indeed seems rather to echo Johnson here (582).

V.i.497 Duke. Looke that you loue your wife: her worth,
worth yours

Heath objects to the "works" substituted by Hanmer and Warburton for the second "worth" above; according to the 1765 GM review of his Revisal, Heath believes instead that we should read "worth's" in place of the first one (35:67).

1813 ignores Heath, but quotes Johnson as disapproving of the Hanmer emendation (6:413-4). Johnson leaves the text itself unamended from the F1 version here, but interprets the clause much as Heath does. Indeed, Johnson stands much in Heath's debt; his silent borrowings from Heath's Revisal, which appeared in February, some eight months before the October publication of Johnson's own edition, are thoroughly documented in Arthur Sherbo's Samuel Johnson, Editor of Shakespeare.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORIES

THE FIRST PART OF HENRY THE SIXTH

I.iv.8 Master Gunner. The Princes espyals haue informed me,
How the English, in the Suburbs close entrencht,
Went through a secret Grate of Iron Barres,
In yonder Tower, to ouer-peere the Citie,
And thence discover, how with most aduantage
They may vex vs with Shot or with Assault.

As the 1765 GM review of Tyrwhitt's Observations reports, he suggests we read "Wont" for "Went" (35:616). The Master Gunner is explaining a strategem the English have used, and how he thinks they may be ambushed at the grate the next time they come to survey the city. In Tyrwhitt's view, the strategem has become a frequent practice by the time the gunner speaks. Furthermore, the original reading sounds as though the English have gone through the grate itself, while "wont" does not. Tyrwhitt's emendation thus makes very good sense.

Following this passage, the GM editor, probably Hawkesworth,

asserts his preference for the original reading. He argues that the gunner, "hoping they might go thither again for the same purpose, had planted a piece of ordnance against it, but had watched three days for their going thither again, without success. This does not look as though they were 'wont' to go; (i.e.) went frequently. The sense seems to be, having heard that they went once, I have conceived hopes that they may go again" (35:616). But whether or not they were 'wont' to peer through, the English appear, exactly as expected, and are ambushed.

1813 omits mention of the GM, but cites Tyrwhitt, admits his revision into its text, and then quotes Malone as follows: "The emendation proposed by Mr. Tyrwhitt is fully supported by the passage in Hall's Chronicle, on which this speech is formed" (13:37). Johnson's only comment on these lines, which appears first in the Appendix added to the last volume of the first edition (1765), notes how the English went "not through a secret grate" but merely approached the grate and looked through. He adds, "I did not know till of late that this passage had been thought difficult" (Yale 8:569).

Riverside admits Tyrwhitt's conjecture into its text, with proper attribution (602, 628).

THE SECOND PART OF HENRY THE SIXTH

III.ii.160 Warwick. See how the blood is settled in his
face.

Oft haue I seeme a timely-parted Ghost,
Of ashy semblance, meager, pale, and bloodlesse,
Being all descended to the labouring heart,
Who in the Conflict that it holds with death,
Attracts the same for aydance 'gainst the enemy,
Which with the heart there cooles, and ne're returneth,
To blush and beautifie the Cheeke againe.
But see, his face is blacke, and full of blood:
His eye-balles further out, than when he liued,
Staring full gastly, like a strangled man:

"S.H.," whom one would assume to be Samuel Henley (see page 55 above), but who is not cited in Kuist for this particular entry, writes to the November 1781 GM to criticize an author in the Critical Review for his remarks on Trinder's Essay on English Grammar. The author there, writes Henley, applauds Trinder's use of the passage above to illustrate a fine point of grammar; according to the report, Trinder thinks that the phrase "Who in the conflict that it holds" uses "who" correctly because the ghost is human, and "it" correctly because its sex is unknown. Henley considers this judgment "farfetched and absurd in the highest degree" because Shakespeare does not refer to the ghost when he writes "who" and "it" here. Rather, "it appears perfectly

plain that Shakespeare means the heart, to which the blood has all descended, 'it' attracting the same for aidance gainst the enemy, 'death.'" Henley suggests we read "which" for "who," and then alter the subsequent "which" to "that" to avoid repetition. Henley concludes that "the whole will be intelligible, except that I do not know what is meant by 'timely-parted'" (51:504).

In the next issue of the GM, the "Supplement for 1781" printed in January 1782, "B.B.C.C." writes to add further strictures to Henley's. He asserts that a text he remembers, but cannot now locate, reads "timely-parted corse," not "ghost," and that the body here spoken of had suffered "a violent and untimely death." He remarks, "I am surprised at your inserting so weak a criticism as that of Mr. Trinder's on the description of the murdered corpse of Duke Humphrey" (51:625-6). An anonymous writer, probably a GM editor or even Duncombe himself, next inserts a note of corrections in the January 1782 issue to report much the same thing as "B.B.C.C.," but properly attributing the "corse" reading to "Dr. Johnson" (52:23).

1813 omits any mention of these opinions, but quotes instead from Johnson: "All that is true of the body of a dead man is here said by Warwick of the soul. I would read,

Oft have I seen a timely-parted coarse,

But of two common words how or why was one changed for the other?" (Yale 8:589). Johnson speculates that a transcriber

inserted "ghost" because he could not account for the use of "timely-parted" when speaking of a body. But 1813 quotes Steevens and Malone as reporting that Shakespeare's contemporaries often interchanged the two words (13:289). Johnson's suggested reading is likely the source for "B.B.C.C.'s" confidence that "corse" is the true reading; perhaps Johnson's edition is the remembered text he cannot find.

Riverside in effect agrees with Henley that "who" refers to the heart, but notes, "timely-parted ghost: i.e., the corpse of one who has died a natural death" (649). Riverside thus agrees with Steevens and Malone against Johnson.

THE THIRD PART OF HENRY THE SIXTH

V.vi.10 King. What Scene of death hath Roscius now to Acte?

"W.R." of "S--- Hall, Sussex," wrote to the GM in 1784 to comment on errors he had found in Johnson's most recent edition, the 1778. His remarks on this passage concern Johnson's collaborator Steevens. He asserts that Steevens was not right to adduce this line to prove Roscius a tragedian, since Horace and Quintillian both testify otherwise. He quotes, "Horat. Epis. II. Lib. II v. 62 'Quae gravis Aesopus, quae doctus Roscius egit,'" in which line, he writes, "the epithets assigned them are clearly intended to

distinguish their different walks." His Quintillian quotation, from "Lib. II cap. 3," is rather more persuasive: "Roscius citator, Aesopus gravior fuit, quod ille Comedias, hic Tragoedias egit" (54,2:885).

1813 cites Malone as quoting this entry, and identifying "W.R." as being "probably Sir Walter Rawlinson." "But it is not in Quintillian or in any other ancient writer we are to look in order to ascertain the text of Shakespeare," Malone continues. "Roscius was called a tragedian by our author's contemporaries . . . and this was sufficient authority to him, or rather to the author of the original play, for there this line is found" (14:200).

Riverside identifies Roscius as an actor without specifying his genre (703).

THE TRAGEDY OF RICHARD THE THIRD

I.iii.241 Queen Margaret. Why strew'st thou Sugar on that
Bottel'd Spider,

The excerpts from Ritson's Remarks in the 1783 GM include his judgment of Johnson's explanation on this passage as "very little worse than none at all." Ritson identifies the "bottled spider" particularly as "the large bloated spider, with a deep black shining skin, generally esteemed the most venomous" (53,2:593).

NV cites both Ritson and Johnson, without mentioning the GM (16:101). Johnson had written, "A 'spider' is called bottled because, like other insects, he has a middle slender and a belly protuberant. Richard's form and venom make her liken him to a spider" (Yale 8:618).

Riverside appears to decide against Ritson, noting, "bottled: swollen, big-bellied" (720).

THE LIFE AND DEATH OF KING JOHN

I.i.231 Bastard. Philip, sparrow, Iames,
There's toys abroad, anon Ile tell thee more.

Holt White writes to the 1785 GM, "The Sparrow is called Philip from its note" (55:278, signed "T.H.W.").

Steevens' 1793, Reed's 1803, and the Boswell-Malone 1821 all use White's note with proper attribution.

NV ignores T.H.W. and Holt White, but quotes several others who later said substantially the same thing about "Philip" and sparrows. NV also notes that Warburton had emended the passage to read, "Spare me," which is probably what prompted Holt White to explain it (19:61). But Johnson had already noted his own preference for "the old reading," adding, "Dr. [Zachary] Gray [i.e. Grey] observes, that Skelton has a poem to the memory of Philip Sparrow; and Mr. Pope in a short

numberless other places) has the signification of, 'by'" (Observations 50).

NV includes Tyrwhitt's reading among its textual collations, noting that Malone and many others accepted it. But Furness himself interprets "Kings" to refer to the "gates" of the previous line (19:127-9).

Riverside does not comment. Incidentally, Riverside gives the speech to Hubert, citing a conjecture by the modern scholar E. A. J. Honigmann (776, 799).

THE TRAGEDY OF KING RICHARD THE SECOND

II.i.225 Ross. . . .

226 Willoughby. . . .

A correspondent "R." inserts a query in the 1784 GM regarding the characters of this play. He writes, "Lord Willoughby was certainly Willoughby of Eresby; but who was Lord Ross?" (54,2:732).

1813 does not mention "R.," but quotes Steevens on the subject of Ross: "Now spelt 'Roos,' one of the Duke of Rutland's titles" (11:4). Whether Steevens volunteered this information, or was prompted to action by the GM query, is not possible to determine from Reed's note.

Riverside identifies neither lord.

II.i.132 Gaunt. Ioyne with the present sicknesse that I
haue,

And thy vnkindnesse be like crooked age,
To crop at once a too-long wither'd flowre.

The 1784 GM reviews Thomas Davies' Dramatic Miscellanies, &c., largely an account of eighteenth-century theatrical life. The work does include a few critical passages, but the GM reviewer notes, "We are more pleased with the anecdotes they contain, than with the criticism, however excellent." Why reviewer Duncombe would prefer the anecdotes is clear to the reader who encounters Davies' windy critical preoccupation with such issues as what liquor sack may be in Henry IV, why a fellow in Henry VIII must be a brazier by evidence of his red face, and how much the wonderful Elizabeth was once admired. For the passage above, Davies notes Johnson's reading of "crooked edge," and Steevens' approval of that reading for its image of Time and his scythe. Davies prefers the original "age," which he paraphrases, "i.e., the many infirmities of age" (54,1:360).

Although 1813 ignores Davies' illustration, Reed cites both Johnson and Steevens. Johnson had suggested changing not only "age" to "edge," but also "like" to "time's," which yields,

And thy unkindness be time's crooked edge
To crop at once--

Johnson confessed he could not apprehend how age could crop anything "at once," nor how the idea of "crookedness" relates to "cropping" (Yale 7:435). Reed follows notes from Johnson and Steevens with [John] M.[onck] Mason's explanation: "Shakespeare had probably two different but kindred ideas in his mind: the bend of age, and the sickle of time, which he confounded together" (11:51-2). The first of Mason's ideas pretty much encompasses Davies' illustration. Mason's Comments on the Several Editions of Shakespeare, which went through more than one edition itself, first appeared in 1785.

Riverside's silence on this issue perhaps reflects our more liberal attitude toward a poet's use of words.

THE FIRST PART OF HENRY THE FOURTH

I.ii.40 Prince. As is the hony, my old Lad of the Castle:

Correspondent "P.T." sent a lengthy letter to the 1752 GM entitled, "Observations of Shakespeare's Falstaff," in which he argues that the actual Sir John Oldcastle could not have provided the model for Falstaff. "P.T." must then account for this line, of course, which so many have seen as a reference to Oldcastle. He suggests that "my old lad" be set off with commas as a vocative phrase:

As is the honey, my old lad, of the Castle.

This has the effect of breaking up the "old Lad of the Castle" phrase often taken as Shakespeare's hint--or slip--linking Falstaff and Oldcastle. Such an effect is fine with "P.T.," who argues that the historical Oldcastle was no such buffoon as plays have portrayed him. Nor did Shakespeare need to remind his audience of the supposed Falstaff-Oldcastle similarity, he asserts. The real Olcastle, a Protestant martyr in "P.T.'s" eyes, was long forgotten by the time he had given his name, through a quirk of history, to the stock buffoon character already very popular on the Elizabethan stage. Shakespeare took this popular clown and made him so much more effective a character that there was no longer any need or desire to identify him as a commonplace figure. The "Castle" in "P.T.'s" reading becomes a famous tavern to which the Prince and Falstaff would frequently resort (22:459-61).

In the textual notes, NV cites "P.T.," as found in the GM, for this suggestion (21:31). The NV editor for this play, Samuel B. Hemingway, adopts the Q1 text of 1598 almost in its entirety; Q1 here reads "of Hibla" after "hony." Rowe had used the F1 text above, and perhaps "P.T." followed Rowe. Had "P.T.'s" source been an edition taken from Q1, his emendation would not have been as attractive to him; "the honey of Hibla of the Castle" is a highly unlikely reading.

Riverside follows the quarto here, and reports the traditional allusion to Oldcastle (849).

I.iii.201 Hotspur. By heauen, me thinkes it were an easie
leap,
to plucke bright Honor from the pale-fac'd Moone,

Holt White discusses this passage among other remarks in a 1783 letter to the GM. He reports that Warburton had found Hotspur's language in this passage gallant and heroic, but that despite this testimony, all others have seen the speech "as bombast." He continues, "Beaumont and Fletcher thought it a proper object of ridicule, and as such have licentiously quoted it in the Knight of the Burning Pestle" (53,2:933). He then inserts the quotation.

Evidently, Holt White's note has never been used elsewhere. It appears in none of the Steevens, Reed, or Malone editions, nor is it mentioned by Hemingway in the NV. In any event, Theobald had said a similar thing in his 1733. Warburton appears to be the only commentator who admires these lines (21:75-6).

II.i.1 Carrier. Heigh-ho, an't be not foure by the day, Ile
be hang'd. Charles waine is ouer the new Chimney, and
yet our horse not packt.

The 1783 GM excerpts from Ritson's Remarks include his

elucidation of "Charles' wain." Ritson says he is indebted "to a learned friend," and defines the phrase as "the vulgar name given to the constellation called the Bear. But why 'Charleses wain'? What 'Charles'? It is, in fact, a mere corruption of the 'Chorles' or 'Churls' wain (Sax. ceorl, a countryman.)" (53,2:593).

NV quotes Ritson's illustration, but does not mention the GM (21:87).

Riverside identifies the allusion as being to 'Charlemagne's wagon," or the Great Bear, without referring to Ritson or his differing etymology (854).

IV.ii.11 Falstaff. If I be not asham'd of my Souldiers, I
am a sowc't-Gurnet:

Rawligh Witlim's angry exchange with Matthew Wendall in the 1760 GM does not end with "keel the pot" (see page 42 above), but discusses "gurnet" as well. The sarcastic Witlim asserts that the word is a variation of "grunt," and "souc'd gurnet" means a pickled hog (30:276). Wendall writes back to counter that "gurnet" is a salt water fish, and that if Witlim would be more careful, he could find both "gurnet" and "keel" in Johnson's Dictionary (30:405).

Although Witlim is wrong in this specific instance, he is not far afield; the American Heritage dictionary reports that "gurnet" does indeed derive from "grunt," except that in this instance the grunt is a noise the fish makes when

brought ashore.

Years later, as a sequel to the above exchange, "D.Y." prints a plate of the "Red Gurnet" in the 1767 GM (37:341). The Nichols File does not refer to this specific page of the GM, but a 1773 article signed "D.Y." is attributed to David Henry (Kuist 78). Henry is the "ingenious young printer" who collaborated with Richard Cave on the editing, printing, and publishing of the GM after the death of its founder, Richard's uncle Edward Cave, in 1754 (Nichols xlvihi). It is a safe bet that Henry is also the "D.Y." of 1767.

NV quotes Johnson, Steevens, and Malone for their definitions, which differ slightly, but all see humor and contempt in the expression. The GM debate, earlier than any of these scholars' editions, is ignored. Hemingway settles for a quotation from the OED: "Gurnet: gurnard.. . . Used as a term of opprobrium (21:264).

THE SECOND PART OF HENRY THE FOURTH

I.ii.58 Chief Justice. . . .

Regarding the real identity of the Lord Chief Justice in this play, "M.E." writes to the 1781 GM to dispute the traditional belief that Sir William Gascoigne was the judge who disciplined Prince Hal. "M.E." argues that since Gascoigne died in 1412, the last year of Henry IV's reign, he

could not be the man who speaks to Henry V about the treatment he had given the new king as a young prince. "M.E." takes historian John Trussel to task for reporting the disciplinary incident and the subsequent discussion, assuming all the while that the Justice was Gascoigne. Trussel did not even have Shakespeare's excuse of "licence" for his deviation from possibility, writes "M.E." (51:516). The GM furnishes here a full-page portrait of Gascoigne.

NV quotes G. R. French's Shakespeareana Genealogica (1869), which states that a Sir William Hankford was Gascoigne's successor, and the DNB, which reports that Hankford takes Gascoigne's place in one version of the legend. Matters are further confused, however, in that the 1412 date above may well be imprecise. In any event, "M.E." and the GM are absent from the inconclusive NV discussion (23:5-6).

Riverside assumes Gascoigne to be the Justice involved (890, 867).

II.iv.33 Falstaff. When Arthur first in Court--(emptie the Iordan) and was a worthy King:

Percy finds this fragment's source in a ballad entitled "Sir Lancelot du Lake," according to the 1765 review of Reliques (35:182).

NV errs in thinking Steevens to be first with this discovery. Percy is not mentioned (23:167).

Riverside identifies the ballad without attribution (898).

II.iv.284 Falstaff. Ha? a Bastard Sonne of the Kings? And
art not thou Poines, his Brother?

In one excerpt from Ritson's Remarks in the 1783 GM review, Ritson asks, "His brother? whose brother? The King's, or his bastard son's?" Instead, Ritson suggests we omit a comma and read "Poins his brother," which he calls "a vulgar corruption of the genetive case." He continues, with characteristic sarcasm, "That so easy a mark should never before be hit is strange indeed. But the meaning, though obviously wrong to the eye, can never be mistaken by the dullest ear. Such an advantage in this, and in many other instances, has the stage over the closet" (53,2:594).

NV reports that the quarto version reads "Poins his," lending Ritson's suggestion a good deal of authority. According to NV's textual notes, Rann adopts Ritson's "Poins's" for his 1794. NV quotes Ritson in the explanatory notes as above, but makes no mention of the GM (23:204).

Riverside follows the quarto reading, and appends no note to this line.

III.ii.23 Shallow. and Will Squele a Cot-sal-man,

Ritson reports that Steevens had explained a "Cotswold man"

(so it reads in Ritson's text) by paraphrasing, "i.e., one skilled in gymnastic excercises." But Ritson has a nearly opposite illustration; he quotes two instances in which, he says, the expression signifies a timid individual: "As yt were a lyon of Cotswoll," and "You stale old ruffian, you lyon of Cotswoll." Ritson remarks, "It is rather unlucky that the ingenious commentator did not comprehend the force of this expression. A 'lyon of Cotswold' is a sheep" (53,2:594).

NV quotes Steevens' explanation as above. Malone is cited, however, as writing that the Cotswold games did not begin until the reign of James I, so Steevens' illustration is probably anachronistic. Matthias A. Shaaber, the NV editor for this play, comments, "Though Malone is very probably right, the commentators uniformly annotate this phrase with references to the Cotswald games, and even Onions glosses it 'athletic man.'" Shaaber's finding of uniformity obviously does not include Ritson's suggestion, which is ignored, as is the GM (23:237).

Riverside identifies only the region in Gloucestershire referred to, making no further explanation, perhaps wisely (904).

IV.iii.6 Falstaff. Well then, Colleuile is your Name, a
Knight is your Degree, and your Place, the Dale.
Colleuile shall still be your Name, a Traytor your
Degree, and the Dungeon your Place, a place deepe
enough: so shall you be still Colleuile of the Dale.

The 1766 GM review quotes Tyrwhitt, "But where is the wit,
or the logic of this conclusion?" He offers the following
instead:

and the dungeon your Place, a dale deep enough,

in the belief that thus is the logic improved and the wit
sharpened. The GM reviewer, probably Hawkesworth, follows
this suggestion with a lengthy commentary of his own.

Now as to the logic of this passage, it
certainly consists in the proof that a dungeon is
a valley; which the proposed emendation wholly
destroys.

A deep place is a dale;
But a dungeon is a deep place,
Therefore a dungeon is a dale.

This logic, such as it is, is very suitable
to the character it is imputed to; and as to the
wit of the conclusion, there is at least as much
wit in this humorous sophistry by which Falstaff
supposes he proves a dungeon to be a dale, as in
his calling a dungeon a dale arbitrarily, and then

saying Colevill of the dungeon, is Colevill of the dale.

Beside the words 'deep enough,' are redundant, if the alteration takes place: If the dungeon be a dale, Colville of the dungeon will be Colevill of the dale, whether this dale be deep or not; neither can a dungeon with any propriety be said to be deep as a dale, though it may properly be said to be deep as a place.

Falstaff infers, that the dungeon is a dale from its depth; he does not first affirm it to be a dale, and then to be deep [36:23].

NV cites Tyrwhitt for his suggestion, and then quotes Johnson in reply, from the 1773, "The sense of 'dale' is included in 'deep'; a 'dale' is a deep place; a 'dungeon' is a deep place: he that is in a 'dungeon' may be therefore said to be 'in a dale'" (Yale 7:512). Hawkesworth's opinion, once again a virtual anticipation of Johnson's, has been left unrecorded (23:323).

Riverside follows the original reading.

V.iii.102 Falstaff. Let King Couitha know the truth thereof.

The 1765 GM review of Reliques notes Percy's agreement with Warburton that there was once as "old bombast play" of King Cophetua, and Percy's report of a ballad entitled, "King Cophetua and the Beggar Maid" (35:182).

NV quotes Johnson, who acknowledges his debt to Percy for this ballad's identification. NV does not mention Warburton, or any "old bombast play," or the GM review (23:427).

Riverside notes the allusion to the ballad without attribution (920).

THE LIFE OF HENRY THE FIFTH

II.i.36 Quickly. O welliday Lady, if he be not hewne now, we shall see wilful adultery and murther committed.

The GM account of Malone's Supplement quotes his text as reading, "well-a-day, lady." From this reading Malone proceeds to declare, "Surely, 'lady' has crept into this passage by the compositor's eye glancing to the preceding word. It seems to have no meaning here." Malone's own source text was "the quarto" (1813 12:323); had he known of the F1 reading reproduced above, he might not have been so sure of the compositor's backward glance. Following this quotation, the GM reviewer Duncombe, also ignorant of the F1 version, nonetheless offers quite a satisfactory response: "To us it seems obviously to mean 'by our lady,' or 'by'r Lady,' a kind of oath very common in those times" (50:376).

1813 does not mention any discussion connected with this phrase, though several paragraphs are devoted to "hewn."

Reed also uses Malone's spelling of "well-a-day," and his use of "drawn" for "hewn" (12:322-3).

Riverside notes, "Lady: (by Our) Lady, a mild oath" (941), without attribution to the reviewer Duncombe.

IV.Chorus.15 The Countrey Cocks doe crow, the Clocks doe
towle:

And the third howre of drowsie Morning nam'd,
Prowd of their Numbers, and secure in Soule,
The confident and ouer-lustie French,
Doe the low-rated English play at Dice;

The 1765 GM excerpts from Tyrwhitt's Observations record his suggestion here of "name" for "nam'd," which creates a second, parallel verb for the subject "Clocks." He also begins a new sentence with "Proud" of line 17 (35:616).

Tyrwhitt's source text, accurately reproduced in the GM, had differed from the F1 version only in placing the phrase "the third . . . nam'd" within parentheses; the phrase was still to be read as an absolute describing the circumstances attendant upon the action of the subject "French" two lines later. Both the original and Tyrwhitt's versions make grammatical sense, but Tyrwhitt's has the advantage of superior logical sense as well.

1813 cites Tyrwhitt for this suggestion, omitting mention of the GM, and admits his alteration into its text. Reed quotes Steevens's approbation, "I have admitted this very

that Theobald's suggestion is inferior to his own because it deviates more from the source text. "In conjectural criticism, as in mechanics," Tyrwhitt writes, "the perfection of the art, I apprehend, consists in producing a given effect with the least possible force" (Observations 44). Steevens has added, "It will be the lot of few critics to retire with advantage gained over my lamented friend, Mr. Tyrwhitt" (12:399).

Riverside adopts Tyrwhitt's "if," within brackets, with proper attribution (958, 974).

THE FAMOUS HISTORY OF THE LIFE OF HENRY THE EIGHTH

II.iv.111 Queen Katherine. You haue by Fortune, and his
Highnesse fauors,
Gone slightly o're lowe steppes, and now are mounted
Where Powres are your Retainers, and your words
(Domestickes to you) serue your will, as't please
Your self pronounce their Office.

In his excerpts printed in the 1765 GM, Tyrwhitt suggests that we read "your wards" for "your words" here. He argues, "The Queen rises naturally in her description. She paints the powers of government depending upon Wolsey under three images: as his retainers, his wards, his domestick servants (35:616).

1813 cites Tyrwhitt as above, omitting mention of the GM, and quotes Steevens as supporting the emendation (15:96).

Riverside retains the F1 reading, but expresses a lack of confidence in its own gloss: "your words . . . office: i.e. words, like menial servants, are made to serve any function that you choose to give them (?)" (996).

CHAPTER IV

THE TRAGEDIES

THE TRAGEDY OF TITUS ANDRONICUS

IV.i.89 Marcus. And sweare with me, as with the wofull

Feere

And father of that chast dishonoured Dame,
Lord Iunius Brutus sweare for Lucrece rape,

According to the review of Observations in the 1765 GM, Tyrwhitt suggests we restore the word "feere" to the text as above, in place of "peer," the word found in all the eighteenth-century editions. Tyrwhitt finds this reading in his familiar F2, and defines the word "feere" as "companion" (35:583). In this particular usage, he writes, it means "metaphorically, a 'husband'" (Observations 15).

1813 gives Tyrwhitt the credit for finding "feere" and for applying its definition in the metaphorical sense here (although Reed mistakenly identifies Tyrwhitt's source as the "first folio"). Tyrwhitt is also quoted as calling this reading "incontestably the true one." Steevens agreed with

him in his own editions (21:86-7). OED supports a definition such as the one Tyrwhitt offers.

THE TRAGEDY OF ROMEO AND JULIET

I.iv.37 Romeo. For I am prouerb'd with a Grandsier Phrase,
Ile be a Candle-holder and looke on,
The game was nere so faire, and I am done.

Mercutio. Tut, duns the Mouse, the Constables owne
word,
If thou art dun, weele draw thee from the mire.
Or saue your reuerence loue, wherein thou stickest
Vp to the eares,

The same "T.P." identified as Grey's friend Mr. Smith in chapter 2 above, page 67, wrote again to the GM in 1750 to comment upon this disputed passage. Noting first that Pope had omitted the lines, "T.P." proceeds to ridicule Warburton, who had explained "constable's own word" as if Mercutio thereby pretends Romeo's proverbs are some kind of password for the constable; "dun," said Warburton, refers to Romeo's dark complexion. Next "T.P." offers his own emendation: we are to read "ward" for "word." Mercutio's obscure phrase hence becomes "Dun's the mouse, the Constable's own ward." The whole problem begins with a quibble on the word "done," "T.P." writes, and Mercutio only means, "Nothing to it," because they are standing in Capulet's "own ward,"

where Capulet is least likely to tolerate any kind of disturbance or altercation. "T.P." claims that the sequel bears this out, since Capulet soon chastises Tybalt for causing trouble in his house. The letter to the GM closes with "T.P." ridiculing Warburton further, claiming that by now all of Warburton's edition has been "committed to the flames" (20:362).

NV omits any reference to "T.P." or to the GM, and consequently does not mention the "ward" emendation. Malone writes, "I know not why, this phrase seems to have meant 'Peace: be still!'" and guesses it is perhaps because a constable remains quiet while apprehending malefactors (1:58).

Riverside notes that the phrase "dun's the mouse" was a proverb meaning "be silent and unseen"; the editor remarks, "hence the association with constables" (1064).

I.iv.72 Mercutio. On Courtiers knees, that dreame on
Cursies strait:

Tyrwhitt reports that F2 reads "countries knees," which leads him to suspect that the true reading may be "counties (i.e., noblemen)" (35:582). The word "courtiers" appears again in F2 in the very next line, and Tyrwhitt notes that other editors have strayed so far as to change this second "courtiers" to "lawyers." But "lawyers" is the reading of

all the quartos and F1.

NV quotes Tyrwhitt's conjecture among the textual notes, ignoring the GM (1:64).

Riverside reads "courtiers'" (1065).

II.i.13 Mercutio. Young Abraham Cupid he that shot so true,
When King Cophetua lou'd the begger Maid,

The 1765 GM review of Percy's Reliques reports his discussion of the old ballad "King Cophetua and the Beggar-Maid," also mentioned in chapter 3 above, page 106. Percy quotes a line thus: "The blinded boy that shot so trim." He suggests, "It is, therefore, not improbable that Shakespeare wrote 'shot so trim,' and that the players or printers not knowing the allusion, might alter it to 'shot so true'; 'trim,' besides being the more humorous expression, seems most likely to have been put into the mouth of Mercutio" (35:181). Just prior to this entry, the GM review had quoted Percy's reference to this passage in a discussion of Much Ado About Nothing and the famous archer Adam Bell (page 53 above). There Percy suggests that the "Abraham Cupid" of Romeo and Juliet makes no particular sense; the line should read "Adam Cupid," alluding to Bell.

NV quotes the Cambridge Shakespeare (1865) to the effect that Pope was the first to call attention to the ballad mentioned, but did not admit "trim" into his text. Cam-

bridge then cites Percy for the "trim" reading in his Reliques, notes NV, but the GM is not mentioned. Steevens appears to be the first to have changed his text to "trim," in his 1793. NV does not cite Percy for his note on "Abraham Cupid," giving that credit to Upton instead (1:87-9).

Riverside retains "Abraham" for its reference to a thieving beggar called the "Abraham man," and follows Q1, published in 1597, where the reading is, indeed, "trim" (1067). Percy was obviously not aware of the Q1 version; he would have been gratified to know it supports his conjecture.

THE TRAGEDY OF JULIUS CAESAR

IV.iii.136 Brutus. Ile know his humor, when he knowes his
time:

What should the Warres do with these Iigging Fooles?

The 1783 GM account of the Second Supplement records Malone's disapproval of Capell's "jingling" emendation for "jigging" here. He writes that Capell has over six hundred "capricious and unwarrantable" alterations. As "jig" meant a metrical composition, he notes, "jigging fools" refers to "silly poets" (53,1:507). In fairness it must be noted that Malone was continually escalating the number of "unwarrantable" emendations he counted in Capell, and never documented more than a handful (Vickers 6:349n).

NV defends Capell by noting that many editors followed Pope, the originator of "jingling," but that Capell alone suffered Malone's attack; not even Pope is blamed. H. H. Furness, Jr., the editor of the NV edition of Julius Caesar, defends Capell from the attack, writing, "Malone and Steevens were ever unjust to Capell, though often silently adopting or appropriating his sagacious emendations." NV makes no mention here of the GM (17:216).

Riverside follows F1 without comment.

THE TRAGEDY OF HAMLET, PRINCE OF DENMARK

I.i.117 Horatio. As stars with trains of fire, and dews of
blood,

Disasters in the sun;

[The passage in which these lines occur does not appear in F1; the version above is Riverside's, which follows Q2 (1604/5) but modernizes the spelling. The two lines have long been troublesome, since they follow a complete sentence, yet contain no verb of their own, and bear no other syntactic connection with their neighbors. Rowe had emended them as follows:

Stars shone with trains of fire, dews of blood fell;

Disasters veil'd the sun.

Rowe's emendation was followed by most eighteenth-century editors.]

The 1783 GM review of Malone's Second Supplement reprints his retraction of a note he had written previously.

"Instead of my former, I wish to substitute the following note," he writes. "The words 'shone,' 'fell,' and 'veil'd,' having been introduced by Mr. Rowe without authority, may be safely rejected." He suggests a change "nearer to the original copy":

Astres, with trains of fire and dews of blood,
Disastrous, dimm'd the sun.

Malone concedes that there is no authority for 'astres' either, but reasons that it would be a coinage from astrum exactly parallel to Shakespeare's 'antres,' in Othello, from antrum. "If, however, this be thought too licentious," Malone writes, he offers "His stars," referring to Caesar. As authority for "dim" used as a verb, Malone cites The Tempest, Richard III, and Sonnet 18 (53,1:507).

NV quotes Malone's "astres" among its explanatory notes. No editor has followed this reading. The GM is not mentioned (3:18).

Riverside annotates line 116 thus: "One or more lines may have been lost between this line and the next" (1143).

I.ii.65 Hamlet. A little more then kin, and lesse then
kinde.

In a letter to the 1774 GM, Rev. John Kynaston ("Q") writes from Caerhaes, Cornwall, to review the illustrations Warburton, Johnson, and Hanmer have offered for this line. Warburton considers "kind" to be an adjective here, and adds it, in the place of "and," to the King's line immediately preceding:

But now my cousin Hamlet, kind my son?

This would seem, however, to require Hamlet to call himself cruel with his reply. Johnson thinks instead that "kind" is used here in its Teutonic sense of "child." He writes, "Hamlet therefore answers with propriety, to the titles of 'cousin' and 'son,' which the King had given him, that he was somewhat more than 'cousin,' and less than 'son'" (Yale 8:961). Turning to Hanmer, Kynaston examines his assertion, supported with lines from Gorbuduc, IV.i, and Shakespeare's Richard II, IV.i., that "kin and kind" is merely a common proverbial expression for relatives, which Hamlet twists in order to exaggerate the differences between himself and his uncle. Finally, Kynaston suggests that his own interpretation is closer to the mark. He writes that "kind" also means "nature," and that the significance of Hamlet's remark lies in the fact that he and his uncle have an "unnatural" relationship because it is "founded in two unnatural crimes, murder and incest" (44:455-6). OED reports instances of

this usage in other sources.

NV cites Steevens for the explanation of "unnatural" for "less than kind," including Steeven's argument that "kind" means "nature." No mention is made of "Q" or Kynaston, who was clearly first with this suggestion (3:33).

Riverside's gloss is very close to Johnson's.

I.v.76 Ghost. Cut off euen in the Blossomes of my Sinne,
Vnhouzzeled, disappointed, vnnaneld,

In the same letter with the entry above, Kynaston turns his attention to this troublesome passage, and in so doing initiates an extended debate that continues through several issues of the magazine. He quotes Capell first,

Unhousel'd, unanointed, unanneal'd,

but centers his discussion upon the "unnanel'd" of F1. Pope, he notes, suggested we read it in the sense of "un-knell'd," or "no knell rung," emphasizing how the former King departed this world unaccompanied by proper and sufficient obsequies. In response to Pope, Theobald offered "unaneal'd," by which he meant "un-anointed," deriving this word, in Kynaston's account, from the Teutonic an ole, "without oil." In Theobald's version, then, the missing ceremony is extreme unction. Kynaston derives his own suggestion, "unannul'd," from the Latin annulus, or "ring," and explains that the

King must have been interred without a ring on his finger. According to Ducarel's Anglo-Norman Antiquities, Kynaston reports, kings are invariably buried with their rings on. He reasons that the departure from invariable practice in this circumstance indicates that Hamlet's father met with foul play (44:455-6).

Two months later, in December, an anonymous correspondent writes wishing to "disannul" Kynaston's suggestion. He declares that the line seems clearly to concern solemn rites, so a reference to a custom merely ceremonial would be incongruous. Besides, he reminds readers, Hamlet says elsewhere that his father had received a royal burial. The correspondent inclines towards Theobald's explanation--without naming him--and wonders whether "unanointed" crept into the line from a marginal gloss for "unanneal'd" (44:553-4). Such a supposition cannot occur to one who takes F1 as the source text, of course. He also declares his preference for "unappointed" over "disappointed."

Kynaston writes back in February of the following year to assert his conviction that "unappointed" is "too general" in this context. "The poet is evidently here describing the particular kinds of preparation which the King wanted, when sent to the grave." But he now agrees with this correspondent in the matter of solemn rites. Perhaps, notes Kynaston, one should follow Pope's reading, since the passing bell is rung after unction, in order that the departing soul may receive the prayers of all nearby Christians at the propitious moment. In this interpretation the three

elements of the disputed line appear in correct chronological order (45:80).

A year later, in the March 1776 issue, "J.B." of Newcastle upon Tyne writes to illustrate the line using Anglo-Saxon records. According to "a very scarce and curious copy of Fabian's Chronicle, printed by Pynsen, 1516," Pope Innocent had interdicted all of England, forbidding mass or any other Christian rite to be performed there. Nonetheless, "J.B." quotes, "there were dyverse placys in Englonde, whiche were occupied with dyvnye Servyce all that season by Lycence purchaced than or before, also Chyldren were crystenyd thoroughe all the Lande and Men houselyd and aneyld (Fol. 14 Septima Pars Johannis)" [I suspect the emphasis is "J.B.'s"]. "J.B." asserts that the Anglo-Saxon husel (eucharist) and ele (oil) "are plainly the roots" of those words. Hence, "an eyld should seem to signify 'oiled' or anointed by way of eminence, i.e. having received extreme unction." "J.B." points out that the historian is here speaking expressly of the "VII Sacraments." He concludes, "If I mistake not, our poet has been very conversant in this Chronicle (46:124)."

It goes on. The anonymous respondent to Kynaston's initial remark above now writes back in April 1776 to report a discovery he made while reading a description of the death of the Earl of Mordaunt, which he located in "an account ["by Halsted"] of the several families that have possessed Drayton, &c. in Northamptonshire, now the estate of Lord

George Germaine." He finds that "unabsolved" and "unasoiled" can both stand instead of "un-anointed," and declares that he prefers "unappointed." He explains, "I mean, in the sense of 'properly fitted out for a journey to the other world.'" In Lambard's Topographical Dictionary we have, p. 227, 'Ryd princely appointed.'" As for the original (and ongoing) debate concerning "unnanelled," he thinks that the word is fine except for its spelling, which is quite a trivial cause for dispute (46:175).

Finally, in June, "Juvenis" writes to suggest that this and similar debates be settled by emendations using words that sound most similar to those in the original texts. His reasoning holds that the plays were never carefully written down, but were instead printed from the reports of people who had heard them presented. More errors have probably come from faulty hearing, he suspects, than any other means. Because "Juvenis" finds "disappointed" insufficiently expressive of meaning, he searches for a substitute that sounds similar but expresses more. Thus, he writes, folk history, coming to him by means of "many ancient persons, who have received the tradition from their forefathers," informs him that the preparation of dying Christians for burial required that they be "houseld" (given the sacrament), "unctioned" (anointed), and finally knelled by the "passing bell." Evidently he wishes to admit emendations from both Pope and Theobald after all (46:266-7).

The last word of all comes, appropriately, from the GM reviewer himself, presumably Duncombe. In a 1785 review of

Robert Heron's Letters of Literature, Duncombe writes that three of the letters, 6, 18, and 38, "contain remarks and criticisms on the last edition of Shakespeare," the Johnson and Steevens 1785. The Letters, Duncombe notes, reveal "considerable knowledge," but this knowledge is accompanied by "much acrimony." Perhaps because the GM had discussed this great Hamlet crux at considerable length already, Duncombe does not present any detail concerning Heron's comments on the present passage, except to indicate that Heron has indeed referred to it. Duncombe himself then goes on to report that "unanneal'd" occurs once in Holinshed and two or three times in Fox's Book of Martyrs, "where it is explained at length." As for the other disputed word, Duncombe would read "unappointed." He adds, evidently in criticism of Heron, that no one wanted elucidation of "unhousel'd" (55,2:546).

NV ignores Kynaston's "unannul'd" ("no rings on") and his later comments agreeing with Pope; makes no mention of the anonymous correspondent's two suggestions; overlooks "J.B.'s" discovery in Fabian's Chronicle which tends to support Theobald's "unaneal'd"; but, at last, among its textual notes, actually cites "Juvenis" in the GM for his "unknell'd" (3:103). Furness further overlooks Duncombe's comments with respect to Heron. But Heron himself is not entirely ignored by the NV. In its 1909 volume of Richard III, Furness' son H. H. Furness, Jr., writes, "'Robert Heron, Esq.,' was the assumed name of a Scotchman, John

Pinkerton, author, among other works, of a volume entitled Letters of Literature, which, on account of its violent and dogmatic assertions, excited much controversy at the time of its publication in 1785" (16:101).

Johnson confesses in his 1765 that he has not satisfied himself yet on this passage; his restoration of the F1 "disappointed" from Theobald's "unappointed" may have caused some of the dissension above. He notes, "'Disappointed' is the same as 'unappointed,' and may be properly explained 'unprepared'; a man well furnished with things necessary for any enterprise, was said to be well 'appointed'" (Yale 8:971).

Riverside notes, "Unhous'led: without the Eucharist. disappointed: without (spiritual) preparation. unanel'd: unappointed, without extreme unction" (1150). No attributions are given.

II.i.108 Polonius. I am sorrie that with better speed and
iudgement
I had not quoted him.

The Reverend Samuel Denne, who signed his hundred or more contributions with the initial letters of his two parishes, "W. & D." (Kuist 55) writes to the 1776 GM to comment upon this passage. Denne suggests we read "quoited" in preference either to the F1 text, to Warburton's "noted," or to

Johnson's gloss of "reckon" for this particular sense of "quote" ("to take the 'quotient' or result of a computation" [Yale 8:972]). The "old quarto" reads "coted," and, writes Denne, "I have a notion that 'coit' or quoit' . . . was oftener spelt indiscriminately with a 'c,' or a 'q,' than 'quote.'" "Cote" or "coit" or "quoit" thus alike mean "observe," but "quote" does not. Denne then links "speed," judgement," and "cast," other words in Polonius' speech, all in one jest with "quoit." He considers "quoit" an especially "quaint" expression entirely befitting Polonius (46:512).

NV prints this suggestion in the textual notes with faithful attribution to "W. & D." and the GM (3:128), but does not know that "W. & D." was Denne.

Riverside follows Q2 precisely, reading "heed" for "speed" as well as "coted" for "quoted"; "coted" is indeed glossed as "observed" (1152), but without attribution.

III.i.58 Hamlet. Or to take Armes against a Sea of
troubles,

Reverend John Kynaston ("Q" as above, but in this early letter writing from his residence at Wigan, prior to his retirement to Caerhaes) writes to the 1772 GM concerning this celebrated mixed metaphor. He quotes Pope's "arms against a siege of troubles," and Warburton's declaration, "Without question Shakespeare wrote--Against Assail of

Troubles." Then Kynaston discusses similar instances of this species of metaphor in great literature. In Prometheus Vinc-tus of Aeschylus ("the Athenian Shakespeare"), he finds "The stormy sea of dire calamity," line 671, and, at 810-11,

My plaintive words in vain confus'dly beat
Against the waves of hateful misery.

Kynaston adds that he does not take this similarity of expression to mean that Shakespeare knew Aeschylus. "All that is hereby intended is, to shew, from the example of a genius as bold and eccentric as his own, that the harsh constructing of a metaphor, or the jumbling of different ones in the same sentence, is not peculiar to Shakespeare, nor a sufficient reason to authorize an alteration of his text" (42:418). Not long after this September letter, Kynaston writes back in December to add that he has found two "modern" works, the Latin Iambics of Baudius ("Dominici Baudii Epistol. Cent. I. Epist. x") and the "Sentimental Journey thro' Greece" of M. DeGuys, which demonstrate similarly harsh metaphors (42:556).

Years later, "Phosphorus" writes to the 1784 GM, speaking of Shakespeare's poetic art, "It seems to me, that he only took the first strong metaphor which came into his head, to express himself forcibly and pathetically, and then another and another, as the subject rose upon them, but had no idea of making them connected with or dependent on each other." As an example of this in a classical poet, he

quotes Terence's "I am walled about with so many and so great difficulties that I cannot swim out" (54:84).

NV cites Theobald for a comment about Shakespeare's "freedom in combining metaphors," which is similar to Kynaston's remark. But Theobald quotes from Aeschylus and from the prophet Jeremiah to show how "sea" has been used to stand for "army." Thus, in a sense, Theobald argues that the metaphor is not quite so mixed as we might think. He doubts that any change in the line is necessary, but offers a couple anyway. Kynaston and "Phosphorus," who forthrightly admit that Shakespeare was not concerned to keep his metaphors unified, are passed over in silence (3:207).

Johnson remarks, in part, "I know not why there should be so much solicitude about this metaphor" (Yale 8:981). There is not much, today; Riverside is silent on this line.

III.i.74 Hamlet. When he himselfe might his Quietus make
With a bare Bodkin?

An anonymous correspondent writes in 1765 that he has found an almanac from 1667, and that "among other memorable things there mentioned, I find as follows--'Julius Caesar slain with bodkins.'" Recalling the passage above, he concludes, "Shakespeare did not mean, as I perceive it is generally understood, 'a little utensil of ladies for their hair'--but a 'dagger,' which, it seems, was then called a 'bodkin,' though I have not been able to find it in any Dictionary or

Glossary." He has found it also, he says, in Sydney's Arcadia (35:229). He writes back two years later, stating he now understands that men always travelled with "this little instrument of defense" (37:57).

NV cites Theobald's Shakespeare Restored (1726) for its "old usage" gloss of "dagger" for "bodkin," and reports that Theobald found it in Chaucer's "Monk's Tale." Theobald had previously mentioned and discarded the current "hair implement" definition. The GM correspondent was unaware of Theobald's reading, obviously, and receives no mention (3:212).

Riverside lists no attribution for its note, "bare bodkin: mere dagger" (1160).

III.i.78 Hamlet. The vndiscovered Countrey, from whose

Borne

No Traueller returnes,

"N.R." writes in 1768 to convey his impression that here Shakespeare contradicts himself, since the Ghost himself is clearly a returned traveller (38:237).

NV notes that this contradiction was spotted as early as Theobald's 1733, and later in Farmer's 1767 Essay (3:213-4). Neither Johnson nor Riverside mention it at all.

III.ii.12 Hamlet. I could haue such a Fellow whipt for
o're-doing Termagant: it out-Herod's Herod. Pray you
auoid it.

Holt White's letter in 1783 includes his critique of Percy's definition for Termagant, which reads in part, "a Saracen diety, clamorous and violent in old moralities." Holt White responds, "The Saracens were Mahometans before the Crusaders were acquainted with them, and consequently had no 'dieties'; the 'unity' of the diety being the principle part of the creed that Mahomet enjoined his followers" (53,2:935).

Evidently Steevens felt it necessary to alter Percy's formulation somewhat, since he quotes Percy, according to NV, as writing that Termagant was the name for "the god of the Saracens" (emphasis mine). Perhaps Steevens was influenced by Holt White's objection. In any event, White is not mentioned at this passage in NV (3:226).

Riverside calls Termagant "a supposed god of the Saracens, whose role in medieval drama . . . was noisy and violent" (1161). Incidentally, Riverside prints Q1's "would" for "could" in line 12.

IV.v.104 Messenger. And as the world were now but to begin,
Antiquity forgot, Custome not knowne,
The Ratifiers and props of euery word,
They cry choose we? Laertes shall be King,

The Tyrwhitt excerpts include his suggestion that we read "work" for "word" (35:616).

NV cites Tyrwhitt's suggestion in its explanatory notes and indicates that Capell adopted it; no mention of the GM appears (3:338). Warburton had suggested "ward," and Johnson, "weal," in the sense of "government" (Yale 8:997).

Riverside notes, "word: pledge, promise" (1173).

V.i.61 1 Clown. In youth when I did loue, did loue,
me thought it was very sweete;

Percy reports that this song was taken from three stanzas of the poem, "The Aged Lover Renounceth Love." According to the 1765 review of Reliques, he writes that it is supposed to be the work of [Thomas] "Lord Vaux" (35:181).

NV states that Theobald was the first to discover the origin of the Clown's song, but that he was misled by the title-page of his source volume into believing it the work of Surrey. Percy may have been the first contemporary to name Lord Vaux as the author, but Furness also finds the attribution in Gascoigne's "Epistle to a Young Gentleman." The only mention of Percy comes in reference to some comments he made on corrupted lines in Shakespeare's quotation (3:380-81).

Riverside identifies the song and its author (1178).

V.i.147 1 Clown. It was the very day, that young Hamlet was borne,

The 1783 review of Ritson's Remarks reprints his criticism of Sir William Blackstone's comments on this line.

Blackstone had interpreted from the clown's words here and later, at line 162, that Hamlet is now thirty years old.

But he must have been much younger in the first act, Blackstone argued, as he was still going to school. Therefore Shakespeare must have forgotten by the fifth act what he had written in the first. "In fact, however," writes Ritson, "the poet has forgot nothing; . . . men may study, or reside at the University at any age" (53,2:595).

Immediately following this excerpt, the GM reviewer writes that everybody knows, including Blackstone from his own experience, that men can attend school at all ages. The critical issue, writes the reviewer--presumably Duncombe--is that no princes have studied at the University that late in life; thus Blackstone was justified in calling attention to the discrepancy. Duncombe then criticizes Ritson for invariably writing "hissself" for "himself," and committing similar blunders with the language. The review concludes with a letter about Ritson's book reprinted from St. James's Chronicle, part of which reads, "His Commentary is confined to topicks of a most trivial and insignificant nature. He explains nothing that is of any consequence to Shakespeare's real merit and character.. . . Not a single important or shining passage of Shakespeare is the subject of any one of

his elaborate elucidations." The letter is signed "Alci-phron," and is itself followed by a virulent, pro-Ritson reply, from "Justice."

NV overlooks both Ritson and the GM, but cites Dr. Benno Tschischwitz (Shakespeare's Saemmliche Werke, 1869) for correcting Blackstone on the point Ritson had attempted to make (3:390).

THE TRAGEDY OF OTHELLO, THE MOOR OF VENICE

I.i.20 Iago. One Michael Cassio, a Florentine

(A Fellow almost damn'd in a faire Wife)

Among the Observations excerpts printed in the 1765 GM is Tyrwhitt's suggestion that we read "life" for "wife" here. Cassio is unmarried, and evidently has not yet met Bianca. Tyrwhitt argues that a fellow can be damned in a fair life according to the biblical verse, "Cursed is he of whom all men speak well" (35:582).

NV quotes Tyrwhitt after reporting that Hanmer had offered "phyz" for "wife," and that Theobald had wondered whether the Florentine supposedly damned was not Iago himself. This last suggestion probably came from Warburton (see Yale 8:1012). It would require Iago to have heard Othello speak of him this way, and now to relate that speech verbatim to Roderigo. Such a requirement has kept everyone except Heath

from considering Warburton's suggestion further. The GM is not mentioned (5:5-10). Johnson writes, "This is one of the passages which must for the present be resigned to corruption and obscurity" (Yale 8:1012).

Riverside notes, "Unexplained. Perhaps Shakespeare originally intended to follow his source Cinthio in giving Cassio a wife" (1203).

I.iii.261 Othello. I therefore beg it not

To please the pallate of my Appetite:

Nor to comply with heat the yong affects

In my defunct, and proper satisfaction.

But to be free, and bounteous to her minde:

In the same review excerpt as above, Tyrwhitt suggests that we make sense of this passage by transposing the last two lines, connecting them with a comma:

Nor to comply with heat, the young affects;

But to be free and bounteous to her mind,

In my defunct and proper satisfaction:

Tyrwhitt continues, "I would then recommend it to consideration, whether the word 'defunct' (which would then be the only remaining difficulty) is not capable of a signification, drawn from the primitive sense of its Latin original [defungor, finish, discharge] which would very well agree with the context" (Observations 5).

Kynaston writes a few years later to comment upon this passage. He explains first how Warburton equates "heat" and "appetite" with "young affects," and how Tyrwhitt transposes the lines. Then he indicates his own agreement with Capell in making "affects" stand in apposition with the other two words, placing the phrase within parentheses:

Nor to comply with heat (the young Affects
In me defunct) and proper satisfaction[.]

Kynaston defends his choice by citing instances where the word "affects" was used to mean "affection," as in Richard II, I.iv, and Love's Labours Lost, I.i., as well as in Beaumont and Fletcher's Bloody Brother, III.i. Furthermore, Kynaston writes, such a use would be apt for one who describes himself, as does Othello, as being "quaint" or "rude of speech" (43:69).

NV cites Upton's On Shakespeare for "in my defunct"; perhaps Capell first read it there. Tyrwhitt's transposition suggestion is quoted in NV as well. Furness comments, characteristically, that since we all agree on Shakespeare's sense here, we should not worry about his precise expression; after all, "Would his fame be seriously impaired, or stabbed to the centre, if we cautiously whispered among ourselves that he now and then wrote carelessly?" Furness does not mention Kynaston, "Q," or the GM at all (6:72-3).

Johnson reads exactly as Kynaston says Capell does. He adds

to his 1773, "Mr. Upton had, before me, changed 'my' to 'me'; but he has printed young 'effects,' not seeming to know that 'affects' can be a noun" (Yale 8:1021).

Riverside glosses the lines much as does Johnson, but in the textual notes cites Steevens for the reading that features "me" and parentheses (1242). Steevens surely borrowed this from Johnson, or Capell, or Upton.

II.i.303 Iago. If this poore Trash of Venice, whom I trace
For his quicke hunting, stand the putting on,
Ile haue our Michael Cassio on the hip,

Writing to the 1763 GM as "T. Row," Samuel Pegge reviews one other emendation for this passage before offering his own. For "Trash" and "trace," Warburton had read "Brach" and "cherish." The Q1 "crush," he declared, was "plainly a corruption of 'cherish.'" Pegge argues that there are no male brachs, and nowhere else does he find "brach" used in the derogatory sense Iago intends to apply here to Roderigo. The whole passage, says Pegge, comes comes down to the trash-trace quibble, "trace" here meaning "follow." "Now this pun, once conceived in the author's head, led him to proceed in the metaphor, and afterwards led him to carry on the speech in words borrowed from hounds and the chace, it being one of the sort itself; insomuch that these metaphorical allusions do not commence at the word 'trash,' but at the word 'trace'; from which point the metaphor is suffi-

ciently followed and preserved, as there are no less than three terms of the chase employed, trace, quick hunting, putting on." Pegge further cites Henry VIII, III.ii.[44], for this use of 'trace': "Now all my joy trace the conjunction" (33:160).

NV traces various readings, including those of Malone (who follows Q1), Theobald ("brach . . . trace"), Warburton as above, and Steevens ("trash . . . trash," by the latter meaning a hanging on of weights to slow an overly-eager dog). Then Furness endorses a note by Halliwell quite similar to Pegge's: "The meaning seems to be--if this wretched fellow, whose steps I carefully watch in order to quicken his pace, follows my directions, I will have our Michael Cassio on the hip." But Pegge, "T. Row," and the GM remain unacknowledged (6:121-2).

Riverside follows F1, and notes, "trace. Obscure. The meaning must be something like 'train,' or 'check to make more eager.'" Steevens' "trash" is cited as having the same signification (1215).

II.iii.89 Iago. King Stephen was and-a worthy Peere,
His Breeches cost him but a Crowne,

Percy reports that this stanza comes from the Ballad, "Take Thy Old Cloak About Thee" (35:182).

NV quotes Percy's identification of this source without

mentioning the GM (6:131).

Riverside identifies the ballad by the name, "King Stephen was a Worthy Peer." No citation is given (1216, 1631).

III.iii.447 Othello. Arise blacke vengeance, from the
hollow hell,

Holt White writes to the 1783 GM to suggest a rebuttal to Warburton's judgment that "hollow hell" is "a poor unmeaning epithet." White refers the reader to Paradise Lost, I:314 ["He call'd so loud, that all the hollow deep /Of hell resounded"], for proof that the phrase has had meaning to others as well as to Shakespeare (53,2:935). Early in the following volume, "Y." writes to ask whether any harm is done by the epithet, even if one concedes that Milton was drawn into a poor usage by Shakespeare. "Y." quotes the similar vastum inane, tinnit inane of Vergil (54:84).

NV reports that most editors had adopted "thy hollow cell" of Q1. "Hell" was not generally restored, notes Furness, until Knight's 1841. It is possible that Holt White influenced Knight indirectly, by means of the various Steevens editions. Furness favorably quotes Holt White for the reference above, without mentioning the GM or "Y." Presumably NV found White's note through Steevens. The "hollow hell" suggestion appears in the Johnson-Steevens 1785 and in Malone's 1790 over the initials "H.T.W.," an error for

White's usual GM signature, "T.H.W.," which Furness did not recognize (see page 46 above). But finally "Holt White" is named in Steevens' 1793, and there, no doubt, Furness found him.

Edited for an age less fastidious about its poetic language, Riverside ignores the dispute and follows F1.

III.iv.46 Othello. A liberall hand. The hearts of old,
gaue hands:

But our new Heraldry is hands, not hearts.

The 1783 review of Ritson's Remarks quotes his criticism of Warburton for seeing "too refined and complex" a meaning in this passage; Warburton had seen the lines as satire on James I's money-raising creations of baronets. Ritson writes, "Without it can be proved that this play existed, in its present shape, prior to the order of baronets, one may, pretty safely, admit that this passage contains an allusion to the arms allotted them. But that Shakespeare intended to sneer at the establishment . . . is not quite as obvious (53,2:593). Following this entry, the GM reviewer Duncombe ridicules "Mr. R's" grammar: "The vulgarism of 'Without' for 'Unless' cannot escape the intelligent reader." But Duncombe makes no substantive comment on Ritson's criticism here.

Although NV quotes many other critics writing against Warburton's note, Ritson is ignored (6:219). Johnson, however,

had called the historical interpretation "very judicious and acute," and considered any emendation unnecessary (Yale 8:1036).

Riverside provides an explanatory gloss for the lines, but mentions no political allusion (1225).

IV.iii.28 Desdemona. She had a Song of Willough,
An old thing 'twas: but it express'd her Fortune,
And she dy'd singing it.

The GM review of Percy's Reliques quotes his identification of this song as one entirely appropriate for Desdemona's own circumstance. It had originally been called, "A Lover's Complaint Being Forsaken of His Love," and was later known as "Willow, Willow, Willow" (35:182). Percy writes that the words Desdemona sings a few lines later vary only slightly from the versions he has found.

NV cites Percy's identification without mention of the GM (6:277).

Riverside notes only, "Willow. Symbolic of disappointed love" (1233).

V.i.11 Iago. I haue rub'd this yong Quat almost to the
sense,
And he growes angry.

Heath's Revisal, as quoted in the 1765 review, reports that most editors have read "gnat" for "quat." Among the exceptions, he writes, are Upton's "quail" and Theobald's "knot," which Theobald had said was a small bird of Lancashire. Still others, says Heath, have read "quab." Heath declares that he remains unsatisfied with any, but offers no suggestion of his own (35:111).

Following this entry, the GM reviewer, probably Hawkesworth, notes that "quat" is "an old word still used in many parts of England for a 'pimple,' which is very likely to be made 'angry' by 'rubbing.'" This passage, therefore, the correction of which has given the critics so much trouble, probably wants no correction." OED agrees with this definition for "quat," citing this very line. With this entry, Hawkesworth closes his review, commenting, "This book being chiefly an hyper criticism on the criticisms of the present Bishop of Gloucester [Warburton], will afford neither so much entertainment nor instruction as if it had been written on a more general plan. And without the bishop's edition of Shakespeare it cannot be read without perpetual vexation and disappointment; for the reader is not referred to the passage by the act and scene of the play in which it occurs, but by the volume and page of the bishop's edition."

NV follows the progress of the "quat" dispute through the early editors, but because Johnson's summary is very similar to Heath's, I quote Johnson:

This is a passage much controverted among the

editors. Sir T. Hanmer reads "quab," a "gudgeon"; not that a gudgeon can be "rubbed" to much "sense," but that a man grossly deceived is often called a "gudgeon." Mr. Upton reads "quail," which he proves, by much learning, to be a very choleric bird. Dr. Warburton retains "gnat," which is found in the early quarto. Theobald would introduce "knot," a small bird of that name. I have followed the text of the folio, and the third and fourth quartos.

A "quat" in the midland counties is a "pimple," which by rubbing is made to smart, or is "rubbed to sense." Roderigo is called a "quat" by the same mode of speech, as a low fellow is now termed in low language a "scab." "To rub to the sense," is "to rub to the quick" [Yale 8:1044].

NV quotes Johnson's explanation as above, which is clearly similar to Hawkesworth's. NV does not mention the GM review (6:283). But the Heath-Hawkesworth-Johnson connection is intriguing. The Revisal was published in February; Hawkesworth wrote his review for the February and March issues; Johnson's edition came out in October. It is difficult to say whether Johnson here attended to Heath's work as he finished his own edition. That he repeats the same critical history as Heath in this instance is little evidence one way or another, all by itself; it helps little to know that Johnson's sentence on Theobald's suggestion, "knot," was not

added until his 1773. But frequent coincidence suggests something more; see Arthur Sherbo's Editor for a complete account of Johnson's borrowings from Heath. The similarity between Johnson's words and Hawkesworth's, on the other hand, is too striking to be called a coincidence. It is likely that the two friends were well aware of each other's work; it is even possible that Hawkesworth provided Johnson with materials from the Revisal review in advance of their publication. In any event, two facts are certain: "quat" does not appear in Johnson's Dictionary, printed in 1755; and it is Johnson who is now remembered for supplying the gloss Hawkesworth printed first in the GM.

Riverside notes, without attribution, "quat: pimple, small boil. sense: quick" (1234).

THE TRAGEDY OF KING LEAR

I.iv.226 Lear. Do's any heere know me?

This is not Lear:

Do's Lear walke thus? Speake thus? Where are his eies?

Either his Notion weakens, his Discernings

Are Lethargied. Ha! Waking? 'Tis not so?

Who is it that can tell me who I am?

Fool. Lears shadow.

[Lear. I would learn that, for by the marks of
sovereignty,

Knowledge, and reason, I should be false persuaded
I had daughters.

Fool. Which they will make an obedient father.]

Lear. Your name, faire Gentlewoman?

[Riverside prints lines 232-5 in brackets as above, for the lines do not appear in its copy-text, F1; their source is Q1 (1608) and Q2 (1619). In addition, Riverside combines Lear's first two phrases into one full line. Lineation above is Riverside's, as always, so the second F1 line above does not bear a separate number; it is part of 226. Pope had ended 232 after "marks," had rewritten 233 thus:

Of sovereignty, of knowledge, and of reason,
and had omitted 235 altogether.]

In the 1766 review of Observations, Tyrwhitt is quoted as suggesting that we read and punctuate as follows:

for by the marks
Of sovereignty, of knowledge, and of reason,
I should be false persuaded--I had daughters--
Your name fair gentlewoman?

Tyrwhitt offers his reading in place of Johnson's, which follows F1 faithfully, omitting the bracketed portion above (36:24).

NV, which prints the quarto portion of this passage in prose, cites Steevens (1773) for the punctuation and line

arrangement he had actually only borrowed from Tyrwhitt, who is overlooked among NV's textual notes. Those notes also record that only Knight's 1841 has adopted the "daughters--" punctuation Tyrwhitt suggests. The explanatory notes, however, do quote Tyrwhitt, and Furness seems to think his illustration as good as any (5:83). While Johnson prints only the F1 lines in his 1765 text, he quotes the quarto passage (with slight inaccuracy) in his notes with the remark, "I think the folio in this place preferable." This note was omitted for the 1773, into which Steevens had inserted Tyrwhitt's. Beneath this insertion Johnson writes, "This note is written with confidence disproportionate to the conviction which it can bring. Lear might as well know by the marks and tokens arising from sovereignty, knowledge, and reason, that he had or had not daughters, as he could know by anything else. But, says he, if I judge by these tokens, I find the persuasion false by which I had long thought myself the father of daughters" (Yale 8:671).

Riverside inclines rather more toward Trywhitt than toward Johnson, though neither man is mentioned in its gloss: "i.e. everything--the outward signs that I am king, my memory, my common sense--suggests (falsely) that I am the man who had daughters" (1263).

II.iv.152 Lear.

Aske her forgiuenesse?

Do you but marke how this becomes the house?

"Gold-Cap" writes to the 1744 GM to quote Hanmer's emendation for this passage, an emendation which "Gold-Cap" understands to have been suggested by Mr. Kinnesman:

Do you but mark--how this becometh--us?

"Gold-Cap" quotes from "other editions," which read "becomes the use," an eighteenth-century innovation. But "Gold-Cap" is not aware of the F1 reading, which makes Hanmer's emendation less attractive. "Gold-Cap" takes his name in part from five verses he quotes, supposedly written by Pope as additions to Book IV of the Dunciad, but which were ordered suppressed when Pope died before the appearance of Hanmer's 1744. The alleged addition would follow line 113 of Book IV, and satirizes Hanmer's Oxford-sponsored edition; a couplet reads,

On whom three hundred gold-capt youths await

To lug the pond'rous volume off in state.

"Gold-Cap" is thus identifying himself as an Oxford student. Incidentally, this is the earliest item presenting an emendation or illustration of Shakespeare to appear in the GM (14:611).

NV lists the suggestion among its textual notes as one of Hanmer's. No commentators or editors have adopted it.

"Gold-Cap" receives no mention, not that one would expect him to (5:152). Johnson believes "no reader is satisfied" with "becomes the house," and reads,

Do you but mark how this becometh--thus.

The two phrases, he thinks, might easily have been confounded by the printers (Yale 8:769).

Riverside glosses "becomes the house" as "befits family decorum" (1271).

III.iv.138 Edgar. But Mice, and Rats, and such small Deare,
Haue bin Toms food, for seuen long yeare:

In the 1765 review of Reliques, Percy is quoted as remarking that while critics often change "deere" to "geer" or "cheer," he has found the following lines in the old "Romance of Sir Bevis"; the lines refer to that knight's hardships in a dungeon:

Rattes and myse and such smal dere
Was his meate that seven yere.

This is the second of two items selected by the GM reviewer Hawkesworth for use in the introductory part of his review. He writes, "In the first volume of this collection there are all the ballads that illustrate Shakespeare, and to this part the Editor has prefixed an essay on the origin of the English stage, which contains many things not to be found in

any other" (35:180). After the Lear passage above he writes, "To these we shall add a more particular account of the ballads that illustrate Shakespeare, which may serve as a supplement to some critical remarks, inserted the two preceding months, see p. 110" (181). The remarks he mentions are those appearing in his recent review of Heath's Revisal. This comment demonstrates the kind of particular concern Hawkesworth had for Shakespeare studies, or perhaps the concern he knew his readers had. He could have drawn excerpts from any of the scores of ballads Percy had printed, but chose to limit them to one central theme: relevance to Shakespeare scholarship.

NV cites Capell as one who found the source of Edgar's lines in the ballad, which Capell named "Life of Sir Bevis." Percy's precedence is not acknowledged. Furness also notes that most editors after Warburton and Hanmer (who read "geer") have retained "deer" (5:197). Johnson writes that "'deer' in old language is a general word for wild animals" (Yale 8:686). OED agrees, citing this line.

Riverside notes, "deer: animals. (Lines 137-39 are adapted from the romance Bevis of Hampton.)" No attribution appears (1277).

IV.vi.91 Lear. O well flowne Bird: i'th'clout, i'th'clout:
Hewgh.

Sir Walter Rawlinson's 1784 letter argues that Warburton's

reading here of "barb" for "bird" is clearly an error, since Lear is speaking of the sport of archery, of "shooting at butts," in which the "bird" is the arrow and the "clout" is the white center of the target. Rawlinson finds corroboration for his suggestion in "Green's Tu quoque," which he identifies as "a comedy written by John Cooke, in the reign of Q. Elizabeth" (54,2:885).

NV finds that Warburton, Theobald, and Hanmer read "barb," and gives the definition for clout from Nares' 1822 Glossary (5:276-7). Rawlinson, "W.R.," and the GM are not mentioned.

Riverside notes, "bird: i.e. arrow. clout: centre of target" (1286).

THE TRAGEDY OF MACBETH

I.ii.14 Sergeant. And Fortune on his damned Quarry smiling,
Shew'd like a Rebels Whore:

Among the excerpts from his Revisal in the 1765 GM, Heath's commentary on this passage notes that while all modern editors (he can only mean all since Hanmer) read "quarrel," the original reads "quarry" and should be retained. He writes, "Quarry is a term in falconry, signifying the game of the hawk after she has seized, and while she is feeding on it; metaphorically it signifies havock of any kind." Heath cites further instances in Macbeth, "quarry of mur-

dered deer," and in Coriolanus, "I'll make a quarry"
(35:110).

NV reports Heath's restoration of the F1 "quarry." But Alexander Dyce is quoted as ridiculing Heath's citation of the "quarry of murdered deer" from IV.iii.206, on the grounds that, according to Heath's illustration, this would have to mean the game killed by the deer. Although Dyce's comment seems to confuse the partitive with the possessive genitive, as well as to ignore Heath's suggestion of a metaphorical extension of the term, "quarry" has not been a popular reading for many reasons. Johnson quotes the line using "quarry," then notes, "Thus the old copy, but I am inclined to read 'quarrel.' 'Quarrel' was formerly used for 'cause,' or for 'the occasion of a quarrel,' and is to be found in that sense in Hollingshead's account of the story of Macbeth, who, upon the creation of the Prince of Cumberland, thought, says the historian, that he had 'a just quarrel' to endeavor after the crown" (Yale 8:755). NV quotes Elwin's Shakespeare Restored of 1853 as endorsing Johnson's opinion. No mention of the GM appears (2:11).

Riverside prints "quarrel," within brackets, attributing the change to Hanmer (1312, 1340).

I.ii.36 Sergeant. If I say sooth, I must report they were
As Cannons ouer-charg'd with double Cracks,
So they doubly redoubled stroakes vpon the Foe:

[Riverside adds "so they" of line 38 to the end of 37, thus beginning 38 with "Doubly," but makes no reference to this emendation, nor lists any alternate reading in the textual notes. Clearly either line 37 or 38 requires considerable elision to be read as pentameter with "so they" superadded. It is uncharacteristic of Riverside, to say the least, silently to commit such an alteration from the sole authority for this play, F1. NV locates this altered lineation in The Globe Edition (1864) and in The Clarendon Press Series (1869).]

Responding to commentators like Theobald who object to "cracks" as something a cannon could even once be charged with, Heath writes that the line is correct as F1 gives it. According to the 1765 review of Revisal, he calls it an instance of "metonymy of the effect for the cause," (35:110). Theobald had also deleted "doubly," and changed the punctuation thus,

As cannons overcharg'd, with double cracks
So they redoubled strokes

Johnson thinks little is gained by Theobald's emendation, and writes, "That a 'cannon is charged with thunder' or 'with double thunders' may be written, not only without

nonsense, but with elegance, and nothing else is here meant by 'cracks'" (Yale 7:8). This time Johnson has a clear claim for the precedence of his note over Heath's; these remarks appear in his 1745 pamphlet, Miscellaneous Observations on the Tragedy of Macbeth.

NV quotes Johnson, and Malone in support of him, but takes no notice of Heath or the GM (2:15).

Riverside notes, "cracks: charges" (1313).

I.ii.60 Ross Nor would we deigne him buriall of his men,
Till he disbursed, at Saint Colmes ynch,
Ten thousand Dollars, to our generall vse.

Writing to the 1754 GM, "P.[aul] Gemsege" (an anagram for Samuel Pegge) corrects the reading in Warburton, "at Colmeskill-isle," to "at Clomeskill's isle." He notes that the island was named for the male English saint, Columba, and has variously been called "Columba et Cella," "Columcelli" (by Bede), and "Columkille," whence "Clomes-kill-isle" derives, though inaccurately. The trouble is that this formulation does not distinguish Columba from a different saint, Columb, and would further indicate only the island of his "cell," or tomb. As though matters were not sufficiently complicated, Pegge mentions another St. Columba, a female, whose name does not pertain to the island in any way (24:495). "Gemsege" writes again in the next volume to expand upon his note, having found "a worse error" in

another spelling, "Colmes-hill," for the place to which Duncan's body was carried at II.iv.33. This last can refer only to Columbae mons vel tumulus, says Pegge, while the correct "Colmeskill" is short for Columbae cella, "the usual burying place of the antient Scottish Kings." Pegge concludes, "Read therefore we must, 'Colmeskill,'" which when found alone is used as ellipsis for the island itself (25:6).

NV ignores "Gemsege," or Pegge, and the GM, but quotes Steevens as saying that those editors who read "Colmes-kill-isle," Pope, Theobald, Warburton, Johnson, and (with variant spelling) Hanmer, do so without authority, for there are in reality two separate but similarly named islands, Colme's Inch and Colm-kill. Shakespeare was referring to that island where, says Steevens, the Danes were defeated: Colme's Inch. "Inch" or "inshe" is Irish for "island" (2:20).

Riverside follows the F1 text above.

I.iii.6 First Witch. Aroynt thee, Witch, the rumpe-fed
Ronyon cryes.

"S.H.," probably Henley again (Kuist 78), writes in 1784 that the "Ronyon's" cry is "explained by saying that the Rauntree, or Rantry, is in the North considered as a preservative against witches, and that this was probably written,

'I've Rauntree, witch,' or 'A rauntree, witch,' that is, you cannot come near me, I've Rauntree to protect me" (54,2:731).

A later GM issue contains the letter attributed to Sir Walter Rawlinson (page 91 above) which purports to examine some of Johnson's errors; it also refers to "S.H.'s" letter on this passage. Rawlinson discusses Johnson's explanation of "aroynt," and asserts that a print to which Johnson referred, and erroneously called a "drawing," was entirely wrongly described; the print depicts "Our Savior," not "St. Patrick," putting to rout "a Devil," not "the Devils," by saying, "Out out Arongt," as written on "a label issuing out of his mouth." Rawlinson defines the word as "Avaunt, Begone," a meaning he says is already known, but whose etymology is probably as "your ingenious Correspondent" [Henley] explains it (54,2:885).

Finally, in the succeeding GM issue, the correspondence already cited from "M.Y.R." (page 43 above) includes commentary on this passage as well. "M.Y.R." writes that "S.H." is "ingenious," but a simpler explanation can be made. "In Derbyshire the word 'aroint' is frequently made use of by the common people, instead of 'stand away,' or 'be gone,' in which latter sense Shakespeare certainly intended to use it." "M.Y.R." closes with a wish that "some Warwickshire gentlemen" would listen to the vulgar dialect in their region for a while and "rescue their bard from obscurity" (55,2:952).

NV notes the many inconclusive etymologies available for "aroint." Among those he cites, Furness actually includes that of "S.H." in the GM; he does not know it is Henley, however. Neither Rawlinson nor "M.Y.R." are mentioned. His reference to "S.H." includes a misprint, citing page 73 instead of 731 in GM volume 54 (2:22).

Johnson does indeed describe the print as Rawlinson reports (Yale 8:757). He writes that he obtained the print from "Hearne's collections" (Thomas Hearne's Ectypa Varia, 1737). But Rawlinson's complaint could not prompt Johnson to revise his account in later editions; the announcement of his death, complete with a lengthy biographical sketch and a Latin epitaph, appears in the very same issue of the GM.

Riverside notes, "Aroint: be gone" (1313)." But OED finds the word only in Shakespeare, and has not discovered its origin.

I.iii.147 Macbeth. Time, and the Houre, runs through the
roughest Day.

Rawlinson's letter continues, noting that no editors are satisfied with "hour" in this passage, and suggests that we read "tide," if it be not "too great a violence to the text," for the line would then clearly allude to the proverb, "Time and tide stay for no man" (54,2:886).

Johnson is one of those unsatisfied editors; he writes, "I

suppose every reader is disgusted at the tautology in this passage, 'Time and the hour,' and will therefore willingly believe that Shakespeare wrote it thus,

Come what may,

Time! On!--the hour runs thro' the roughest day.

Johnson concludes with a rather lengthy justification for this reading (Yale 8:760). But NV quotes a helpful explication from Grant White's Words and Their Uses (1871): "The use of 'tide' in its sense of hour, the hour, led naturally to a use of 'hour' for 'tide.' 'Time and the hour' in this passage is merely an equivalent of time and tide--the time and tide that wait for no man." Rawlinson clearly had the right idea, but NV does not mention him or the GM (2:42).

I.iv.24 Macbeth. And our Duties are to your Throne, and

State,

Children, and Seruants; which doe but what they should,

By doing euery thing safe toward you Loue

And Honor.

The 1765 review of Heath's Revisal reprints his suggestion of "Serves" for "safe" in this passage. Heath quotes the emendations offered by Warburton ("Fief'd"), Hanmer ("Shap'd"), and Johnson ("doing nothing Save," in the Macbeth pamphlet), and then provides his own "Serves." We are to understand "that" between "everything" and "Serves" (35:111). Since F1, by the way, an improper arrangement of

lines before and after this passage has been corrected such that "safe" (or "Shap'd" or "Save" or what you will) begins a line, and hence takes a capital letter.

The GM reviewer Hawkesworth indulges in conjecture himself on this passage. First he reports that John Upton (Critical Observations on Shakespeare, 1746) has cited Shakespeare's use of "safe" as a verb in Antony and Cleopatra, when Antony says in Act I [iii.70], "you should safe my going," but that Upton has not thought to apply that meaning here. Because such application would require us to read,

by doing everything

To safe toward your love and honor,

Hawkesworth then speculates, "Probably as the word 'safe,' in this sense, was not common even in Shakespeare's time, it might need explanation, and somebody might have written in the margin as a gloss, 'to ward'; 'ward' being then commonly used in the same sense in which Shakespeare here uses 'safe.' It is easy to conceive how the how words 'to ward' in the margin might creep into the text as one, 'towards,' and how the word 'to' might be removed to admit them.'" It is difficult to conceive how Hawkesworth thought this scenario "easy to conceive."

NV cites Heath for "Serves" among the textual notes, but overlooks the GM emendation and conjecture (2:47). In the 1765, Johnson defends his own early reading, but not enthu-

siastically; he writes, "It is probable that his passage was first corrupted by writing 'safe' for 'save,' and the lines then stood

doing nothing

Safe tow'rd your love and honour.

which the next transcriber observing to be wrong, and yet not being able to discover the real fault, altered to the present reading.. . . I am afraid none of us have hit the right word" (Yale 8:762).

Riverside simply notes, "Safe toward: to secure" (1315).

I.vii.16 Macbeth.

Besides, this Duncane

Hath borne his Faculties so meeke;

The 1780 review of Malone's Supplement includes a response to his quotation of Henley's suggested punctuation. Henley, writes Malone, would read the passage "as Mr. Henderson speaks it: 'Besides this; Duncan, &c.'" The reviewer Duncombe remarks, "Mr. Garrick, the best commentator on Shakespeare, spoke it otherwise, and the old reading seems to us much the most natural, and also agreeable to our author's idiom" (50:376).

NV cites "Anon." for the suggestion Malone prints as Henley's. Duncombe's response is overlooked (2:71).

To plague the ingredience of our poison'd chalice
To our own lips.

"If this mistake had happened in the first copy, and had been continued in the subsequent impressions, what diligence or sagacity could have restored the passage to sense?"

Malone then quotes the F1 version as follows:

that we but teach
Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return
To plague the inventor. This even-handed justice
Commends the ingredience of our poison'd chalice
To our own lips [GM 53,1:506].

NV cites Malone's emendation among the textual notes, omitting mention of the GM, and noting that Malone later withdrew his suggested addition (2:92). Johnson was not one of those who favored "strides," by the way; he revised the line to read, "With Tarquin ravishing, slides toward his design, Moves like a ghost" (Yale 8:770).

Riverside adopts Pope's "strides," with attribution, but otherwise follows F1 (1319, 1340).

III.i.128 Macbeth. I will advise you where to plant your
selues,

Acquaint you with the perfect Spy o'th'time,
The moment on't, for't must be done to Night,
And something from the Pallace:

The 1765 Observations review includes Tyrwhitt's suggestion
that we read,

Acquaint you with the perfect spot, the time,
The moment on't

on the grounds that what must be perfect are the spot and
time, and that there is no spy we know of (35:583).

NV cites Tyrwhitt in the textual notes, but lists no others
who have adopted his suggestion. Steevens believes that a
full stop should come after "yourselves"; the "Acquaint"
sentence would therefore be vocative (2:147). Johnson
changes "the perfect" to "a perfect," "perfect" here meaning
"well instructed" or "well informed." "Accordingly," he
writes, "a third murderer joins them afterwards at the place
of action" (Yale 8:779).

Riverside follows F1, and provides a gloss to the effect
that "spy" can also signify "information" or "intelligence"
(1324).

V.v.34 Messenger. The Wood began to moue.

Writing to the 1752 GM, "T.C." reports that there was once a Highland custom wherein certain clans would carry tree branches and boughs as identifying insignia of their familial affiliations. Usually these branches were mere sprigs, because wood is so scarce in most of the Highlands, but near Birnham the insignia could be much larger. "T.C." claims to have heard this account from an innkeeper during a journey north (22:458).

NV ignores "T.C.," but cites Dyce as locating the source for this incident in Holinshed. Deloney's 1607 ballad in praise of Kentishmen, printed in Strange Histories, evidently celebrates the deception also (2:285).

THE TRAGEDY OF ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA

I.iv.10 Lepidus.

I must not thinke

There are, euils enow to darken all his goodnesse:

His faults in him, seeme as the Spots of Heauen,

More fierie by nights Blacknesse;

[Riverside follows the lineation established with F2, which corrects the meter of lines 10 and 11 by transferring "There are," to the end of 10, and deleting the comma.]

Kynaston writes to point out one of Johnson's "trivial

errors": judging this comparison to be "forced and harsh." While Johnson argued that stars should "beautify the night," and that "blackness" has no corresponding quality in the counterpart to Lepidus' figure of speech, Kynaston answers, "The comparison is neither 'forced' nor 'harsh,' if the proper point of likeness in it be attended to." He reminds us that authors have at other times employed metaphors whose parts only took in the properties of comparison that were pertinent. For example, Ajax is once compared to an ass in the Iliad, only because he persevered obstinately despite suffering repeated blows. The beauty of the night sky, writes Kynaston, is here "foreign to Shakespeare's purpose." Because Antony is possessed of many fine attributes, his faults seem more conspicuous by means of those very qualities." Antony's "goodness" is thus "the counterpart of the simile which answers to night's blackness," and for which Johnson had sought in vain (45:369).

NV quotes an explanation from Steevens that sounds remarkably like Kynaston's, but Kynaston himself is not mentioned, nor his signature "Q," nor the GM. Furness notes his own preference for Capell's explanation that Antony's faults seem more obvious against the blackness of the rising crisis of war (15:60).

This is another instance of our having become less fastidious about our use of poetic language; Riverside does not even gloss the lines.

II.v.43 Cleopatra. Yet if thou say Anthony liues, 'tis
well,

Or friends with Caesar, or not Captiue to him,
Ile set thee in a shower of Gold,

For "'tis well," Tyrwhitt suggests we read "is well," applying the predicate adjective to Antony, not to the report itself, and supplying the verb for the subsequent parallel clauses (35:583). The 1765 review adds no comment to this excerpt.

NV quotes Tyrwhitt, though not from the GM, and notes that while most subsequent editors have followed his reading, the change "is not absolutely necessary" and so should be eschewed (15:134).

Riverside eschews it.

II.v.82 Cleopatra. These hands do lacke Nobility, that they
strike

A meaner then my selfe:

The 1783 review of Malone's Second Supplement quotes his conjecture that these lines were a criticism of Queen Elizabeth, by then deceased, who publicly had struck the Earl of Essex (53,1:506).

NV repeats Malone's point in less specific terms, but adds, "What cared Shakespeare, at such a moment, for Elizabeth and all her court? He was Cleopatra" (15:137).

II.v.115 Cleopatra. Bring me word quickly,
Let him for euer go, let him not Charmian,
Though he be painted one way like a Gorgon,
The other wayes a Mars.

When Tyrwhitt's commentary on these lines appears in the
1765 review, his source text reads,

Let him for ever go--let him not--Charmion,
for which he suggests we read,

Let him for ever go--let him--no--Charmion

Tyrwhitt writes that the emotional, broken speech of the
source is not as appropriate as his suggestion, which reads
as though Cleopatra struggles with indecision (35:583).

According to NV's textual notes, the version printed as
Tyrwhitt's source is from Capell, but Johnson had it thus in
his 1765, some two or three years before Capell; furthermore
it is Johnson to whom Tyrwhitt is responding throughout his
pamphlet. Tyrwhitt's suggestion above is cited, without
mention of the GM; it was adopted by Rann (1794) and
Wordsworth (15:142). Johnson's note reads, "She is now
talking in broken sentences, not of the messenger, but of
Antony" (Yale 8:852).

With the exception of a comma for Capell's (Johnson's) final
dash, Riverside uses his punctuation here; or, put another
way, follows Rowe exactly (1360).

III.ii.39 Caesar. Farewell my dearest Sister, fare thee
well,

The Elements be kind to thee, and make

Thy spirits all of comfort: fare thee well.

In a letter to the 1783 GM, Holt White discusses these lines by first quoting Johnson's and Steevens' explanations. Johnson had guessed that the elements referred to are those of the body; Steevens had written, "May the four elements, of which the world is composed, be kind." White suggests that "the elements" are those two, air and water, most likely to have any effect on Octavia's passage over the sea; the import of the line, then, is merely, "I wish you a good voyage" (53,2:935). Such a meaning for "elements" is listed in the OED from the fourteenth well into the nineteenth centuries; it remains today as the only surviving reference to the original "elements," when we use it to refer to the weather.

Malone did not make use of Holt White's suggestion in his 1790, but Steevens' 1793 cites White, and the note is preserved in the subsequent Steevens and Reed editions, and in Malone's and Boswell's 1821.

NV does not mention Holt White, but after quoting several others, Furness writes, "Caesar means no more than 'May you have a comfortable journey.'" With Holt White's identical interpretation abundantly available in the collated editions, Furness' ignorance of it is curious. In any event,

as an alternate reading to the one he presents as his own, Furness suggests that Johnson's paraphrase is good except for the connotations of its final word, 'cheerful' (15:178-9). Johnson had written, "This is obscure. It seems to mean, "May the different 'elements' of the body, or principles of life, maintain such proportion and harmony as may keep you cheerful" (Yale 8:853).

Riverside does not decide between the Johnson and Holt White glosses, noting, without attribution, "The elements: i.e. external nature as it will affect her journey (?) or the bodily humors that determine her own health and state of mind (?). Perhaps both: 'may all things go well with you'" (1364).

III.vii.3 Cleopatra. Thou hast forespoke my being in these
warres,

And say'st it it not fit.

Enobarbus. Well: is it, is it.

Cleopatra. If not, denounc'd against vs why should
not we be there in person.

[F2 corrects "it it" to "it is."]

As his note indicates in the 1765 GM excerpts from Observations, Tyrwhitt first follows contemporary practice by adopting Rowe's emendation and Hanmer's versification,

Is't not denounced against us?

Why should not we be there in person?

Then he offers his own reading, differently punctuated,

Is't not? Denounce against us

Why should not we be there in person? [35:583]

Although NV cites Tyrwhitt, without mention of the GM, and notes Steevens' and Reeds' adoption of this emendation, Furness approves of the F1 reading. Versification has varied from editor to editor since Hanmer (15:207-8).

Riverside, which here departs from F1 only to follow the minor F2 correction to line 4, notes that many editors adopt Rowe's emendation. Riverside explains the disputed line, somewhat uncertainly, "even if it were not declared against me (?)" (1367).

III.x.10 Scarus. Yon ribaudred Nagge of Egypt,

Tyrwhitt, who follows F2 in reading "You" for "Yon," further suggests "hag" for "nag" (35:583).

Without mentioning the GM, NV notes that Tyrwhitt's reading is adopted by nineteenth-century editors Collier and Singer (15:217). In his 1765, Johnson attends only to the meaning of "ribaudred," but in the 1773 he adds Tyrwhitt's note and his own refutation, "The brieze [four lines later], or oestrum, the fly that stings cattle, proves that 'nag' is the right word" (Yale 8:856).

Riverside follows F1.

III.xiii.1 Cleopatra. What shall we do, Enobarbus?

Enobarbus.

Thinke, and dye.

Tyrwhitt responds here to Johnson's opinion that Hanmer's "drink" for "think" is unnecessary. Johnson had explained, "Think, and die"; that is, 'Reflect on your folly, and leave the world,' is a natural answer" (Yale 8:858). In his own pamphlet, Tyrwhitt elaborates, "I grant it would be, according to this explanation, a very proper answer from a Moralist or a Divine; but Enobarbus, I doubt, was neither the one nor the other" (Observations 10). He offers "wink," on the authority of Beaumont and Fletcher, in whose Sea Voyage Tibalt says to Aminta in I.i., "wink and die" (35:583).

NV quotes Tyrwhitt without mention of the GM review (15:233).

Riverside notes, "Think: grieve. Thought often signified 'melancholy, grief'; see IV.vi.34-35" (1370).

IV.xii.19 Antony. Fortune, and Anthony part heere, euen
heere

Do we shake hands? All come to this? The hearts
That pannelled me at heeles, to whom I gaue
Their wishes, do dis-Candie, melt their sweets
On blossoming Caesar:

"Ruricola" writes to the 1747 GM to suggest an alternative to one of "the Rev. Mr Upton's ingenious observations," his

emendation of "pannell'd" into "paged." "Ruricola" refers also to Theobald's corresponding "pantler'd." His alternative is "spannell'd," inspired by the devoted behavior of the dog (17:179).

NV ignores "Ruricola," citing Hanmer for his earlier "spaniel'd," of which "Ruricola" is doubtless unaware (15:293). Johnson adopts Hanmer's substitution, deeming it an emendation "with which it was reasonable to expect that even rival commentators would be satisfied" (Yale 8:863).

Riverside reads "spannelled," in the customary brackets, with proper attribution to Hanmer in the textual notes (1377, 1390).

THE TRAGEDY OF CORIOLANUS

I.i.135 Menenius. I send it through the Riuers of your
blood

Euen to the Court, the Heart, to th'seate o'th'Braine,

Tyrwhitt suggests we read, "to the seat, the brain" (35:583). He does not consider the received expression to be Shakespeare's, who "uses 'Seat' for 'Throne,' the 'Royal Seat'" (Observations 17).

NV quotes Tyrwhitt's suggestion, but records only Rann (1794) as adopting the change (20:47-8).

Riverside retains the F1 reading, but glosses the line much as Tyrwhitt does (1397).

I.ix.45 Martius. When Steele growes soft, as the Parasites
Silke,

Let him be made an Ouerture for th'Warres:

Tyrwhitt reads,

Let this be made a coverture for the wars.

Hawkesworth quotes Tyrwhitt as claiming authority for "coverture" in F2, but is mistaken (35:583); F2 also reads "ouerture" here. Tyrwhitt is defending his emendation by analogy with a passage in III Henry VI, for which F2 does indeed read "coverture" for "overture." Hawkesworth did not attend carefully enough to a confusing paragraph in Tyrwhitt's Observations, page 19.

NV includes thirteen pages of explanatory notes on this passage, one of which is Tyrwhitt's. The NV editor for this play, H. H. Furness, Jr., writes that Tyrwhitt was followed by many editors in this emendation (20:146, 158).

Riverside follows F1, but labels "overture" as "hard to explain," and quotes Tyrwhitt's conjecture as one adopted by "many editors" (1405).

THE LIFE OF TIMON OF ATHENS

II.ii.9 Caphis. Good euen, Varro:

Because later lines reveal that this scene occurs in the afternoon before dinner, many editors had suggested altering "even" to a more appropriate time of day. For his part, Johnson had written, "I do not suppose the passage corrupt: such inadvertencies neither author nor editor can escape" (1765; Yale 8:718). Tyrwhitt writes, however, that we should read the text as it stands, because by "even" Shakespeare means any time after noon. In support of this assertion Tyrwhitt adduces passages from Romeo and Juliet and Hamlet, which latter, at I.i., Tyrwhitt notes has also been often mistakenly emended (35:616). The Romeo and Juliet passage reads as follows:

II.iv.109 Nurse. God ye good morrow Gentlemen.

Mercutio. God ye godden faire Gentlewoman.

Nurse. Is it godden?

Mercutio. 'Tis no lesse I tell you: for the
bawdy hand of the Dyall is now vpon the pricke of
Noone.

1813 quotes Tyrwhitt in support of the original text, without mentioning the GM review (19:59).

III.iii.11 Sempronius. Must I be his last Refuge? His
Friends (like Physitians)

Thriue, giue him ouer: Must I take th'Cure vpon me?

Instead of the "thrived" he says most editors read, Tyrwhitt suggests we read "shriev'd," so that the word now refers not to the physicians but to the patient (35:583).

1813 quotes Tyrwhitt, and not the GM, but reports also Malone's warning that both Tyrwhitt and Hanmer (who had suggested "try'd") founded their conjectures on the "thriv'd" substitution made by the F2 editor, "the first and principal corrupter of these plays," in Malone's view (19:92). Johnson notes that Theobald "misrepresented" the word "thriv'd" as the old reading he was restoring (Yale 8:723).

Riverside follows F1.

IV.iii.115 Timon. Let not the Virgins cheeke
Make soft thy trenchant Sword: for those Milke pappes
That through the window Barne bore at mens eyes,
Are not within the Leafe of pittty writ,

Tyrwhitt suggests two significant alaterations,

Let not the virgin's cheek
Make soft thy trenchant sword; nor those milk paps
That through the widow's barb bore at men's eyes

Tyrwhitt thinks Shakespeare would not call the breasts of a virgin "milk paps"; furthermore, he finds that "barb" meant "veil" in Shakespeare's day (35:616).

The GM reviewer Hawkesworth responds by commenting on the equal impropriety, strictly speaking, of assigning "milk paps" to a widow. "The sentiment which Shakespeare intended to express, is this: 'Let not the looks of the virgin induce thee to spare her, for her breasts, though intended for the purpose of suckling infant innocence, are, notwithstanding, destitute of pity.'" Hawkesworth points out that Shakespeare used a similar figure of speech twice earlier in this passage, with the white-bearded usurer and honest-habited bawd, and that, consequently, Tyrwhitt's suggestion would disrupt the rhetorical pattern thereby established.

1813 quotes Tyrwhitt, but omits Hawkesworth's commentary or any mention of the GM (19:146-7). Responding to Warburton's suggested "window-lawn," Johnson wrote, "The reading is more probably 'window-bars.' The virgin that shows her bosom through the lattice of her chamber" (Yale 8:731). Hawkesworth doubtless had access to this note when he wrote his review of Tyrwhitt. Johnson's emendation has generally survived.

Riverside prints "-bars" within the customary brackets, properly attributing the conjecture to Johnson (1476).

CHAPTER V

THE ROMANCES

CYMBELINE

I.i.1 1 Gentleman. You do not meet a man but Frownes.

Our bloods no more obey the Heauens

Then our Courtiers:

Still seeme, as do's the Kings.

[Riverside joins virtually all editors in following Rowe's lineation here, printing these as two full pentameter lines ending in "bloods" and "courtiers," and a final half line as above awaiting completion by the next speaker.]

The 1765 GM review of Observations quotes Tyrwhitt's suggestion that we omit the colon after "courtiers" and the "s" after "Kings." The lines then mean, adds Tyrwhitt, that the courtiers "still look as the King does" (35:582). In his own pamphlet, Tyrwhitt goes on to remark that the passage paraphrases what the speaker will say again at line 13: that the courtiers "wear their faces to the bent of the King's looks" (6). Reviewer Hawkesworth does not comment.

Without mention of the GM, NV notes that Tyrwhitt's emendation "has been accepted more widely than any other" (18:9).

Tyrwhitt was offering his view almost as a direct response to Johnson's note in his 1765. It reads, "This passage is so difficult, that commentators may differ concerning it without animosity or shame." Johnson decides "that the lines stand as they were originally written, and that a paraphrase, such as the licentious and abrupt expressions of our author too frequently require, will make emendation unnecessary" (8:874). Tyrwhitt obviously disagreed. In contrast, one might say that Riverside agrees completely; the editor accepts no emendation, and supplies a paraphrase that differs from Johnson's without animosity or shame. Riverside then refers the reader to lines 12-14, as does Tyrwhitt (1521).

I.vi.44 Jachimo. Sluttery to such neate Excellence, oppos'd
Should make desire vomit emptinesse,
Not so allur,d to feed.

The GM excerpts quote Tyrwhitt,

Should make desire vomit. Emptiness
Not so allured to feed.

If the sense of this emendation is difficult to discover, perhaps the fault lies in the fact that here the GM's account of Tyrwhitt (35:583) differs from Tyrwhitt's actual

words. The emendation in Observations reads,

Should make desire vomit, emptiness

Not so allure to feed [page 8].

NV quotes Tyrwhitt correctly, without reference to the GM. Furness remarks further that the image presented is unattractive, and "Discussion makes it only more repulsive" (18:84). Johnson was not loath to discuss it; for the 1765 he had printed the lines unemended, supplying a brief explanation. But for the 1773 he reprints Tyrwhitt's note with the remark, "This is not ill conceived; but I think my own explanation right. 'To vomit emptiness' is, in the language of poetry, to feel the convulsions of eructation without plenitude" (Yale 8:882).

Riverside also glosses the lines without emending (1528).

III.ii.35 Imogen. Good wax, thy leaue: blest be
You Bees that make these Lockes of counsaile. Louers,
And men in dangerous Bondes pray not alike,
Though Forfeytours you cast in prison, yet
You claspe young Cupids Tables: good Newes Gods.

Rowe had set the example for all the early editors by imagining "Forfeytours" to be a spelling for "forfeitures," and emending accordingly. Not until Tyrwhitt's pamphlet was the error rectified. According to the GM review, he writes, "In Cymbeline, for 'forfeitures,' read, with the folio

edition, 'forfeitours,' which will preclude Mr. Johnson's long note and conjecture" (35:582). Actually this is just a brief paraphrase of Tyrwhitt's comment, though in the main preserving what he said. The folio he mentions is, as always for him, "the Folio Edition 1632" (Observations 12), or F2.

NV notes, without mentioning the GM, that Hanmer had restored "forfeiteurs" long before Tyrwhitt's work appeared (18:186). Nonetheless, Hanmer's emendation did not influence Johnson, because the 1765 followed Rowe. Hence Johnson's "long note and conjecture" explaining it. Tyrwhitt's comments, on the other hand, had a direct effect, perhaps aided by its exhibition in the GM review; Johnson's 1773 reads "forfeiteurs," and the "long note" is withdrawn (Yale 8:889).

Riverside adopts Hanmer's spelling of the F1 word, with proper attribution (1562).

V.v.318 Belarius. He it is, that hath

Assum'd this age:

Tyrwhitt suggests that for "age" we read "gage," meaning "engagement." He intends this to refer to the pledge Belarius made some eight lines earlier, that he and the two youths would "dye all three" if he could not prove the youths to be of as noble a birth as Cymbeline himself (35:582). Tyrwhitt's attention to "age" results from his

confusion over the sense of "Assum'd" here. He takes "assumed" to mean "took on" or "put on," correct connotations elsewhere but inappropriate with "this age," since Belarius has truly grown old. Tyrwhitt does not extend the meaning to "reached" or "attained," which would resolve the difficulty. Hawkesworth has no comment.

NV mentions Tyrwhitt's suggestion among others, but does not adopt the emendation. Furness lists Steevens as the first to explain "assumed" as "reached" (18:425).

Riverside follows F1 and notes, "Assum'd: reached" (1559). This gloss is generally supported by citations in the OED.

V.v.334 Belarius. Your pleasure was my neere offence, my
punishment

It selfe, and all my Treason that I suffer'd,
Was all the harme I did.

Hawkesworth reports that Tyrwhitt reads "mere offence" for "near offence." Tyrwhitt means "mere" in its usual Elizabethan signification of "entire" (35:583). In his pamphlet, he goes on to argue that the old spelling "neere" (as above) was closer to "meere" than to "deare," which was Johnson's suggestion (Observations 13).

Without reference to the GM, NV cites Tyrwhitt's emendation, and reports its adoption by nearly every editor since. Only Capell, Malone, and Steevens, and their successors Reed and

Boswell, have decided against the reading. Johnson himself had justified "dear" in the 1765 with the paraphrase, "The offence which cost me so 'dear' was only your caprice." He made no revision in subsequent editions (8:907). Furness himself prefers to assume that a transposition of words has occurred in the F1 line, such that the original should have read, "Your pleasure was neere my offence" (18:426).

Riverside prints "mere" within the customary brackets, and gives proper attribution to Tyrwhitt in the textual notes (1563).

THE WINTER'S TALE

V.iii.56 Paulina. Indeed my Lord,

If I had thought the sight of my poore Image
Would thus haue wrought you (for the Stone is mine)
Il'd not haue shew'd it.

The review of Observations reports that Tyrwhitt would read the lines without the parentheses, and with this further alteration:

Would thus have wrought you, for the stone i'th'mine
I'd not have shew'd it.

In other words, I'd not have displayed it as a stone statue. Tyrwhitt adds, "A 'mine of stone,' or 'marble,' would not at

NV cites Alexander Dyce for his paraphrase, "That is, complete." Furness is unaware of "Omega's" precedence (9:25).

Riverside notes, "full: very" (1612). No attribution appears.

I.ii.99 Prospero.

Like one

Who hauing into truth, by telling of it,
Made such a synner of his memorie
To credite his owne lie, he did beleeeue
He was indeed the Duke,

The 1765 review of Heath's Revisal includes his remarks on this passage as well as an elaborate reply from the reviewer Hawkesworth. Heath quotes both Warburton and Hanmer in order to demonstrate how they were incorrect with their notes. Warburton altered line 100 to read, "Who having unto truth by telling oft." Heath objects because "to make a man's 'memory a sinner unto truth' is strange English." Furthermore, the review quotes him, "the nominative 'one,' with its adjective or participle, and their connecting pronoun relative, 'who having made,' are left destitute of any corresponding verb to which they may be referred." On the other hand, Hanmer's edition reads, "Who loving an untruth and telling't oft." Heath cannot accept this "because it wants the necessary appearance of probability." By this I suppose he means it requires too many departures from the earliest text, F1. Heath's own supposition is "that a line

has been dropped, and that the passage is corrupt besides." But Heath offers no emendation of his own. Hawkesworth then replies,

But with respect to his objections against the emendation in Warburton's edition, if he recollects that "as I am a sinner to God," is still a very common expression, he will not think the expression, "a sinner unto truth," so strange; and upon a review of the passage perhaps, he will think that the verb "believe," at the end of the 4th verse, is the verb corresponding with the nominative "one," its adjective or participle, and their connecting pronoun relative.

He believed, he was indeed, the Duke, like one who having made his memory so great a sinner to truth, by the frequent repetition of a lie, as to credit it.

To make the construction perfect, it is confessed that the participle "having," should be changed into the preterite "had"; but such inaccuracies are by no means proofs of corruption in Shakespeare's text [35:66].

NV takes notice neither of Heath's remarks nor of Hawkesworth's reply. Furness comments instead that "however loud the outcry by the critics against this involved sentence, Shakespeare had been, as usual, eminently successful and peculiarly happy in conveying his precise meaning to one and

all editors from Rowe to Steevens, Reed, and Boswell, except for Johnson and Capell (9:84).

Riverside glosses "maid" as "a human maiden, not a goddess" (1617). Kynaston was right in his explanation, but insisted on the wrong word.

I.ii.468 Miranda. Make not too rash a triall of him, for
Hee's gentle, and not fearfull.

Several of the Revisal excerpts concern passages from The Tempest. Here Heath takes issue with Hanmer's emendation, "gentle though not fearful." Hanmer interpreted "fearful" to mean "afraid"; Heath points out that the phrase can easily mean "not to be feared," so no emendation is necessary. Hawkesworth concurs in this opinion (35:66). OED lists "Causing fear" as a definition for "fearful" from the fourteenth through the nineteenth centuries. Heath also wishes to read "harsh" for "rash," but Hawkesworth does not comment on this suggestion.

NV cites Ritson's Remarks for providing the best explanation of "fearful" with his paraphrase, "terrible." Furness considers this reading to interpret both "fearful" and "gentle" according to "their usual acceptations" (9:90). He does not know that Heath anticipated Ritson by nearly twenty years. Heath's "harsh" is ignored as well.

Riverside defines "gentle" as "of high birth," and "fearful"

as "cowardly" (1618). In this view, however, Miranda's words must be seen as a warning to her father, instead of the opposite sense the other emenders intend.

II.i.258 Antonio. how shall that Claribell
Measure vs backe to Naples? keepe in Tunis,
And let Sebastian wake.

The review of Observations quotes Tyrwhitt as emending the "back to Naples" he finds in "later Editors" to one closer to his favorite old copy, F2. From its "back by Naples" he proposes to read,

Measure us back? B'w'y, Naples; keep in Tunis
And let Sebastian wake.

This he considers a corruption of "God be with you," or "farewell" (36:22). Had he known that those "later Editors" had the authority of F1 behind them, he might not have made this suggestion. Hawkesworth is silent.

NV records Tyrwhitt's emendation with the note, "Tyrwhitt, misled by the later Folios and Rowe, emended what he supposed to be the true text by what he called 'a spirited turn'" (9:119). In fact, however, Tyrwhitt had called his change "a less alteration" than the one he thought he was correcting. The effect of his change, not the change itself, is what he actually calls a "spirited turn" (Observations 32).

Riverside retains the F1 reading.

III.ii.133 Caliban. Art thou affeard?

"Omega's" 1784 letter also reports that "afeard" above "is still the dialect of the West of England for 'afraid'" (54:407).

NV notes only that Rowe spells the word "afraid" from the outset. No dispute over its meaning is recorded anywhere (9:171).

IV.i.64 Iris. Thy bankes with pioned, and twilled brims
Which spungie Aprill, at thy hest betrim;

The Revisal review quotes Heath's suggestion of "lillied" for "twilled." Heath objects to the "tulip'd" of "Modern editions." He argues, "Tulips never grow on the banks of rivers, nor do they appear ever to have been used in garlands, for which the brittleness of their foot stalks renders them unfit." In contrast, "Lillies are known to grow on the banks of rivers," and have been made into garlands, as he demonstrates with two quotations from Milton (35:66).

NV quotes Heath, doubtless from the Revisal and not GM. Furness finds that this emendation "has met with more approval than any other" (9:195). But he suspects that the two words "pioned" and "twilled" are correct ones whose agricul-

tural significations are no longer known. OED does not list an unequivocal definition for them, but quotes this line.

Riverside notes, "pioned and twilled: undercut by the stream and retained by interwoven branches" (1629). No source for this definition is given.

V.i.40 Prospero. by whose ayde
(Weake Masters though ye be) I haue bedymn'd
The Noone-tide Sun,

Heath suggests we read "weak ministers." But Hawkesworth points out that Hanmer had made the same suggestion earlier. Writes Hawkesworth, "He has throughout his work offered many emendations as his own, which are to be found in Hanmer" (35:66).

Neither Heath nor the GM is mentioned when Furness cites Hanmer for "ministers," a suggestion which has been followed by no other editor (9:236).

V.i.89 Ariel. In a cowslips bell, I lie,
There I couch when Owles doe crie,

The excerpts from Revisal continue with Heath's observation that a full stop should be placed after "couch," and a new sentence begun with "When owls do cry." Heath accepts Warburton's declaration that owls cry only in winter, and so concludes that Ariel could not then lie in a cowslip's bell.

Hawkesworth does not comment (35:66).

NV quotes Heath's suggestion, followed by Steevens' assertion that the time "when owls do cry" is at night, in any season. Furness does not mention the GM (9:242).

V.i.174 Miranda. Yes, for a score of Kingdomes, you should
 wrangle,
And I would call it faire play.

"T.P.'s" letters to the 1750 GM (see pages 67 and 113 above) attend in part to this passage, which "T.P." would alter to,

Yes, for a score of kingdoms; and should I wrangle,
You would call it fair play.

"T.P." blames a "blundering transcriber" for the original reading, of which he can make little sense. "But," he adds, "Mr. Warburton allows the old reading to be right (for he alters nothing) and only by the help of a pretty little short note makes the sense as plain as the nose on a man's face" (20:252, misprinted as 522). "T.P." graciously provides the "pretty little short note" as follows: "i.e. If the subject, or bet, were kingdoms: 'score' not signifying the number 'twenty,' but 'account.'" "T.P.'s" contempt for the note is rather more comprehensible than his assertion that Warburton "alters nothing."

NV prints this emendation, which Furness calls "unwarranted," as the suggestion of "Mr. Smith" in Zachary Grey's

Critical, Historical, and Explanatory Notes, printed in 1754 (9:251). This is the second note from "T.P." in the GM to show up in NV as "Mr. Smith's"; the first is on page 67 above. In Grey's preface to his work, he acknowledges help from the Reverend William Smith of Harleston, in Norfolk (xii; Vickers 4:154). The connection between Smith and "T.P." is not immediately clear. It is even possible that "T.P." and Smith are the same person; in addition to these identical notes, others of Smith's notes demonstrate a sarcasm similar to "T.P.'s." Furthermore, in the GM excerpt above, "T.P." interrupts his mockery of Warburton long enough to announce that the "best edition" of Shakespeare is soon to appear. The "T.P." letters precede Grey's work by some four years. Perhaps the heralded "best edition" has some connection with Grey's work, or with Grey's expressed hope that either Thomas Edwards or John Upton would publish an edition which would see "the genuine text of Shakespeare restored" (Vickers 4:147).

Riverside also considers any emendation unwarranted, retaining the F1 reading.

V.i.286 Stephano. O touch me not, I am not Stephano, but a
Cramp.

"Omega" writes that "a Cramp" signifies a cramp "all over, wholly" (54,1:407). It is curious that "Omega" thought this line needed explanation. Perhaps Warburton's puzzlement had

misled him; Warburton wrote, "It is plain a joke is intended, but where it lies is hard to say." NV quotes Warburton's note as the only confusion recorded on this passage; to all other commentators, the sense is clear (9:264). But one need only look at these thousands of lines intently enough, and after a time the clearest passage may become opaque. We who examine Shakespeare's text may consider ourselves fortunate that his genius and reputation have never really depended upon our efforts.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this discussion, I made some points about the role of the Gentleman's Magazine in Shakespeare textual scholarship which I would like to recall at this time. First, the early years of the GM's existence, and therefore the period I selected as the beginning of my inquiry, coincided with a time in English literary history that might well have thrust greatness upon the magazine had it not achieved greatness otherwise. Shakespeare was becoming interesting again to the public, and no less a figure than Samuel Johnson was preparing an edition of the poet's dramatic works. At the same time, the popular and highly successful Gentleman's Magazine gradually turned its attention away from political concerns and toward literary ones. Its reviewer and literary editor, John Hawkesworth, himself a close friend and associate of Johnson's, early demonstrated a deep and continuing interest in the drama, and especially in Shakespeare's plays. When the issue of Shakespeare textual scholarship arose, its first popular forum was the literary department of the GM.

Another point I made had to do with standards of

textual editing and, particularly, with the practice of emendation. Warburton and Hanmer had returned to Pope's bad habit of emending to personal taste instead of authority, a habit only inherently evil if readers forget that they are reading not Shakespeare but Pope's Shakespeare, or Warburton's. The new notion of Shakespeare as an author whose exact words had special importance gradually brought about significant changes in the way scholars read his works. Johnson, then leaving virtual editorship of the GM to prepare his own Shakespeare, considered carefully the question of textual authority. His successor, Hawkesworth, readily printed articles and letters concerned with matters of text, educating the public in new standards and practices that were only then developing. Discoveries in etymology, research on Shakespeare's contemporaries, and even bits of anecdotal history were sent to the magazine in the hope that someone could make intelligent use of them. The popular forum, in other words, was also a scholarly one.

A brief discussion of the way this diverse forum was used will help focus my conclusions concerning its value. On the popular side, Brian Vickers has described the way in which, by the time of Johnson's edition of Shakespeare, the literary members of the English populace had become acutely aware of the "unsettled nature" of Shakespeare's text. Perhaps predictably, given the desultory nature of those readers' literary preoccupations, many saw here an opportunity to contribute something of value to the growing body of knowledge regarding their country's premier poet. And

contribute they did. As Vickers has put it, "Suggesting emendations was almost a national pastime, for which everyone felt himself to be qualified" (5:21).

As for the scholarly side of the forum, there are ways in which Warburton, and those editors fortunate enough to be not quite so bad as he, actually helped the new pastime along by opening themselves to attack from every person possessed of a well-equipped library, or a seasoned, judicious taste, or a confirmed delusion of either. Books appeared following every edition, in the grand tradition of Theobald's Shakespeare Restored, denouncing the newest edition as though it were a tale told by an idiot. In some instances, Theobald's critique of Pope for example, the attacks were not entirely unjustified. And Thomas Edwards' The Canons of Criticism (1750) is generally considered an accurate, brilliant, and necessary rebuke of Warburton's sorry performance. Of course there were those, on the other hand, whose virulent attacks were motivated less by a desire to prevent a poor edition from seriously misleading the public, than by personal motives of revenge or gain. William Kenrick's hostile Review of Doctor Johnson's New Edition of Shakespeare (1765) is largely an example of this latter type, though Arthur Sherbo has demonstrated that Kenrick had some valid points (Editor 31). But editions and books responding to them played only one part in fostering the society's young concern with the correction of Shakespeare's text. Other independent pamphlets appeared,

some of them truly seeking to contribute to the debate without acrimony or pettiness. Thomas Tyrwhitt declared at the outset of his pamphlet, for example, that it was not his intention "to enter into the merits of Mr. Johnson's performance" (Observations 2). The GM's participation in the new pastime actually began at this stage, strictly speaking; for most of these editions, responses, and pamphlets, the GM carried reviews, references to which will be found in the Appendix following.

All this scholarly activity in turn increased public interest in the condition of Shakespeare's text. And the very publications that helped pique its interest also provided a means with which to pursue it. Almost as a natural consequence of their formats, the literary journals of the period all gave some space to contributors' responses, which in this circumstance often meant suggestions for resolving textual difficulties. In Vickers' words, "the columns of the Gentleman's Magazine or the St. James's Chronicle were filled with correspondence on the great cruxes," giving rise to continuing controversies that spanned years (5:21). The GM's participation, in particular, can be summarized under three heads: excerpts from treatises published elsewhere, commentary sent from individual readers, and the reviewers' responses to both.

It should be stated immediately that the GM's participation in the overall effort to restore Shakespeare's text was serious and selective enough to have a long-lasting effect. That is, textual commentary suggested in its pages

has survived to influence later editors at a surprisingly respectable rate. From 1744 through 1785, suggested explanations, emendations, and sources for songs and lyrics totaling some 186 items were printed in the GM. One might suspect, assuming an amateur status for most of the contributors, that most of their suggestions proved eventually to be of questionable value to the study of Shakespearean drama. But out of this original 186, only 88 items have effectively been forgotten. Even this can be qualified, however; "forgotten" in this sense means only that the items have either been ignored entirely by later editors, specifically the compilers of the variorum editions, or have been silently borrowed by other scholars. Many original GM emendations survive, in other words, but credit for the suggestion or discovery has gone to someone else. Counting these erroneous attributions, then, only 53 items appear to have disappeared entirely, while some 35 have survived as the original ideas of men other than those who first published them. All in all, some 133 out of an original 186 textual suggestions printed in the GM between 1731 and 1785 have survived for possible consideration by Shakespeare scholars.

My early assumption that the majority of the suggestions came from unpublished amateurs is not precisely true. In fact it was exactly half and half: 93 items were sent by various readers, while another 93 were reprinted in GM reviews of books or pamphlets written by such professional men of letters as Thomas Percy, Benjamin Heath, Thomas

Tyrwhitt, Joseph Ritson, and Edmond Malone. It is difficult if not impossible to estimate the extent to which the GM contributed to the preservation of these writers' suggestions. Taking a conservative point of view, one could make a valid case that the importance of their works was already evident when the GM chose to review them, that the reviews were performed only because it was quite obvious that the books were important. Such reasoning leads to the assertion that their emendations would have survived with or without the GM. But it would not be possible, I think, to prove that the GM had no influence on the popularity or, ultimately, the importance of these works. The magazine was simply too popular, read by too many, admired by too large a portion of the learned society to wield no influence. Scholars were solicitous of a good report in the GM, and by the middle of the century they did not complain when the magazine reprinted major segments of their books, simply because they knew its approbation would further spread their ideas, and perhaps ultimately sell more books.

Writers' acquiescence in the GM's review practices produced some interesting effects. To call the review of Tyrwhitt's Observations a series of "excerpts," for example, is almost ridiculous, because only a couple of his entries out of the entire pamphlet fail to appear in the review. The review itself continued through three monthly issues. What advantage accrues to Tyrwhitt in allowing the GM virtually to reprint his pamphlet (albeit he had no choice) if it is not the advantage of a favorable report and a positive

broadcasting of his ideas? Thus one could counter the conservative argument by asserting that the GM did indeed help make the books as important as they eventually became. A look at the survival rate of the reprinted items may lend credence to this assertion. Heath has not fared as well as the others (eight of twelve suggestions lost), but excluding the review of his Revisal, among the eighty items reprinted in the GM from the books and pamphlets, a mere nine have been effectively lost to the inheritors of Shakespeare scholarship. Either the GM had an uncanny aptitude for assessing the importance of the ideas it selected to review (not a worthless aptitude in its own right), or else its participation in the establishment and recognition of this importance was more effectual than the conservative argument would allow. And it is furthermore significant that the one work which has not done so well also received an unfavorable review in the magazine (page 141 above). Clearly, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the GM played a major role in securing the public's interest in these important works.

If the magazine's importance to Shakespeare textual scholarship rested solely on the success of the books and pamphlets it chose to review, however, its significance for the textual scholar would now be quite limited. We come then to the second head under which the GM's importance can be assessed, the contributions of readers. The magazine's influence must be measured at least as much by its encouragement of what Vickers called a national pastime. Amateur

scholars read the editions that appeared every few years, or the pamphlets and books responding to them, or perhaps the GM reviews of all of these; they consulted their personal libraries, or their personal canons of criticism, and, from all over the country, sent suggestions, emendations and illustrations to the GM. The editors, whom I have assumed throughout to be John Hawkesworth before 1773 and John Duncombe after, generously printed a great many suggestions through the years; half of the items reproduced in the preceding chapters came from individual correspondents.

It is to be expected that suggestions however perceptive from amateurs however talented will have been lost at a higher rate than those of their professional contemporaries. The amateurs' names are unfamiliar, or they are pseudonymous and often unknown to this day. They have written no books of scholarship that later editors might consult. Even contemporary editors probably did not know them, otherwise they might have sent their emendations not to the GM but to the professionals then at work. Those ambitious amateurs who sent material to the editors anyway, and met with little or no success, turned to the GM perhaps as a last resort. A long letter sent by Sir Walter Rawlinson to the 1780 GM helps illustrate how this may have worked. He forwarded many emendations and instances of what he considered to be obvious borrowings from the classical authors, with the remark that he had already sent them to Johnson and Steevens, who had made little use of them. Hence, he writes, he offers them "to the public, through the channel of your

useful Magazine" (50:518). Dr. Samuel Henley thought to make use of the opposite route, offering his emendations to the GM because he had heard that Steevens and Malone "are continuing their illustrations of this incomparable author"; he says he hopes his remarks are "worthy of their notice, in which event "they are very much at their service" (50:21). In yet other circumstances, contributors wrote to the GM with their suggestions simply because it had become the most effective forum for their message. One writes anonymously to the May, 1765 issue, "While almost every body is making emendations, annotations, or illustrations, of some part or other of Shakespeare, with the principle of which your magazine is enriched, give me leave to take this opportunity of throwing one mite into the treasury, which I accidentally cast my eye upon the other day" (35:229). While one might guess that a suggestion by an unknown individual sent to a single literary journal would have to be extremely striking, or very lucky, or both, to be noticed and adopted by an editor of Shakespeare, this anonymous writer obviously believes otherwise. What is more, my research indicates that he is substantially correct.

Despite the adverse circumstance, many suggestions did indeed survive. The majority did not, it is true; among the 93 unsolicited items discussed in the preceding chapters are 71 which have gone unacknowledged by the later editors. That appears to leave only 22 surviving entries. As I noted above, however, this does not mean that all the other 71

have been lost to scholars, only that those correspondents who first suggested them have not received proper credit for their ideas. In fact, seventeen of these 71 have not been lost at all, but have survived as the original work of someone else. This means that 39 items, or more than half, have come to the attention of later editors. Since it is preferable that worthy emendations or explanations be somehow preserved regardless of attribution, we may consider the GM to have been quite important already; after all, more than half of the contributors' suggestions it printed have made their way into the record of Shakespeare scholarship in one form or another.

Ideally, however, we would preserve the idea, the original emendation, alongside the name of the person who first published it; therefore, proper attribution has been one of my chief concerns. Even the unfortunate Heath, whom I excepted from my discussion of the professionals above, would profit from an analysis of who took credit for what. Vickers points out that Heath did not receive the most favorable of assessments by the editors of the Monthly Review or the pro-Warburton Critical Review (4:49-50), and I have already quoted the GM on the subject in chapter 4 above (141). Furthermore, Arthur Sherbo has demonstrated how frequently Johnson borrowed from Heath, often silently (Editor 31-39). It was even Heath's lot to have some of the entries in the GM review of his Revisal appropriated by others. Thus of the eight items he contributed which, as I said above, have been lost, only three can be said to be

truly forgotten, because four have become the property of later editors. (The remaining one survives also, properly attributed however to Sir Thomas Hanmer, who thought of it first.) It is impossible to estimate what influence the GM review had on those who later adopted Heath's ideas, or even whether they saw it at all. But much can be made of coincidence; the Revisal appeared in February, the GM review in March, and Johnson's edition in October. One of Johnson's borrowings was featured in the review. Whether the GM account played a part in Johnson's activity remains to be determined, but his early connections with the magazine, his admiration of it, and his friendship with its current reviewer Hawkesworth are well documented.

And what of those amateurs less famous than Heath? The Reverend John Kynaston presents an interesting example. From 1772 through 1776 Kynaston sent ten suggestions for emendations, signing them with the letter "Q" and posting them from his residence at Wigan and, later, Caerhaes. His interests evidently included both tragedy and comedy, for he discussed passages in Hamlet, Othello, and Antony and Cleopatra as well as Two Gentlemen of Verona, All's Well that Ends Well, and The Tempest. None of the ten survives as his idea, unfortunately, but four are now attributed to George Steevens and one to Malone, for a total of five suggestions preserved--not a bad legacy for an amateur. A second pseudonymous contributor I have been unable to identify, but the sixteen suggestions of "Omega" ought to be properly attri-

buted if ever his name is discovered. Seven of them have survived as emendations or explanations in the variorums, the credit for six of them going to Steevens, Isaac Reed, and the nineteenth-century editors Dyce, Halliwell, and Knight. The position of the GM as an influential forum for Shakespeare scholarship cannot improve so long as the suggestions that first appeared in its pages are erroneously understood to be the work of later scholars.

Other contributors have not suffered quite so much anonymity. For example, Thomas Holt White, brother of the naturalist Gilbert White of Selbourne, was a frequent correspondent to the magazine, sending in emendations and "parallels" from 1783 until well beyond the scope of my investigation, on into the 1790's. Not including a 1768 suggestion which he virtually repeated in 1784, Holt White submitted thirteen entries during the years I have investigated, five of which are mentioned in the variorums. Four of these appear over the signature "Holt White," a sure sign that the variorum editor found them in Steevens, who used that name in preference to the "T.H.W." which White used when corresponding with the GM. But in the fifth instance, the editor actually cites "T.H.W." in the GM for the emendation. These circumstances suggest that Steevens and, on occasion, New Variorum editor Horace Howard Furness consulted the GM as they prepared their texts. Holt White's survival rate thus is quite good; it becomes even more impressive if we consider that one additional suggestion appears to have been borrowed silently by Furness himself.

Furthermore, several of the remaining contributions I must now record as "lost" I was nonetheless able to describe in preceding chapters as having influenced later editors. Most significant among these, perhaps, is Holt White's discovery of a quarto reading for A Midsummer Night's Dream (Puck's "filly foal") which has been widely adopted ever since, and always without attribution. All in all, White's letters to the GM have proven quite significant to later scholars.

I turn to the third test of the GM's influence, the magazine's reviewers. They were not silent during the half-century either. Hawkesworth and Duncombe occasionally responded directly to the suggestions in the books they were reviewing, offering emendations of their own at times. Four of Hawkesworth's eight contributions of this type have been entirely ignored, while the other four are now found as notes in the editions of Samuel Johnson. Four of Duncombe's six entries have also survived, but none under his own name. It is not likely that the names Hawkesworth or Duncombe appear on anyone's list of important Shakespeareans, but it is clear their role has been larger than was suspected. Their influence was felt; only their names were unnoted.

Thus, giving proper consideration to the GM editors, its contributors, and those whose books it reviewed, I must conclude that its influence on eighteenth-century attempts to establish Shakespeare's text was significant, pervasive, and probably essential to a discipline that was only then coming into existence. Certainly, in any event, the maga-

zine was important to Johnson; he refined his critical and editorial skills there, and what miscellaneous information he was able to glean from its columns for use in his Dictionary and his Shakespeare is impossible to calculate. Perhaps the magazine was even more important to Steevens; whatever else he took from the GM, he was able to take possession of ten of its best Shakespeare entries and claim them as his own. But the GM's true contributions have only very rarely been linked to its name. In all, only five of the items appearing during the years I investigated are acknowledged in the variorums as originating in the GM. I have demonstrated the inaccuracy and, I trust, the injustice of this. Future scholars concerned with these matters will do well to adjust the record and, more to their own benefit, attend more closely to so important a publication.

Nor is such close attention enough. An Appendix follows which lists all the articles, letters, and references concerning Shakespeare and his works that I was able to locate in the pages of the GM from 1731 until 1785. The research can be carried beyond that rather arbitrary date, of course; while theories of textual editing evolved sufficiently in the latter years of the century that my particular focus would itself be far less productive in the later volumes, other matters of Shakespeare scholarship and criticism continue to be debated and discussed in the magazine for some years. But even if future research is limited to the years I have examined, a wealth of material in the GM remains to be consulted. This investigation has concen-

trated only on textual scholarship. Hundreds of articles and letters dealing with Shakespeare in general, with source studies, with applications of Shakespearean situations to contemporary politics, with David Garrick's performances, adaptations, and his Shakespeare Jubilee, with other companies' performances, and with Johnson and his role as an editor and critic of Shakespeare, all appeared in the GM volumes I have consulted. In addition to these, the numerous reviews of Shakespeare editions and published critical articles can keep the student of Shakespeare criticism busy for many months. The volume and page references for all of this material appear, for exceptionally curious readers, in the Appendix following.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Other References to Shakespeare in the Gentleman's Magazine 1731-1785

Applications of Shakespeare to Contemporary Matters

- Letter from the Weekly Review, from "Falstaff" 1:207
- Allusion to Hamlet in Weekly Review, on Fortune 2:967
- London Journal quotes Craftsman quoting John of Gaunt
(Henry V) 3:24
- Allusion to Othello and jealousy in Auditor 3:30
- Auditor quotes Hamlet on concern for soul 3:114
- Grubstreet Journal's "Antient Pistol" in theatrical
management dispute 3:286
- Free Briton quotes Iago on reputation 3:468
- Shakespeare's distinction between dogs and men 5:119
- Craftsman quotes Measure for Measure on abuse of authority
by princes 7:557
- The need to cite Shakespeare while composing 16:101
- A Latin version of Hamlet's "To be" soliloquy 16:379
- London Evening Post quotes Measure for Measure, II.vii, on
mercy 16:425
- Definition supported by citation of Twelfth Night 19:66
- World applies Falstaff's words on his trade, robbery, to all
who labor 26:334

Editions of Shakespeare, and other Treatises

(The first number is the one the work bears in the List of Books for a given month.)

45. "Shakespeare's Plays, 7 volumes with Notes Explanatory and Critical by Mr. Theobald." 4:56

28. Verses to Hanmer on his Edition of Shakespeare 13:672

Pope's "Hanmer" additions to the Dunciad 14:611

1. "The Works of Shakespeare, copied from the 4to edition printed at Oxford, and carefully revis'd by the former editions. In 6 volumes 8v pr 1L.10s." [Author still unknown. See Sherbo, Warburton.] 15:280

51. "Critical Observations upon Shakespeare. By John Upton. Hawkins." 16:224

8. "A new canto of Shakespeare's fairy queen" [mistake for Spencer?] 16:672

31. "The works of Shakespeare. By Mr. Pope and Mr. Warburton, in 8 vols 8vo. pr. 2L.8s." 17:252

"Just Publish'd (Price 1s.) Miscellaneous Observations on the Tragedy of MACBETH. Printed at St. John's Gate, where may be had the life of Richard Savage, Esq." [Both by Samuel Johnson.] 17:252

14. "An Enquiry into the Learning of Shakespeare. By Peter Whalley, A.B." [With review] 18:48

16. "An answer to Mr. W---s preface to his edition of Shakespeare." 18:48

17. "A supplement to Warburton's edition of Shakespeare." 18:192

11. "An attempte to rescue that aunciente English poet and play-wrighte, Maister Williaume Shakespere, from the many errours charged on him by certaine new-fangled wittes." [Anon.] 18:576

Sonnet attacking Warburton for his version of "Pope's Shakespeare" 21:373

5. "Remarks on a late edition of Shakespeare." Printer Norris 21:574

28. "A new edition of Shakespeare's works, with a glossary, from the Oxford edition in 4to in 9 pocket vols." [From Hanmer's edition.] 22:46
41. "Miscellaneous observations on the tragedy of Hamlet." [Anon.] 22:47
57. "The beauties of Shakespeare, regularly selected from each play." [Anon.] 22:147
34. "Shakespeare illustrated. 2 vols. 5s. Millar. By the author of the Female Quixote [Charlotte Lennox]. 9 novels & a Play that served as sources for Othello, Measure for Measure, Romeo and Juliet, Cymbeline, Twelfth Night, Macbeth, the Winter's Tale, the Comedy of Errors, and Hamlet." [with review] 23:250
34. "Critical, historical, and explanatory notes on Shakespeare by Zachary Grey, LL.D." 24:247
21. "Conjectures on original composition, by Dr. Young." [A comparison of Shakespeare and Jonson] 29:230
- "Some Account of a Work lately published, entitled, A Revisal of Shakespeare's Text." [Benjamin Heath] 35:65
- Above continued 35:110
- A remark on the above, by W.H.T--n. 35:127
- "Some Account of a Collection of Old Ballads, lately published in 3 volumes in 12mo by Tho. Perey [misprint for Percy]. (Dodsley)" [This is Percy's Reliques of Ancient English Poetry] 35:179
1. "The Plays of William Shakespeare, with the corrections and illustrations of various commentators; to which are added notes. By Samuel Johnson." [With review consisting of excerpts from the Preface, and reprinting of all of the so-called "General Observations," Johnson's "short strictures," which the GM calls the "general censure of faults, or praise of excellencies, that are added to the end of most plays."] 35:479
1. "A review of Dr. Johnson's new edition of Shakespeare. By William Kendrick [Kenrick]." [With review] 35:529
18. "Observations and Conjectures Upon some passages of Shakespeare. [By Thomas Tyrwhitt.]" [With review and almost complete excerpts, printed over the next three issues of the GM] 35:582
- "Twenty Plays of Shakespeare. Collated. By George Steevens." 36:38

- "A Defence of William Kenrick's review of Johnson's Shakespeare." [Anon.] 36:38
19. "An Imitation of Shakespeare. By William Kenrick." 36:38
- "Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare. By Richard Farmer, M.A." 37:121
- "Introduction to the School of Shakespeare" [Anon.] 44:134
- "Shakespeare's Macbeth, Collated with the old and new editions. [Anon.] Owen pub." 44:278
- Mention of optimistic anticipation of [Thomas] Warton's History of English Poetry 44:429
- "Cursory Remarks on Tragedy, on Shakespeare, &c." [Anon.] 45:88
- "The morality of Shakespeare's drama illustrated. By Mrs. Griffith" 45:93
43. "Six Old Plays, on which Shakespeare founded his Measure for Measure, Comedy of Errors, Taming of the Shrew, King John, Henry IV, Henry V, and King Lear. Edited by John Nichols." 49:258
54. "Supplement to the Edition of Shakespeare's Plays, published in 1778, by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens. Containing additional Observations by several of the former Commentators: To which are subjoined the genuine Poems of the same Author, and seven plays that have been ascribed to him. With notes, by the Editor and others. 2 vols. large 8vo. 18s. Bathurst." [By Edmond Malone. This is his Supplement. With review.] 50:375
90. "A Second Appendix to Mr. Malone's Supplement to the last edition of the plays of Shakespeare: Containing Additional Observations by the Editor of the Supplement. 8vo." [Now known as the Second Supplement. With review.] 53:505
99. "Remarks, Critical and Illustrative, on the Text and Notes of the last Edition of Shakespeare. 8vo." [Joseph Ritson, identified in the review only as "Mr. R."] 53:593
39. "Dramatic Miscellanies. By Thomas Davies." [With review] 54:281
- "Letters of Literature. By Robert Heron [Pseudonym for John Pinkerton. With review.] 55:546

Garrick, David, and Shakespeare

"Dramaticus," in Champion #455, writes of Garrick's
remarkable talent of characterization 12:527

Brief mention 16:104

Record of pamphlet, "A letter to Mr. Garrick," on his
purchase of patent for Drury Lane theatre 17:300

A Prologue by Garrick 20:422

A pamphlet, "Shakespeare and Garrick," listed 25:574

Poem to Garrick, written as though the writer were a
grateful Shakespeare returned from the dead 28:539

Garrick's Prologue to Florizell and Perdita [adaptation of
The Winter's Tale] 32:86

Poem to Garrick 35:138

Poem on Garrick and Shakespeare 37:378

A view of Shakespeare's birthplace, sent for upcoming
Jubilee 39:344

Details of "Approaching festival at Stratford" [Garrick's
Jubilee] 39:375

Garrick's Ode at the Stratford Jubilee; with a collection
of poems from same, and a masque 39:446-7

Garrick's "Song" on the Jubilee 39:455

Sarcastic poem on the Jubilee 39:504

Comedy of the Jubilee 39:549

Defense of Garrick's Jubilee Ode 39:585

Poem on Garrick and Shakespeare 41:463

"Q" [Kynaston] on Garrick's interpretation of Shakespeare's
description of night 44:24

Poem, Invitation to the Jubilee 45:394

Poem to Garrick 45:444

Poem on Garrick's death, by "W.O." 49:208

Biographical anecdotes of Garrick 49:280

Poem to Shakespeare, on Garrick 49:281

A list of Garrick's published works, many of which are alterations of Shakespeare plays 49:338

"English Prologues and Epilogues from Shakespeare to Garrick." [Book review] 49:507

Garrick's Memoirs [from Thomas Davies] 50:330

Garrick in Davies' Dramatic Miscellanies 54:281

General

The degenerate times prefer Senesino to Shakespeare 1:56

Cibber plunders Shakespeare: Universal Spectator 1:72

On Shakespeare and Jonson: Universal Spectator 1:153

On Robin Goodfellow: The Craftsman 1:238

Love not Shakespeare's subject: Fog's Journal 1:246

Panegyric as satire in Marc Antony's speech 1:296

"Shakespeare's lofty strain," vs. moderns 1:493

Farce and Pantomime: Read's Journal 2:566

Mr. Carpenter as Sly in Shrew: Grub-Street Journal 2:593

Shakespeare's puns and jingles: Universal Spectator 2:643

Scarborough's cliffs and Lear: Universal Spectator 2:741

Shakespeare justly censured by Rymer: Applebee's Journal
2:786

Punning as Shakespeare's corruption: Universal Spectator
2:902

Shakespeare and Addison: Fog's Journal 2:917

Shakespeare's immodesty: Universal Spectator 2:965

Elegy for Wilks, actor of Hamlet 2:1025

New theater in Goodman's Fields: Monthly Intelligencer
2:1028

Art or Genius, not both: Universal Spectator 2:1104
 Tom Cynick's complaints on actors: Auditor 3:67
 Shakespeare and poetic diction: Grubstreet Journal 3:120
 Satiric verses on Theobald: Grubstreet Journal 4:135
 On Plays 8:7
 Stage a mirror for statesmen: Craftsman 9:245
 Letter from "Pistol" to Common-Sense 10:132
 Shakespeare's "Lover's Complaint" 10:249
 "On Shakespeare," from "Q" [not Kynaston] 15:213
 Bawdy poem on Shakespeare 18:184
 Otway's vs. Shakespeare's characters 18:551
 The gentlemen in Othello 21:119-23
 Remarks on Lear 22:253
 "Verses on reading Shakespeare" 23:287
 "Crito's" dream vision of Shakespeare: Adventurer 23:422
 Help sought to defend Shakespeare 24:233
 Shakespeare's Cardinal Wolsey error (Henry VIII): Paul
 Gemsege [Samuel Pegge] 25:300
 Poem on Shakespeare 25:373
 Epitaph by Shakespeare for Tom a Combe 28:486
 On the Stratford bust of Shakespeare 29:257
 Refutation of above defense 29:380
 Reply to above 29:454
 Shakespeare's poem "Beauty's Value" 30:39
 Demolition of Shakespeare's house 30:308
 Brief history of Shakespeare's stage 31:216
 Anecdote 31:221
 Sheridan's anecdote 31:268

Johnson's anecdote 35:475

Life of Quin, actor of Falstaff 36:132

Elegy on Powell, actor 39:407

Voltaire's complaints on Johnson's edition 41:392

Jonson and Shakespeare (as art vs. nature) 42:522

On scene divisions in the editions 43:547

Poems complaining of Shakespeare's commentators 43:572

Kynaston's praise of Shakespeare's description of night in
Macbeth 44:24

Answer to above 44:76

Kynaston counters with Midsummer Night's Dream description
of night 44:105

Shakespeare's biblical allusions 44:106

"Scrutator" on Warburton, Hanmer, Dr. Smith, and the Oxford
edition [Hanmer's] 51:27

Epitaph by Shakespeare for Elias James 51:363

"Misopoclerus" on Shakespeare's anachronisms 51:608

Dispute on spelling of "Shakespeare" 52:511

Two editions of Milton's "On Shakespeare" 53:128

"T.S." on the necessity of emendations despite occasional
absurdities 53:571

"W.J.'s" correction of Henry V history 53:585-9

Rev. Mr. Costard, Twickenham, on language of tragedy
53:835-8

J. Bowle's objection to spelling of "Shakspeare" 54:253

"N.T.A.'s" remarks on Mr. Wilks' Hamlet 54:569

Johnson, Samuel, and Shakespeare

(Not included here are the numerous references to Johnson's opinions in the emendations collected in chapters 2-5 above.)

Announcement of publication of the edition 35:479

Voltaire's complaints on above 41:392

Kynaston discusses Johnson's "trivial errors" 45:368

Johnson's inconsistencies in pronouncements on diction
53:929

Complaints about nit-picking in critiques of Johnson's
edition 54:360

Biographical sketch (by Thomas Tyer) and obituary of
Johnson, with epitaph 54:899-911

Listing for "Shakespeare" says only "See Johnson, Samuel"
54:Index

Reprint of Johnson's letter to Birch requesting works of
Shakespeare's contemporaries 55:8

"Parallel" Passages and Supposed Sources

Falstaff and Tully's Verres: Craftsman 1:245

Review of Whalley's Enquiry 18:25

"Rider's" view: Socrates and Shakespeare 21:566

Sidney's Arcadia as source of Edgar subplot in Lear 37:57

Biblical allusions 44:106

Sir Walter Rawlinson's finding of classical "imitations"
50:518-20

Thomas Holt White's "parallels" 53:933-35

Thomas Holt White, continued 55:277-8

Response to above 55:498

Performances of Shakespeare, Alterations, Prologues and Epilogues

Henry IV at new theatre 2:1028

Prologue to Lear, at Covent-Garden 3:204

"An Epistle to the Countess of Shaftsbury; with a Prologue and Epilogue on Shakespeare. By Mr. Cooke, pr. 6d."
13:56

Mr. Arne sets As You Like It song to music 14:98

Poem to Jenny Cibber on her Juliet 14:558

Thompson's Coriolanus 19:33

Garrick's Prologue 20:422

Gentlemen performing Othello 21:105

The Fairies, an opera of Midsummer Night's Dream 25:93

The Winter's Tale, altered 26:47

Prologue to above 26:86

"Catherine and Petruccia, a comedy of 3 acts, from Shakespeare" 26:95

"The Tempest; an opera; from Shakespeare" 26:95

"Cymbeline, King of Britain, a tragedy. Altered from Shakespeare, by C. Marsh" 29:88

"Cymbeline, a tragedy. Altered from Shakespeare, by W. Hawkins 29:184

A Prologue to the Tempest 30:586

"Bell's edition of Shakespeare's acting plays." 44:86

Prologue and Epilogue to Lear, by George Keate, Esq. 53:429

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot, John Lawrence. John Hawkesworth: Eighteenth-Century Man of Letters. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.
- Alexander, Peter, ed. Studies in Shakespeare: British Academy Lectures. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Bate, Walter Jackson. Samuel Johnson. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979.
- Boswell, James. The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- Carlson, C. Lennart. The First Magazine. Providence: Brown, 1938.
- Eddy, Donald. "John Hawkesworth: Book Reviewer to the Gentleman's Magazine." Philological Quarterly 43 (1964): 223-38.
- Edwards, Thomas. The Canons of Criticism and Glossary, Being a Supplement to Mr. Warburton's Edition of Shakespeare. London: Printed for C. Bathurst, 1765; reprint ed., Eighteenth-Century Shakespeare Series, no. 7. London: Frank Cass and Company, 1970.
- Graham, Walter. English Literary Periodicals. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1930.
- Granville-Barker, Harley, and Harrison, G. B., eds. A Companion to Shakespeare Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1949.
- Gray, Charles H. Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795. New York: 1931.
- Greene, Donald. "Was Johnson Theatrical Critic of the Gentleman's Magazine?" Review of English Studies 3 (1952): 158-61.
- Isaacs, J. "Shakespearian Scholarship." A Companion to Shakespeare Studies. Harley Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison, eds. Pp. 305-24.

- Johnson, Samuel. A Dictionary of the English Language: In which the Words Are Deduced from their Originals, and Illustrated in their Different Significations by Examples from the Best Writers. London: Printed by W. Strahan, for J. and P. Knapton, et al., 1755; reprint ed., New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1967.
- Keesey, Donald Earl. "Dramatic Criticism in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1747-1784." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964.
- Krutch, Joseph Wood. Samuel Johnson. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1944.
- Kuist, James M., ed. The Nichols File of the "Gentleman's Magazine": Attributions of Authorship and Other Documentation in Editorial Papers at the Folger Library. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.
- Mayo, Robert. The English Novel in the Magazines 1740-1815. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1962.
- McKerrow, Ronald B. "The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by His Earlier Editors, 1709-1768." Studies in Shakespeare. Peter Alexander, ed. Pp. 103-31.
- Pollard, A. W. "Shakespeare's Text." A Companion to Shakespeare Studies. Harley Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison, eds. Pp 263-86.
- Nichols, John. The Rise and Progress of the "Gentleman's Magazine". London: J. Nichols, 1821; reprint ed., The Garland Series English Book Trade. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1974.
- Shakespeare, William. The Norton Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare. Prepared by Charlton Hinman. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1968.
- Shakespeare, William. Shakespeare as Put Forth in 1623: A Reprint of Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. London: printed for Lionel Booth by J. Strangeways and H. E. Walden, 1864.
- Shakespeare, William. Works. The New Variorum Edition Series. Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott Co.
- Antony and Cleopatra. Vol. 15. Horace Howard Furness, ed. 1907.
- As You Like It. Vol. 8. Horace Howard Furness, ed. 1890.
- Coriolanus. Vol. 20. Horace Howard Furness, Jr., ed. 1928.

Cymbeline. Vol. 18. Horace Howard Furness, ed. 1913.

Hamlet. Vol. 3. 3rd ed. Horace Howard Furness, ed.
1877.

Henry IV, Part I. Vol. 21. Samuel Burdett Hemingway,
ed. 1936.

Henry IV, Part II. Vol 23. Matthias A. Shaaber, ed.
1940.

Julius Caesar. Vol. 17. Horace Howard Furness, Jr.,
ed. 1913.

King John. Vol. 19. Horace Howard Furness, Jr., ed.
1919.

King Lear. Vol. 5. 2nd ed. Horace Howard Furness, ed.
1880.

Love's Labours Lost. Vol 14. 2nd ed. Horace Howard
Furness, ed. 1906

Macbeth. Vol 2. Horace Howard Furness, ed. 1873.

The Merchant of Venice. Vol. 7. Horace Howard
Furness, ed. 1888.

A Midsummer-Night's Dream. Vol 10. Horace Howard
Furness, ed. 1895.

Much Ado about Nothing. Vol. 12. 2nd ed. Horace
Howard Furness, ed. 1899.

Othello. Vol. 6. Horace Howard Furness, ed. 1886.

Richard III. Vol 16. 2nd ed. Horace Howard Furness,
Jr., ed. 1909.

Romeo and Juliet. Vol. 1. Horace Howard Furness, ed.
1871.

The Tempest. Vol. 9. Horace Howard Furness, ed.
1895.

Troilus and Cressida. Vol. 16. Harold N. Hillebrand,
ed. 1953.

Twelfth Night. Vol. 13. Horace Howard Furness, ed.
1901.

The Winter's Tale. Vol. 11. Horace Howard Furness,
ed. 1898.

Shakespeare, William. Works. 21 Vols. Edited by Isaac Reed. London: for J. Nichols and Son, 1813. Volume 4: The Tempest, Two Gentlemen of Verona, A Midsummer-Night's Dream. Vol. 5: The Merry Wives of Windsor, Twelfth Night. Vol. 6: Much Ado About Nothing, Measure for Measure. Vol. 8: As You Like It, All's Well That Ends Well. Vol. 9: The Taming of The Shrew, The Winter's Tale. Vol. 11: Richard II, Henry IV Part I. Vol. 12: Henry IV Part II, Henry V. Vol 13: Henry VI Part I, Henry VI Part II. Vol. 14: Henry VI Part III, "Dissertation on Henry VI," Richard III. Vol. 15: Henry VIII, Troilus and Cressida. Vol. 19: Timon of Athens, Othello. Vol. 20: Romeo and Juliet, A Comedy of Errors. Vol. 21: Titus Andronicus, Pericles, Prince of Tyre, "Appendix," "Glossarial Index."

Shakespeare, William. Works. The Riverside Shakespeare. Edited by G. Blakemore Evans, et al. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974

Sherbo, Arthur. "Additions to the Nichols File of the Gentleman's Magazine." Studies in Bibliography 37 (1983): 228-33.

Sherbo, Arthur, ed. Johnson on Shakespeare. Introduction by Bertrand H. Bronson. Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson, Vols. 7 and 8. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968.

Sherbo, Arthur. Samuel Johnson, Editor of Shakespeare. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, no. 42. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1956.

Sherbo, Arthur. "Warburton and the 1745 Shakespeare." Journal of English and Germanic Philology 51 (January 1952): 71-82.

Smith, D. Nichol, ed. Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare. Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1903.

Smith, David Nichol. Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

Vickers, Brian, ed. Shakespeare: The Critical Heritage. 6 Vols. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974-81. Vol. 2: "1693-1733"; 1974. Vol. 3: "1733-1752"; 1975. Vol. 4: "1753-1765"; 1976. Vol. 5: "1765-1774"; 1979. Vol. 6: "1774-1801"; 1981.

Walker, Alice. "Edward Capell and his Edition of Shakespeare." Studies in Shakespeare. Peter Alexander, ed. Pp. 132-48.