

VARIOUS

NOTES AND QUERIES,
NUMBER 51, OCTOBER
19, 1850

Various
Notes and Queries, Number
51, October 19, 1850

*http://www.litres.ru/pages/biblio_book/?art=35494015
Notes and Queries, Number 51, October 19, 1850:*

Содержание

NOTES	4
ROBERD THE ROBBER	4
ON A PASSAGE IN "THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR," AND ON CONJECTURAL EMENDATION	7
Minor Notes	10
Queries	14
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL QUERIES	14
FAIRFAX'S TASSO	20
MINOR QUERIES	22
REPLIES	29
GAUDENTIO DI LUCCA	29
ENGLEMANN'S BIBLIOTHECA SCRIPTORUM CLASSICORUM	34
SHAKSPEARE'S USE OF THE WORD "DELIGHTED."	37
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	39

Various Notes and Queries, Number 51, October 19, 1850

NOTES

ROBERD THE ROBBER

In the *Vision of Piers Ploughman* are two remarkable passages in which mention is made of "Roberd the robber," and of "Roberdes knaves."

"Roberd the robbere,
On *Reddite* loked,
And for ther was nocht wherof
He wepte swithe soore."

Wright's ed., vol. i. p. 105.

"In glotonye, God woot,
Go thei to bedde,
And risen with ribaudie,
The Roberdes knaves."

Vol. i. p. 3.

In a note on the second passage, Mr. Wright quotes a statute of Edw. III., in which certain malefactors are classed together "qui sont appellez *Roberdesmen*, Wastours, et Dragelatche:" and on the first he quotes two curious instances in which the name is applied in a similar manner,—one from a Latin song of the reign of Henry III.:

"Competenter per *Robert*, robbur designatur;
Robertus excoriat, extorquet, et minatur.
Vir quicumque ravidus consors est Roberto."

It seems not impossible that we have in these passages a trace of some forgotten mythical personage. "Whitaker," says Mr. Wright, "supposes, without any reason, the 'Roberde's knaves' to be 'Robin Hood's men.'" (Vol. ii. p. 506.) It is singular enough, however, that as early as the time of Henry III. we find the term 'consors Roberto' applied generally, as designating any common thief or robber; and without asserting that there is any direct allusion to "Robin Hood's men" in the expression "Roberdes knaves," one is tempted to ask whence the hero of Sherwood got his own name?

Grimm (*Deutsche Mythol.*, p. 472.) has suggested that Robin Hood may be connected with an equally famous namesake, Robin Goodfellow; and that he may have been so called from the hood or hoodikin, which is a well-known characteristic of

the mischievous elves. I believe, however, it is now generally admitted that "Robin Hood" is a corruption of "Robin o' th' Wood" equivalent to "silvaticus" or "wildman"—a term which, as we learn from Ordericus, was generally given to those Saxons who fled to the woods and morasses, and long held them against their Norman enemies.

It is not impossible that "Robin o' the Wood" may have been a general name for any such outlaws as these and that Robin Hood, as well as "Roberd the Robbere" may stand for some earlier and forgotten hero of Saxon tradition. It may be remarked that "Robin" is the Norman diminutive of "Robert", and that the latter is the name by which we should have expected to find the doings of a Saxon hero commemorated. It is true that Norman and Saxon soon came to have their feelings and traditions in common; but it is not the less curious to find the old Saxon name still traditionally applied by the people, as it seems to have been from the *Vision of Piers Ploughman*.

Whether Robin Goodfellow and his German brother "Knecht Ruprecht" are at all connected with Robin Hood, seems very doubtful. The plants which, both in England and in Germany, are thus named, appear to belong to the elf rather than to the outlaw. The wild geranium, called "Herb Robert" in Gerarde's time, is known in Germany as "Ruprecht's Kraut". "Poor Robin", "Ragged Robin", and "Robin in the Hose", probably all commemorate the same "merry wanderer of the night."

RICHARD JOHN KING.

ON A PASSAGE IN "THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR," AND ON CONJECTURAL EMENDATION

The late Mr. Baron Field, in his *Conjectures on some Obscure and Corrupt Passages of Shakspeare*, published in the "Shakspeare Society's Papers," vol. ii. p. 47., has the following, note on *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Act ii. Sc. 2.:—

"*Falstaff*. I myself sometimes having the fear of heaven on the left hand, and hiding mine honour in my necessity, am fain to shuffle, to hedge, and to lurch; and yet you, you rogue, will esconce your *rags*, your cat-a-mountain looks, your red-lattice phrases and your bold-beating oaths, under the shelter of your honour.'

"Pistol, to whom this was addressed, was an ensign, and therefore *rags* can hardly bear the ordinary interpretation. A *rag* is a beggarly fellow, but that will make little better sense here. Associated as the phrase is, I think it must mean *rages*, and I find the word used for *ragings* in the compound *bard-rags*, border-ragings or incursions, in Spenser's *Fairy Queen*, ii. x. 63., and *Colin Clout*, v. 315."

Having on one occasion found that a petty larceny committed on the received text of the poet, by taking away a superfluous *b*, made all clear, perhaps I may be allowed to restore the

abstracted letter, which had only been *misplaced* and read *brags*, with, I trust, the like success? Be it remembered that Pistol, a braggadocio, is made up of *brags* and slang; and for that reason I would also read, with Hanmer, *bull-baiting*, instead of the unmeaning "*bold-beating* oaths."

I well know with what extreme caution conjectural emendation is to be exercised; but I cannot consent to carry it to the excess, or to preserve a vicious reading, merely because it is warranted by the *old copies*.

Regretting, as I do, that Mr. Collier's, as well as Mr. Knight's, edition of the poet, should both be disfigured by this excess of caution, I venture to subjoin a cento from George Withers, which has been inscribed in the blank leaf of one of them.

"Though they will not for a better
Change a syllable or letter,
Must the *Printer's* spots and stains
Still obscure THE POET'S Strains?
Overspread with antique rust,
Like whitewash on his painted bust
Which to remove revived the grace
And true expression of his face.
So, when I find misplaced B's,
I will do as I shall please.
If my method they deride,
Let them know I am not tied,
In my free'r course, to chuse
Such strait rules as they would use;

Though I something miss of might,
To express his meaning quite.
For I neither fear nor care
What in this their censures are;
If the art here used be
Their dislike, it liketh me.
While I linger on each strain,
And read, and read it o'er again,
I am loth to part from thence,
Until I trace the poet's sense,
And have the *Printer's errors* found,
In which the folios abound."

PERIERGUS BIBLIOPHILUS.

October.

Minor Notes

Chaucer's Damascene.—Warton, in his account of the physicians who formed the Library of the Doctor of Physic, says of John Damascene that he was "Secretary to one of the caliphs, wrote in various sciences before the Arabians had entered Europe, and had seen the Grecian philosophers." (*History of English Poetry*, Price's ed., ii. 204.) Mr. Saunders, in his book entitled *Cabinet Pictures of English Life*, "Chaucer", after repeating the very words of this meagre account, adds, "He was, however, more famous for his religious than his medical writings; and obtained for his eloquence the name of the Golden-flowing" (p 183.) Now Mr. Saunders certainly, whatever Warton did, has confounded Damascenus, the physician, with Johannes Damascenus Chrysorrhoeas, "the last of the Greek Fathers," (Gibbon, iv. 472.) a voluminous writer on ecclesiastical subjects, but no physician, and therefore not at all likely to be found among the books of Chaucer's Doctour,

"Whose studie was but litel on the Bible."

Chaucer's *Damascene* is the author of *Aphorismorum Liber*, and of *Medicinæ Therapeuticae*, libri vii. Some suppose him to have lived in the ninth, others in the eleventh century, A.D.; and this is about all that is known about him. (See *Biographie Universelle*, s.v.)

Long Friday, meaning of.—C. Knight, in his *Pictorial Shakspeare*, explains Mrs. Quickly's phrase in *Henry the Fourth*—"Tis a *long* loan for a poor lone woman to bear,"—by the synonym *great*: asserting that *long* is still used in the sense of *great*, in the north of England; and quoting the Scotch proverb, "Between you and the long day be it," where *we* talk of the *great* day of judgment. May not this be the meaning of the name *Long Friday*, which was almost invariably used by our Saxon forefathers for what we now call Good Friday? The commentators on the Prayer Book, who all confess themselves ignorant of the real meaning of the term, absurdly suggest that it was so called from the great *length of the services* on that day; or else, from the length of the fast which preceded. Surely, The Great Friday, the Friday on which the great work of our redemption was completed, makes better sense?

T.E.L.L.

Hip, hip, Hurrah!—Originally a war cry, adopted by the stormers of a German town, wherein a great many Jews had taken their refuge. The place being sacked, they were all put to the sword, under the shouts of, *Hierosolyma est perdita!* From the first letter of those words (*H.e.p.*) an exclamation was contrived. We little think, when the red wine sparkles in the cup, and soul-stirring toasts are applauded by our *Hip, hip, hurrah!* that we record the fall of Jerusalem, and the cruelty of Christians against

the chosen people of God.

JANUS DOUSA.

Under the Rose (Vol. i., p. 214.).—Near Zandpoort, a village in the vicinity of Haarlem, Prince William of Orange, the third of his name, had a favourite hunting-seat, called after him the Princenbosch, now more generally known under the designation of the Kruidberg. In the neighbourhood of these grounds there was a little summer-house, making part, if I recollect rightly, of an Amsterdam burgomaster's country place, who resided there at the times I speak of. In this pavilion, it is said, *and beneath a stucco rose*, being one of the ornaments of the ceiling, William III. communicated the scheme of his intended invasion in England to the two burgomasters of Amsterdam there present. You know the result.

Can the expression of "being under the rose" date from this occasion, or was it merely owing to coincidence that such an ornament protected, as it were, the mysterious conversation to which England owes her liberty, and Protestant Christendom the maintenance of its rights?

JANUS DOUSA.

Huis te Manpadt.

Albanian Literature.—Bogdano, Pietro, *Archivescovo di Scopia*, *L'Infallibile Verita della Cattolica Fede*, in Venetia, per G. Albrizzi, MDXCI, is I think much older than any Albanian book mentioned by Hobhouse. The same additional characters

are used which occur in the later publications of the Propaganda, in two parts, pp. 182. 162.

F.Q.

Queries

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL QUERIES

1. Has anything recently transpired which could lead bibliographers to form an absolute decision with regard to the "unknown" printer who used the singular letter R which is said to have originated with Finiguerra in 1452? That Mentelin was the individual seems scarcely credible; and there is a manifest difference between his type and that of the anonymous printer of the *editio princeps* of Rabanus Maurus, *De Universo*, the copy of which work (illuminated, ruled, and rubricated) now before me was once in Heber's possession; and it exhibits the peculiar letter R, which resembles an ill-formed A, destitute of the cross stroke, and supporting a round O on its reclined back. (Panzer, i. 78.; Santander, i. 240.)

2. Is it not quite certain that the acts and decrees of the synod of Würzburg, held in the year 1452, were printed in that city previously to the publication of the *Breviarium Herbiplense* in 1479? The letter Q which is used in the volume of these acts is remarkable for being of a double semilunar shape; and the type, which is very Gothic, is evidently the same as that employed in an edition of other synodal decrees in Germany about the year 1470.

3. When and where was the *Liber de Laudibus gloriosissime Dei genitricis Marie semper Virginis*, by Albertus Magnus, first printed? I do not mean the supposititious work, which is often confounded with the other one; but that which is also styled *Super Evangelium* Missus est *Quaestiones*. And why are these Questions invariably said to be 230 in number, when there are 275 chapters in the book? Beughem asserts that the earliest edition is that of Milan in 1489 (*Vid. Quetif et Echard, i. 176.*), but what I believe to be a volume of older date is "sine ullâ notâ;" and a bookseller's observation respecting it is, that it is "very rare, and unknown to De Bure, Panzer, Brunet, and Dibdin."

4. Has any discovery made as to the author of the extraordinary 4to. tract, *Oracio querulosa contra Inuasores Sacerdotum*? According to the *Crevenna Catalogue* (i. 85.), the work is "inconnu à tous les bibliographes." Compare Seemiller, ii. 162.; but the copy before me is not of the impression described by him. It is worthy of notice, that at signature A iiiij the writer declares, "nostris jam temporibus calchographiam, hoc est impressioram artem, in nobilissima Vrbanie germe Maguncia fuisse repertam."

5. Are we to suppose that either carelessness or a love of conjectures was the source of Chevillier's mistake, not corrected by Greswell (*Annals of Paris. Typog., p. 6.*), that signatures were first introduced, anno 1476, by Zarotus, the printer, at Milan? They may doubtless be seen in the *Opus Alexandride Ales super tertium Sententiarum*, Venet. 1475, a book which supplies

also the most ancient instance I have met with of a "Registrum Chartarum." Signatures, however, had a prior existence; for they appear in the *Mammetractus* printed at Beron Minster in 1470 (Meermau, ii. 28.; Kloss, p. 192.), but they were omitted in the impression of 1476. Dr. Cotton (*Typ. Gaz.*, p. 66.), Mr. Horne (*Introd. to Bibliog.*, i. 187. 317), and many others, wrongly delay the invention or adoption of them till the year 1472.

6. Is the edition of the *Fasciculus Temporum*, set forth at Cologne by Nicolaus de Schlettstadt in 1474, altogether distinct from that which is confessedly "omnium prima," and which was issued by Arnoldus Ther Huernen in the same year? If it be, the copy in the Lambeth library, bearing date 1476, and entered in pp. 1, 2. of Dr. Maitland's very valuable and accurate *List*, must appertain to the third, not the second, impression. To the latter this Louvain reprint of 1476 is assigned in the catalogue of the books of Dr. Kloss (p. 127.), but there is an error in the remark that the "Tabula" prefixed to the *editio princeps* is comprised in eight leaves, for it certainly consists of nine.

7. Where was what is probably a copy of the second edition of the *Catena Aurea* of Aquinas printed? The folio in question, which consists of 417 unnumbered leaves, is an extremely fine one, and I should say that it is certainly of German origin. Seemiller (i. 117.) refers it to Esslingen, and perhaps an acquaintance with its water-marks would afford some assistance in tracing it. Of these a rose is the most common, and a strigilis may be seen on folio 61. It would be difficult to persuade the

proprietor of this volume that it is of so modern a date as 1474, the year in which what is generally called the second impression of this work appeared.

8. How can we best account for the mistake relative to the imaginary Bologna edition of Ptolemy's *Cosmography* in 1462, a copy of which was in the Colbert library? (Leuglet du Fresnoy, *Méth. pour étud. l'Hist.*, iii. 8., à Paris, 1735.) That it was published previously to the famous Mentz Bible of this date is altogether impossible; and was the figure 6 a misprint for 8? or should we attempt to subvert it into 9? The *editio princeps* of the Latin version by Angelus is in Roman letter, and is a very handsome specimen of Vicenza typography in 1475, when it was set forth "ab Hermano Leuilapide," alias Hermann Lichtenstein.

9. If it be true, as Dr. Cotton remarks in his excellent *Typographical Gazetteer*, p. 22., that a press was erected at Augsburg, in the monastery of SS. Ulric and Afra, in the year 1472, and that Anthony Sorg is believed to have been the printer, why should we be induced to assent to the validity of Panzer's supposition that Nider's *Formicarius* did not make its appearance there until 1480? It would seem to be more than doubtful that Cologne can boast of having produced the first edition, A.D. 1475/7; and it may be reasonably asserted, and an examination of the book will abundantly strengthen the idea, that the earliest impression is that which contains this colophon, in which I would dwell upon the word "*editionem*" (well known to the initiated): "Explicit quintus ac totus formicarii liber uxta

editionem fratris Iohannis Nider," &c., "Impressum Auguste per Anthonium Sorg."

10. In what place and year was *Wilhelmi Summa Viciarum* first printed? Fabricius and Cave are certainly mistaken when they say Colon. 1479. In the volume, which I maintain to be of greater antiquity, the letters *c* and *t*, *s* and *t*, are curiously united, and the commencement of it is: "Incipit summa viciarum seu tractatus moral' edita [*sic*] a fratre vilhelmo episcopo lugdunęs. ordinsq. fratřu predicator." The description given by Quetif and Echard (i. 132.) of the primary impression of Perault's book only makes a bibliomaniac more anxious for information about it: "in Inc. typ. absque loco anno et nomine typographi, sine numeris reclamat. et majusculis."

11. Was Panormitan's *Lectura super primo Decretalium* indubitably issued at Venice, prior to the 1st of April, 1473? and if so, does it contain in the colophon these lines by Zovenzonius, which I transcribe from a noble copy bearing this date?

"Abbatis pars prima notis que fulget aliemis
Est vindelini pressa labore mei:
Cuius ego ingenium de vertice palladis ortum
Crediderim. veniam tu mihi spira dabis."

12. Is it not unquestionable that Heroldt's *Promptuarium Exemplorum* was published at least as early as his *Sermones*? The type in both works is clearly identical, and the imprint in the latter, at the end of *Serm. cxxxvi.*, vol. ii., is Colon. 1474, an

edition unknown to very nearly all bibliographers. For instance, Panzer and Denis commence with that of Rostock, in 1476; Laire with that of Cologne, 1478; and Maittaire with that of Nuremberg, in 1480. Different statements have been made as to the precise period when this humble-minded writer lived. Altamura (*Bibl. Domin.*, pp. 147. 500.) places him in the year 1400. Quetif and Echard (i. 762.), Fabricius and Mansi (*Bibl. Med. et inf. Latin.*), prefer 1418, on the unstable ground of a testimony supposed to have proceeded from the author himself; for whatever confusion or depravation may have been introduced into subsequent impressions, the *editio princeps*, of which I have spoken, does not present to our view the alleged passage, viz., "à Christo autem transacti sunt *millequadringenti decem et octo anni*," but most plainly, "M.cccc. & liij. anni." (*Serm. lxxxv.*, tom. ii.) To this same "Discipulus" Oudin (iii. 2654.), and Gerius in the Appendix to Cave (p. 187.), attribute the *Speculorum Exemplorum*, respecting which I have before proposed a Query; but I am convinced that they have confounded the *Speculum* with the *Promptuarium*. The former was first printed at Deventer, A.D. 1481, and the compiler of it enters upon his prologue in the following striking style: "Impressoria arte jamdudum longe lateque per orbem diffusa, multiplicatisque libris quarumcunque fere materiarum," &c. He then expresses his surprise at the want of a good collection of *Exempla*; and why should we determine without evidence that he must have been Heroldus?

FAIRFAX'S TASSO

In a copy of Fairfax's *Godfrey of Bulloigne*, ed. 1600 (the first), which I possess, there occurs a very curious variorum reading of the first stanza of the first book. The stanza, as it is given by Mr. Knight in his excellent modern editions, reads thus:

"The sacred armies and the godly knight,
That the great sepulchre of Christ did free,
I sing; much wrought his valour and foresight,
And in that glorious war much suffer'd he;
In vain 'gainst him did hell oppose her might,
In vain the Turks and Morians armed be;
His soldiers wild, to brawls and mutines prest,
Reduced he to peace, so heaven him blest."

By holding up the leaf of my copy to the light, it is easy to see that the stanza stood originally as given above, but a cancel slip printed in *precisely the same type* as the rest of the book gives the following elegant variation:

"I sing the warre made in the Holy Land,
And the Great Chiefe that Christ's great tombe did free:
Much wrought he with his wit, much with his hand,
Much in that braue atchieument suffred hee:
In vaine doth hell that Man of God withstand,
In vaine the worlds great princes armed bee;

For heau'n him fauour'd; and he brought againe
Vnder one standard all his scatt'red traine."

Queries.—1. Does the above variation occur in any or many other copies of the edition of 1600?

2. Which reading is followed in the second old edition?

T.N.

Demerary, September 11. 1850.

MINOR QUERIES

Jeremy Taylor's Ductor Dubitantium.—Book I. chap. 2. Rule 8. § 14.—

"If he (the judge) see a stone thrown at his brother judge, as happened at Ludlow, not many years since."

(The first ed. was published in 1660). Does any other contemporary writer mention this circumstance? or is there any published register of the assizes of that time?

Ibid. Chap. 2. Rule 3. § 32.—

"The filthy gingran."

Apparently a drug or herb. Can it be identified, or its etymology pointed out?

Ibid. §. 50.—

"That a virgin should conceive is so possible to God's power, that it is possible in nature, say the Arabians."

Can authority for this be cited from the ancient Arabic writers?

A.T.

First Earl of Roscommon.—Can you or any of your correspondents put me on any plan by which I may obtain some information on the following subject? James Dillon, first Earl of Roscommon, married Helen, daughter of Sir Christopher

Barnwell, by whom he had seven sons and six daughters; their names were Robert, Lucas, Thomas, Christopher, George, John, Patrick. Robert succeeded his father in 1641, and of his descendants and those of Lucas and Patrick I have some accounts; but what I want to know is, who are the descendants of Thomas (particularly), or of any of the other three sons?

Lodge, in his *Peerage*, very kindly kills all the sons, Patrick included; but it appears that he did not depart this life until he had left issue, from whom the late Earl had his origin. If Lodge is thus wrong in one case, he may be in others, and I have reason to believe that Thomas left a son settled in a place in Ireland called Portlick.

FRANCIS.

St. Cuthbert.—The body of St. Cuthbert, as is well known, had many wanderings before it found a magnificent resting-place at Durham. Now, in an anonymous *History of the Cathedral Church of Durham*, without date, we have a very particular account of the defacement of the shrine of St. Cuthbert, in the reign of Henry VIII. The body was found "lying whole, uncorrupt, with his face bare, and his beard as of a fortnight's growth, with all the vestments about him as he accustomed to say mass withal." The vestments are described as being "fresh, safe, and not consumed." The visitors "commanded him to be carried into the Revestry, till the king's pleasure concerning him was further known; and upon the receipt thereof the prior and monks buried him in the ground under the place where his shrine

was exalted." Now, there is a tradition of the Benedictines (of whose monastery the cathedral was part) that on the accession of Elizabeth the monks, who were apprehensive of further violence, removed the body in the night-time from the place where it had been buried to some other part of the building. This spot is known only to three persons, brothers of the order; and it is said that there are three persons who have this knowledge now, as communicated from previous generations.

But a discovery was made in 1827 of the remains of a body in the centre of the spot where the shrine stood, with various relics of a very early period and it was asserted to be the body of St. Cuthbert. This, however, has not been universally assented to, and Mr. Akerman, in his *Archæological Index*, has—

"The object commonly called St. Cuthbert's Cross" (though the designation has been questioned), "found with human remains and other relics of the Anglo-Saxon period, in the Cathedral of Durham in 1827."—p. 144.

There does seem considerable discrepancy in the statements of the remains found in 1827 and the body deposited 1541.

I will conclude with asking, Is there any evidence to confirm the tradition of the Benedictines?

J.R.N.

Vavasour of Haslewood.—*Bells in Churches.*—It is currently reported in Yorkshire that three curious privileges belong to

the chief of the ancient Roman Catholic family of Vavasour of Haslewood:

1. That he may ride on horseback into York Minster.
2. That he may specially call his house a castle.
3. That he may toll a bell in his chapel, notwithstanding any law prohibiting the use of bells in places of worship not in union with the Church of England.

Is there any foundation for this report; and what is the real story? Is there still a law against the use of bells as a summons to divine services except in churches?

A.G.

Alteration of Title-pages.—Among the advertisements in the last *Quarterly* and *Edinburgh Reviews*, is one which replies to certain criticisms on a work. One of these criticisms was a stricture upon its title. The author states that the reviewer had a *presentation copy*, and ought to have inquired into the title under which the book was sold to the *public* before he animadverted upon the connexion between the title and the work. It seems then that, in this instance, the author furnished the *Reviews* with a title-page differing from that of the body of his impression, and thinks he has a right to demand that the reviewers should suppose such a circumstance probable enough to make it imperative upon them to inquire what the real title was. Query, Is such a practice common? Can any of your readers produce another instance?

M.

Weights for Weighing Coins.—A correspondent wishes to know at what period weights were introduced for weighing coins.

He has met with two notices on the subject in passages of Cottonian manuscripts, and would be glad of farther information.

In a MS. Chronicle, Cotton. Otho B. xiv.—

"1418. Novæ bilances instituuntur ad ponderanda aurea Numismata."

In another Cottonian MS., Vitell. A. i., we read—

"1419. Here bigan gold balancis."

H.E.

Shunamitis Poema.—Who was the author of a curious small 8vo. volume of 179 pages of Latin and English poems, commencing with "Shunamitis Poema Stephani Duck Latine redditum?"

The last verse of some commendatory verses prefixed point out the author as the son of some well-known character:

"And sure that is the most distinguish'd fame,
Which rises from your own, not father's name.
London, 21 April, 1738."

My copy has no title-page: a transcript of it would oblige.

E.D.

Lachrymatories.—In many ancient places of sepulture we find long narrow phials which are called lachrymatories, and are

supposed to have been receptacles for tears: can you inform me on what authority this supposition rests?

J.H.C.

Egg-cups used by the Romans.—That the Romans used egg-cups, and of a shape very similar to our own, the ruins at Pompeii and other places afford ocular demonstration. Can you tell me by what name they called them?

J.H.C.

Sir Oliver Chamberlaine.—In Miss Lefanu's *Memoirs of Mrs. Frances Sheridan*, the celebrated authoress of *Sidney Biddulph*, *Nourjahad*, and *The Discovery*, and mother of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, it is stated that "her grandfather, Sir Oliver Chamberlaine," was an "English baronet." The absence of his name in any of the Baronetages induces the supposition, however, that he had received only the honour of knighthood; and the connexion of his son with Dublin, that the statement of Whitelaw and Walsh, in their history of that city, may be more correct,—viz. that "Sir Oliver Chamberlaine was descended from a respectable English family that had been settled in Dublin since the Reformation." I should be glad to be informed on this point, and also respecting the paternity of this Sir Oliver, who is not only distinguished as one of the progenitors of the Sheridans, but also of Dr. William Chamberlaine, the learned author of the *Abridgement of the Laws of Jamaica*, which he for some time administered, as one of the judges in that island; and of his

grandson, the brave, but ill-fated, Colonel Chamberlaine, aide-de-camp to the president Bolivar.

J.R.W.

October 10. 1850.

Meleteticks.—In Boyle's *Occasional Reflections* (ed. 1669), he uses the word *meleteticks* (pp. 8. 38.) to express the "way and kind of meditation" he "would persuade." Was this *then* a new word coined by him, and has it been used by any other writer?

P.H.F.

Luther's Hymns.—"In the midst of life we are in death," &c., in the Burial Service, is almost identical with one of Luther's hymns, the words and music of which are frequently closely copied from older sources. Whence?

F.Q.

"Pair of Twises".—What was the article, carried by gentlemen, and called by Boyle (R.B.), in his *Occasional Reflections* (edit. 1669, p. 180.), "a pair of *twises*," out of which he drew a little penknife?

P.H.F.

Countermarks on Roman Coin.—Several coins in my cabinet of Tiberius, Trajan, &c. bear the stamp NCAPR; others have an open hand, &c. I should be glad to know the reason of this practice, and what they denote.

E.S.T.

REPLIES

GAUDENTIO DI LUCCA

(Vol. ii., p. 247. 298.)

The *Memoirs of Sig. Gaudentio di Lucca* have very generally been ascribed to Bishop Berkeley. In Moser's *Diary*, written at the close of the last century (MS. penes me), the writer says,—

"I have been reading Berkeley's amusing account of *Sig. Gaudentio*. What an excellent system of patriarchal government is there developed!"

See the *Retrospective Review*, vol iv. p. 316., where the work is also ascribed to the celebrated Bishop Berkeley.

EDWARD F. RIMBAULT.

In the corrigenda and addenda to Kippis's *Biographia Britannica*, prefixed to vol. iii. is the following note, under the head of *Berkeley*:

"On the same authority [viz., that of Dr. George Berkeley, the bishop's son,] we are assured that his father did not write, and never read through, the *Adventures of Signor Gaudentio di Lucca*. Upon this head, the editor of

the *Biographia* must record himself as having exhibited an instance of the folly of building facts upon the foundation of conjectural reasonings. Having heard the book ascribed to Bishop Berkeley, and seen it mentioned as his in catalogues of libraries, I read over the work again under this impression, and fancied that I perceived internal arguments of its having been written by our excellent prelate. I was even pleased with the apprehended ingenuity of my discoveries. But the whole was a mistake, which, whilst it will be a warning to myself, may furnish an instructive lesson to others. At the same time, I do not retract the character which I have given of the *Adventures of Signor Gaudenzio di Lucca*. Whoever was the author of that performance, it does credit to his abilities and to his heart."

After this decisive testimony of Bishop Berkeley's son, accompanied by the candid confession of error on the part of the editor of the *Biographia Britannica*, the rumour as to Berkeley's authorship of *Gaudenzio* ought to have been finally discredited. Nevertheless, it seems still to maintain its ground: it is stated as probable by Dunlop, in his *History of Fiction*; while the writer of a useful Essay on "Social Utopias," in the third volume of *Chambers's Papers for the People*, No. 18., treats it as an established fact.

L.

In addition to the remarks of your correspondent L., I may state that the first edition in 1737, 8vo., contains 335 pages, exclusive of the publisher's address, 13 pages. It is printed for T.

Cooper, at the Globe, in Paternoster Row. The second edition in 1748, 8vo., contains publisher's address, 12 pages; the work itself 291 pages.

I find no difference between the two editions, except that in the first the title is *The Memoirs of Sigr. Gaudentio di Lucca*; and in the second, *The Adventures of Sigr. Gaudentio di Lucca*; and that in the second the notes are subjoined to each page, while in the first they follow the text in smaller type, as *Remarks of Sigr. Rhedi*. The second edition is—

"Printed for W. Innys in Paternoster Row, and R. Manby and H.S. Cox on Ludgate Hill, and sold by M. Cooper in Paternoster Row."

With respect to the author, it must be observed that there is no evidence whatever to justify its being attributed to Bishop Berkeley. Clara Reeve, in her *Progress of Romana*, 1786, 8vo., mentions him as having been supposed to be the author; but her authority seems only to have been the anonymous writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. xlvii. p. 13., referred to by your correspondent. The author of an elaborate review of the work in the *Retrospective Review*, vol. iv., advocates Bishop Berkeley's claim, but gives no reasons of any validity; and merely grounds his persuasion upon the book being such as might be expected from that great writer. He was, however, at least bound to show some conformity in style, which he does not attempt. On the other hand, we have the positive denial of Dr. George Berkeley, the bishop's son (Kippis's *Biog. Brit.*, vol. iii., addenda to vol. ii.),

which, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, seems to be quite sufficient.

In a letter signed C.H., *Gent. Mag.*, vol. vii. p. 317., written immediately on the appearance of the work, the writer observes:—

"I should have been very glad to have seen the author's name prefixed to it: however, I am of opinion that it its very nearly related to no less a hand than that which has so often, under borrowed names, employed itself to amuse and trifle mankind, in their own taste, out of their folly and vices."

This appears to point at Swift; but it is quite clear that he could not be the author, for very obvious reasons.

A correspondent of the *Gent. Mag.*, who signs his initials W.H. (vol. lv. part 2. p. 757), states "on very good authority" that the author was—

"Barrington, a Catholic priest, who had chambers in Gray's Inn, in which he was keeper of a library for the use of the Romish clergy. Mr. Barrington wrote it for amusement, in a fit of the gout. He began it without any plan, and did not know what he should write about when be put pen to paper. He was author of several pamphlets, chiefly anonymous, particularly the controversy with Julius Bate on Elohim."

Of this circumstantial and sufficiently positive attribution, which is dated October, 1785, no contradiction ever appeared that I am aware of. The person intended is S. Berington, the author of—

"Dissertations on the Mosaical Creation, Deluge, building of Babel, and Confusion of Tongues, &c." London: printed for the Author, and sold by C. Davis in Holborn, and T. Osborn in Gray's Inn, 1750, 8vo., pages 466, exclusive of introduction, 12 pages.

On comparing Gaudentio di Lucca with this extremely curious work, there seems a sufficient similarity to bear out the statement of the correspondent of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, W.H. The author quoted in the *Remarks of Sigr. Rhedi*, and in the *Dissertations*, are frequently the same, and the learning is of the same cast in both. In particular, Bochart is repeatedly cited in the *Remarks* and in the *Dissertations*. The philosophical opinions appear likewise very similar.

On the whole, unless some strong reason can be given for questioning the statement of this correspondent of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, I conceive that S. Berington, of whom I regret that so little is known, must be considered to be the author of *The Memoirs of Gaudentio di Lucca*.

JAS. CROSSLEY.

Manchester, October 7. 1850.

ENGLEMANN'S BIBLIOTHECA SCRIPTORUM CLASSICORUM

(Vol. ii., pp. 296. 312.)

The sort of defence, explanation, or whatever it may be called, founded upon usage, and offered by ANOTHER FOREIGN BOOKSELLER, is precisely what I wanted to get out, if it existed, as I suspected it did.

If your correspondent be accurate as to Engelmann, it appears that no wrong is done to *him*; it is only the public which is mystified by a variety of title-pages, all but one containing a suppression of the truth, and the one of which I speak containing more.

I now ask you to put in parallel columns extracts from the title given by Engelmann with the substitutes given in that which I received.

"Schriftsteller—welche vom Jahre 1700 bis zu Ende des Jahres 1846 besonders in Deutschland gedruckt worden sind."

"Classics ... that have appeared in Germany and the adjacent countries up to the end of 1846."

I do not think it fair towards Mr. Engelmann, whose own title is so true and so precise, to take it for certain, on anonymous authority, that he sanctioned the above paraphrase. According to the German, the catalogue contains works from 1700 to 1846, published *especially* in Germany; meaning, as is the fact, that there are some in it published elsewhere. According to the English, all classics printed in Germany, and all the adjacent countries, in all times, are to be found in the catalogue. I pass over the implied compliment to this country, namely, that while a true description is required in Germany, a puff both in time and space is wanted for England. I dwell on the injurious effect of such alterations to literature, and on the trouble they give to those who wish to be accurate. It is a system I attack, and not individuals. There is no occasion to say much, for publicity alone will do what is wanted, especially when given in a journal which falls under the eyes of those engaged in research. I hope those of your contributors who think as I do, will furnish you from time to time with exposures; if, as a point of form, a Query be requisite, they can always end with, Is this right?

A. DE MORGAN.

October 14. 1850.

SHAKSPEARE'S USE OF THE WORD "DELIGHTED."

(Vol. ii., pp. 113. 139. 200. 234.)

I should have been content to leave the question of the meaning of the word *delighted* as it stands in your columns, my motive, so kindly appreciated by Mr. SINGER, in raising the discussion being, by such means to arrive at the true meaning of the word, but that the remarks of L.B.L. (p. 234.) recall to my mind a canon of criticism which I had intended to communicate at an earlier period as useful for the guidance of commentators in questions of this nature. It is as follows:— Master the grammatical construction of the passage in question (if from a drama, in its dramatic and I scenic application), deducing therefrom the general sense, before you attempt to amend or fix the meaning of a doubtful word.

Of all writers, none exceed Shakspeare in logical correctness and nicety of expression. With a vigour of thought and command of language attained by no man besides, it is fair to conclude, that he would not be guilty of faults of construction such as would disgrace a school-boy's composition; and yet how unworthily is he treated when we find some of his finest passages vulgarised

and degraded through misapprehensions arising from a mere want of that attention due to the very least, not to say the greatest, of writers. This want of attention (without attributing to it such fatal consequences) appears to me evident in L.B.L.'s remarks, ably as he analyses the passage. I give him credit for the faith that enabled him to discover a sense in it as it stands; but when he says that it is perfectly intelligible in its natural sense, it appears to me that he cannot be aware of the innumerable explanations that have been offered of this very clear passage. The source of his error is plainly referable to the cause I have pointed out.

It is quite true that, in the passage referred to, the condition of the body before and after death is contrasted, but this is merely incidental. The natural antithesis of "a sensible warm motion" is expressed in "a kneaded clod" and "cold obstruction;" but the terms of the other half of the passage are not quite so well balanced. On the other hand, it is not the contrasted condition of each, but the separation of the body and spirit—that is, *death*—which is the object of the speaker's contemplation. Now with regard to the meaning of the term *delighted*, L.B.L. says it is applied to the spirit "*not* in its state *after death*, but *during life*." I must quote the lines once more:—

"Ay, but to die, and go we know not where;
To lie in cold obstruction, and to rot;
This sensible warm motion to become

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.

Текст предоставлен ООО «ЛитРес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на ЛитРес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.