VARIOUS

NOTES AND QUERIES, NUMBER 184, MAY 7, 1853

Various

Notes and Queries, Number 184, May 7, 1853

Various

Notes and Queries, Number 184, May 7, 1853 / Various — «Public Domain»,

Содержание

Various
Notes and Queries, Number 184, May 7, 1853 / A Medium of Inter-communication for Literary Men, Artists, Antiquaries, Genealogists, etc

Notes

OLD POPULAR POETRY: "ADAM BELL, CLYM OF THE CLOUGH, AND WILLIAM OF CLOWDESLY."

I have very recently become possessed of a curious printed fragment, which is worth notice on several accounts, and will be especially interesting to persons who, like myself, are lovers of our early ballad poetry. It is part of an unknown edition of the celebrated poem relating to the adventures of Adam Bell, Clym of the Clough, and William of Cloudesly.

There are (as many of your readers will be aware from Ritson's small volume, *Pieces of Ancient Popular Poetry*, 8vo. 1791) two old editions of *Adam Bell, &c.*, one printed by William Copland, without date, and the other by James Roberts in 1605. The edition by Copland must have preceded that by Roberts by forty or fifty years, and may have come out between 1550 and 1560; the only known copy of it is among the Garrick Plays (at least it was so when I saw it) in the British Museum. The re-impression by Roberts is not very uncommon, and I think that more than one copy of it is at Oxford.

When Copland printed the poem, he did not enter it at Stationers' Hall; comparatively few of his publications, generally of a free, romantic, or ludicrous character, were licensed, and he was three times fined for not first obtaining the leave of the Company. Nevertheless, we do find an entry of a "book" called "Adam Bell," &c., among the memoranda belonging to the year 1557-8, but it was made at the instance, not of Copland, but of John Kynge, in this form:

> "To John Kynge, to prynte this boke called Adam Bell, &c., and for his lycense he geveth to the howse"—

What sum he gave is not stated. Again, we meet with another notice of it in the same registers, under the date of 1581-2, when John Charlwood was interested in the undertaking. I mention these two entries principally because neither Ritson nor Percy were acquainted with them; but they may be seen among the extracts published by the Shakspeare Society in 1848 and 1849.

No impressions by Kynge or Charlwood having come down to us, we have no means of knowing whether they availed themselves of the permission granted at Stationers' Hall; and, unless I am deceived, the fragment which occasions this Note is not from the presses of either of them, and is of an earlier date than the time of Copland; the type is much better, and less battered, than that of Copland; at the same time it has a more antique look, and in several respects, which I am about to point out, it furnishes a better text than that given by Ritson from Copland's edition, or by Percy with the aid of his folio manuscript. I am sorry to say that it only consists of a single sheet; but this is nearly half the production, and it comprises the whole of the second, and two pages of the third "fit." The first line and the last of the portion in my hands, testify to the greater antiquity and purity of the text there found; it begins—

"These gates be shut so wonderly well;"

and it ends,

"Tyll they came to the kynge's palays."

It is "*wonderous* well" in Copland's impression, and palace is there spelt "pallace," a more modern form of the word than *palays*. Just afterwards we have, in my fragment,

"Streyght comen from oure kyng,"

instead of Copland's

"Streyght *come nowe* from our king."

Comen is considerably more ancient than "come nowe;" so that, without pursuing this point farther, I may say that my fragment is not only an older specimen of typography than Copland's impression, but older still in its words and phraseology, a circumstance that communicates to it additional interest. I subjoin a few various readings, most, if not all, of them presenting a superior text than is to be met with elsewhere. Speaking of the porter at the gate of Carlisle, we are told—

"And to the gate faste he throng."

Copland's edition omits *faste*, and it is not met with in Percy. In another place a rhyme is lost by an awkward transposition, "he saide" for *sayd he*; and farther on, in Copland's text, we have mention of

"The justice with a quest of squyers."

instead of "a quest of *swerers*," meaning of course the jury who had condemned Cloudesly "there hanged to be." Another blunder committed by Copland is the omission of a word, so that a line is left without its corresponding rhyme:

"Then Clowdysle cast hys eyen aside,
And sawe his two bretheren *stande*
At the corner of the market-place,
With theyr good bowes bent in theyr hand."

The word I print in Italics is entirely wanting in Copland. It is curious to see how Percy (*Reliques*, i. 157., ed. 1775) gets over the difficulty by following no known copy of the original:

"Then Cloudesle cast his eyen asyde,
And saw hys brethren twaine
At a corner of the market-place,
Ready the justice for to slaine."

Cloudesly is made to exclaim, in all editions but mine, "I see comfort," instead of "I see *good* comfort." However, it would perhaps be wearisome to press this matter farther, and I have said enough to set a few of your readers, zealous in such questions, rummaging their stores to ascertain whether any text with which they are acquainted, tallies with that I have above quoted.

J. Payne Collier.

WITCHCRAFT

Observing that you have lately admitted some articles on witchcraft, it may be interesting to make a note of two or three original papers, out of some in my possession, which were given to me many years ago by an old general officer, who served in the American war, and brought them with him to England about 1776. I send exact copies from the originals.

H. T. Ellacombe.

Rectory, Clyst St. George.

Whereas several persons, being by authority comitted to Ipswich Goall for fellony and witchcraft, and order being given that search should be made carefully upon their bodyes, to see if there nothing appeared preternaturall thereon: for that end, on July y^{e} 4^{t}h, 1692, a Jurie of one man and eight women were sumoned to attend, and sworne to make dilligent search, and to give a true account of what they found, viz^{t}.—

Doctor Philemon Dance,
Mrs. Johana Diamond, midwife,
Mrs. Grace Graves,
Mrs. Mary Belcher,
Mrs. Gennet Pengery,
Ann Lovell,
Francis Davis,
Mary Browne,

Who, after search made in particular, give this account, viz^{t}.—Upon the body of goodwife Estue they find three unnaturall teats, one under left arme, and one on the back side of her sholder-blade, one near to her secret parts on one thigh, which, being pricked throw with a pin, remained without sense, and did not bleed.

2. Upon y^{e} veiwing and searching y^{e} body of Sarah Cloice, there was nothing unnaturall appeared on her.

3. Upon searching y^{e} body of Mrs. Bradbury, there was nothing appeared unnaturall on her, only her brest were biger than usuall, and her nipples larger than one y^{t} did not give suck, though her body was much pined and wasted, yet her brests seemed full.

4. Upon y^{e} searching y^{e} body of y^{e} wife of Giles Cory, there was severall darke moulds, one of which was upon one of her buttocks, and being pricked with a pin, it was without sence, and did not bleed.

5. Upon y^{e} searching y^{e} body of Widow Hoer, nothing appeared on her unnaturall, only her body verry much scratched, and on her head a strange lock of haire, verry long, and differing in color from y^{e} rest on her head, and matted or tangled together, which she said was a widow's lock, and said, if it were cutt off she should die.

6. Upon searching y^{e} body of Rachell Clenton, there was found an unnaturall teat on one side, something lower than just under her arme, which teat having a pin thrust throw it she was not senceable of, till by scratching her side, pricked her fingers with y^{e} pin y^{t} was then in y^{e} teat; neither did y^{e} teat bleed.

There was also ordered, with ye foresaid Doct^{r}, four other men, viz^{t}, Mr. Har. Symonds, Samuel Graves, Sen^{r}, Thomas Knewlton, and John Pinder, to search y^{e} body of Giles Cory, and they returned y^{t} they, having searched him, found nothing unnaturall upon him.

The truth of which I heare attest

(Signed) Tho^{s} Wade, J.P

Province of Massachusettes Bay,
New England, Essex.

Anno R. R. et Reginæ Gulielmi et Mariæ Angliæ, &c. quarto, annoqu Dom. 1692.

The Jurors for our Sov^{n} Lord and Ladye the King and Queen present—

That Abigail Barker, wife of Ebenezer Barker of Andiver, in the County of Essex aforesaid, about two years since, at and in the town of Andiver aforesaid, wickedly, maliciously, and felloniously, a covenant with the Devill did make, and signed the Devill's Booke, and by the Devill was baptized, and renounced her former Christian baptism; and gave herselfe up to the Devill to serve him, and for the Devill to be her lord and master; by which wicked and diabollicall couvenant, shee the said Abigaill Barker is become a detestable witch, contrary to the peace of our Soveraigne Lord and Lady the King and Queene, their crowne and dignity, and the law in that case made and provided.

Sep., '92. The examination and confession of Abigail Barker, taken before John Hawthorn, Esq., and other their Majesties Justices:

Q. How long have you been in the snare of the Devil?

A. Not above two yeares and a half.

Q. At what place were you first overtaken?

A. I am at present very much bewildered.—But a little after she said as followes:—About two yeare and a half agoe she was in great discontent of mynd, her husband being abroad, and she at home alone; at which tyme a black man appeared to her, and brought a book with him, to which he put her finger and made a black mark. She saith, her memory now failes her now more than ordinary; but said she gave herself up to the Devil to serve him, and he was her lord and master; and the Devil set a mark upon her legg, which mark is black and blue, and she apprehends is a witch mark; and said that she is a witch, and thinks that mark is the cause of her afflicting persons, though she thought nothing of it then till afterwards she heard of others having a mark upon them. She sayes, that some tyme after this the black man carryed her singly upon a pole to 5-mile pond, and there were 4 persones more upon another pole, viz. Mistriss Osgood, Goody Wilson, Goody Wardwell, Goody Tyler, and Hanneh Tyler. And when she came to the pond the Devil made a great light, and took her up and dypt her face in the pond, and she felt the water, and the Devil told her he was her lord and master, and she must serve him for ever. He made her renounce her former baptisme, and carryed her back upon the pole. She confesses she has afflicted the persones that accused her, viz. Sprague, Lester, and Sawdy, both at home and in the way comeing downe. The manner thus:—The Devil does it in her shape, and she consents unto, and clinches her hands together, and sayes the Devil cannot doe it in her shape without her consent. She sayes she was at a meeting at Moses Tyler's house, in company with Mistriss Osgood, Goody Wilson, Goody Tyler, and Hanah Tyler. She said the mark above was on her left legg by her shin. It is about two yeare agoe since she was baptized. She said that all this was true; and set her hand to the original as a true confession. *Noate*, that before this her confession she was taken dumb, and took Mr. Epps about the neck and pulled him down, thereby showing him how the black man bowed her down; and for one houre's tyme could not open her lips.

I, underwritten, being appointed by authority to take the above examination, doe testify upon oath taken in court, that this is a true coppy of the substance of it to the best of my knowledge.

Wm. Murray

6th July, 1692/3.
The above Abigail Barker was examined before their Majesties Justices of the Peace in Salem.

(Atest.) John Higginson, Just. Peace.

Owned before the Grand Jury.

(Atest.) Robert Payne, Foreman.

6th January, 1692.

SPRING, ETC

Our ancestors had three verbs and three corresponding substantives to express the growth of plants, namely, *spring*, *shoot*, and *sprout*,—all indicative of rapidity of growth; for *sprout*, (Germ. *spriessen*) is akin to *spurt*, and denotes quickness, suddenness. The only one of these which remains in general use is *shoot*: for *sprout* is now only appropriated to the young growth from cabbage-stalks; and *spring* is heard no more save in *sprig*, which is evidently a corruption of it, and which now denotes a small slip or twig as we say, sprigs of laurel, bay, thyme, mint, rosemary, &c.

Of the original meaning of *spring*, I have met but one clear instance; it is, however, an incontrovertible one, namely,

> "Whoso spareth the *spring* (*i. e.* rod, switch), spilleth his children."—*Visions of Piers Plowman*, v. 2554., ed. Wright.

Perhaps this is also the meaning in—

> "Shall, Antipholus,
> Even in the spring of love thy *love-springs* rot?"
>
> *Com. of Errors, Act III. Sc. 2.*

and in "Time's Glory"—

> "To dry the old oak's sap and cherish *springs*."
>
> *Rape of Lucrece.*

Spring afterwards came to be used for underwood, &c. Perhaps it answered to the present *coppice*, which is composed of the springs or shoots of the growth which has been cut down:

> "The lofty high wood and the lower *spring*."
>
> *Drayton's Muses' Elysium, 10.*
>
> "The lesser birds that keep the lower *spring*."
>
> *Id., note.*

It was also used as equivalent to grove:

> "Unless it were
> The nightingale among the thick-leaved *spring*."
>
> *Fletcher's Faith. Shep., v. 1.*

where, however, it may be the coppice.

> "This hand Sibylla's golden boughs to guard them,
> Through hell and horror, to the Elysian *springs*."
>
> *Massinger's Bondman, ii. 1.*

In the following place Fairfax uses *spring* to express the "salvatichi soggiorni," i. e. *selva* of his original:

"But if his courage any champion move
Too try the hazard of this dreadful *spring*."

Godf. of Bull., xiii. 31.

and in

"For you alone to happy end must bring
The strong enchantments of the charmed *spring*."

Id., xviii. 2.

it answers to *selva*.

When Milton makes his Eve say—

"While I
In yonder *spring* of roses intermix'd
With *myrtles* find what to redress till noon."

Par. Lost, ix. 217.

he had probably in his mind the *cespuglio* in the first canto of the *Orlando Furioso*; for *spring* had not been used in the sense of thickets, clumps, by any previous English poet. I am of opinion that *spring* occurs for the last time in our poetry in the following lines of Pope:

"See thy bright altars throng'd with prostrate kings,
And heap'd with products of Sabæan *springs*."

Messiah, 93.

Johnson renders the last line—

"Cinnameos cumulos, Nabathæi munera *veris*;"

and this is probably the sense in which the place has generally been understood. But let any one read the preceding quotations, and reflect on what a diligent student Pope was of the works of his predecessors, and perhaps he will think with me.

Thomas Keightley.

NOTES AND QUERIES ON BACON'S ESSAYS, NO. III

(Vol. vii., pp. 6. 80.)

Essay IX. p. 21. (note *a*). "They used the word 'præfiscini.'" See *e. g.*, Plaut. *Asin.*, ii. 4. 84. (Weise):

> "Præfiscini hoc nunc dixerim: nemo etiam me adcusavit
> Merito meo."

(Leonida boasts of his integrity.)

Ditto, p. 22. (note *c*). "From the *Stichus* of Plautus," ii. 1. 54.

Ditto, p. 23. "Which has the character of Adrian the Emperor." See *Hist. Aug. Script.*, i. 149., *ut supr.* (Spartian. *Vit. Hadrian.* cap. 15.)

Ditto p. 26. "It was well said." By whom?

Essay X. ditto. "A poor saying of Epicurus." Where recorded?

Ditto, p. 27. "It hath been well said, 'That the arch flatterer,'" &c. By whom, and where?

Ditto, ditto. "It hath been well said, 'That it is impossible,'" &c. By whom and where?

Ditto, ditto. "The poet's relation." Ovid. *Heroid.* xvi. 163.

Essay XI. p. 28. "Cum non sis qui fueris," &c. Whence?

Ditto, p 29. "Illi mors gravis incubat," &c. Seneca, *Thyest.* 401. (ed. Lemaire), Act II. extrem.

Ditto, p. 31. "That was anciently spoken." By whom?

Ditto, ditto. "Tacitus of Galba." Tac. *Hist.*, i. 49.

Ditto, ditto. "Of Vespasian." Tac. *Hist.*, i. 50.

Essay XII. ditto. "Question was asked of Demosthenes." See Cic. *De Orat.*, III. 56. § 213.

Ditto, p. 32. "Mahomet's miracle." Where recorded?

Essay XIII. p. 33. "The desire of power," &c. Cf. Shaksp. *Hen. VIII.*, III. 2. "By that sin (ambition) fell the angels," &c.

Essay XIII. p. 33. "Busbechius." In Busbequii *Legationes Turciæ Epist. Quatuor* (Hanoviæ, 1605), p. 133., we find this told of "Aurifex quidam Venetus."—N. B. In the Index (*s. v.* Canis) of an edition of the same work, printed in London for R. Daniel (1660), *for* 206 *read* 106.

Ditto, ditto (note *b*). Gibbon (*Miscellaneous Works*, iii., 544., ed. 1815) says, "B. is my old and familiar acquaintance, a frequent companion in my post-chaise. His Latinity is eloquent, his manner is lively, his remarks are judicious."

Ditto, p. 34. "Nicholas Machiavel." Where?

Ditto, p. 35. "Æsop's cock." See Phædrus, iii. 12.

Essay XV. p. 38. "Ille etiam cæcos," &c., Virg. *Georg.* i. 464.

Ditto, ditto. "Virgil, giving the pedigree," &c. *Æn.* iv. 178.

Ditto, p. 39. "That kind of obedience which Tacitus speaketh of." Bacon quotes, from memory, Tac. *Hist.*, ii. 39., "Miles alacer, qui tamen jussa ducum interpretari, quam exsequi, mallet."

Ditto, ditto. "As Machiavel noteth well." Where?

Ditto, p. 40. "As Tacitus expresseth it well." Where?

Ditto, p. 41. "Lucan," i. 181.

Ditto, ditto. "Dolendi modus, timendi non item." Whence?

Ditto, ditto. "The Spanish proverb." What is it? Cf. "A bow long bent at last waxeth weak;" and the Italian, "L'arco si rompe se sta troppo teso." (Ray's *Proverbs*, p. 81., 4th edit., 1768.)

Ditto, p. 43. "The poets feign," &c. See *Iliad*, i. 399.

Ditto, ditto (note *y*). "The myth is related in the *Works and Days of Hesiod*," vv. 47-99., edit. Göttling.

Ditto, p. 44. "Sylla nescivit." Sueton. *Vit. Cæs.*, 77.

Ditto, p. 45. "Galba." Tac. *Hist.*, i. 5.

Ditto, ditto. "Probus." Bacon seems to have quoted from memory, as we find in Vopiscus (*Hist. Aug. Script., ut supr.*, vol. ii. 679. 682.), as one of the *causæ occidendi*, "Dictum ejus grave, Si unquam eveniat salutare, Reip. brevi milites necessarios non futuros."

Ditto, ditto. "Tacitus saith." *Hist.*, i. 28.

P. J. F. Gantillon, B.A.

(To be continued.)

SHAKSPEARE CORRESPONDENCE

The Passage in King Henry VIII., Act III. Sc. 1. (Vol. vii., pp. 5. 111. 183. 494.).—Mr. Ingleby has done perfectly right to "call me to account" for a rash and unadvised assertion, in saying that we must interpolate *been* in the passage in *King Henry VIII.*, Act III. Sc. 2., after *have*; for even that would not make it intelligible. So far I stand corrected. The passages, however that are cited, are not parallel cases. In the first we have the word *loyalty* to complete the sense:

" . . . . . My loyalty,
Which ever has [been] and ever shall be growing."

In the second, the word *deserved* is clearly pointed out as being understood, from the occurrence of *deserve* after *will*:

"I have spoken better of you than you have [deserved] or will deserve at my hands."

I will assist Mr. Ingleby's position with another example from *Rich. II.*, Act V. Sc. 5.:

" . . . . . like silly beggars,
Who sitting in the stocks, refuge their shame,
That many have [sat] and others must sit there."

And even from a much later writer, Bolingbroke:

"This dedication may serve for almost any book that has, is, or shall be published."

Where we must supply *been* after *has*. But in the passage I attempted, and I think successfully, to set right, admitting that custom would allow of the ellipsis of the participle *been*, after the auxiliary *have*, to what can "am, have, and will be" possibly refer?

" . . . . . I do professe
That for your highness' good, I euer labour'd
More then mine owne, that am, haue, and will be."

What? Add *true* at the end of the line, and it mars the verse, but make the probable correction of *true* for *haue*, and you get excellent sense without any ellipsis. I am as averse to interpolation or alteration of the text, when sense can by any rational supposition be made of it, as my opponent, or any true lover of the poet and the integrity of his language, can possibly be; but I see nothing rational in refusing to correct an almost self-evident misprint, which would redeem a fine passage that otherwise must always remain a stumbling-block to the most intelligent reader. We have all I trust but one object, *i. e.* to free the text of our great poet from obvious errors occasioned by extremely incorrect printing in the folios, and at the same time to strictly watch over all attempts at its corruption by unnecessary meddling. This, and not the displaying of our own ingenuity in conjectures, ought to be our almost sacred duty; at least, I feel conscious that it is mine.

S. W. Singer.

"That one may smile, and smile, and be a villain."

Hamlet.

The notable quotation of this line by the Earl of Derby, in the Lords, on Monday evening, April 25, has once more reminded me of my unanswered Query respecting it, Vol. vi., p. 270.

On the 26th February (Vol. vii., p. 217.) Mr. Collier was good enough to say, that his only reason for not answering it was, that he had not then within his reach the copy of "N. & Q." wherein it had been proposed; politely adding, that if I would reprint the Query, he would at once answer it.

Supposing, however, that Mr. Collier's absence from his library would be only temporary, I deemed it less troublesome to the Editor of "N. & Q." to wait until Mr. Collier could refer to the Query, as already printed.

Two months have since elapsed, and I now no longer hesitate to ask the Editor for an opportunity of again referring to it, trusting that a sufficient excuse will be found in the importance of the subject, as affecting the fundamental sense of a passage in Shakspeare.

A. E. B.

Leeds.

Mr. J. Payne Collier's "Notes and Emendations."—There can be no doubt that many of these emendations are rational and judicious; but I cannot help thinking, *on the whole*, that Mr. Collier has rather overrated their value, and placed too implicit faith in the infallibility of his unknown guide. At all events, there is not a shadow of authority given for any one of the corrections, and we have therefore a full right to try them, as the lawyers would say, "upon the merits;" or, in other words, to treat them as mere speculative alterations, and to adopt or reject them, as may appear advisable in each particular case. It is difficult to conjecture what can have been the position in life, or the occupation of this mysterious annotator. That his pursuits were not purely literary, I think is plain: first, from the very circumstance of his not authenticating any of his notes, which a literary inquirer would certainly have done; and, secondly, from the very minute attention which is paid to the *business* of the scene and the movements of the actors. These considerations, coupled with the fact of his frequently striking out whole passages of the text (which a literary enthusiast would *not* have done), would at first lead us to suppose that the writer was a theatrical manager, and that the alterations were made to suit either the fancies, or perhaps the peculiar qualifications of certain performers. But in this case one can hardly suppose that the remarks would have extended to more than a certain number of plays, which were most frequently acted. Thus much, however, appears certain, that the commentaries are rather those of an *habitual play-goer*, than of a studious critic; and it will be easy to show that a great portion of the new readings he proposes are really changes *for the worse*, while a still larger number are at least unnecessary! I shall content myself with only a few instances, on this occasion, as I am unwilling to encroach too far on your space; but I can easily multiply them, if I am encouraged to renew the subject.

In the first place, I differ from Mr. Collier entirely as to the famous passage from *Henry VIII.*, p. 324., which he brings so prominently forward as to give it special notice in his Introduction. To me, I confess, the phrase—

"To steal from spiritual *labour* a brief span,"

appears quite tame and poor in comparison with

"To steal from spiritual *leisure* a brief span,"

and, moreover, destroys all the poetry of the thought. Nor can I see the slightest difficulty in the *sense* of the original passage. The king means to say that Wolsey cannot steal from the *little leisure* afforded him by his spiritual labours "a brief span, to keep his earthly audit:" and surely this is much more poetical than the substituted passage.

In p. 323., from the same play, we have—

"to the sharp'st *kind* of justice,"

transformed to "sharp'st *knife* of justice:" but I cannot assent to this change. The obvious meaning of the poet is, that the contempt of the world, "*shutting all doors*" against the accused, is a sharper *kind* of justice than any which the law could inflict: but, to be given up to "the sharp'st *knife* of justice" could only mean, being consigned to the public executioner,—which was just what Katherine was deprecating.

In p. 325. the lines relating to Wolsey's foundations at Ipswich and Oxford are printed thus in the folio—

"one of which fell with him,
Unwilling to outlive the good that did it:"

that is, unwilling to outlive the virtues which prompted it,—a passage teeming with poetical feeling: but the commentator has ruthlessly altered it to—

"Unwilling to outlive the *good man* did it;"

which, I submit, not only destroys all the poetry, but is decidedly *not English!*

The next passage I would notice is from *Much Ado about Nothing*, p. 76. How, I would ask, can the phrase—

"And sorrow wag,"

be a misprint for "call sorrow joy?" No compositor, or scribe either, could possibly be misled by any sound from the "reader" into such a mistake as that! The words "and sorrow wag," I admit, are not sense; but the substitution of "call sorrow joy" strikes me as bald and common-place in the extreme, and there is no pretence for its having any authority. If, then, we are to have a mere fanciful emendation, why not "bid sorrow wag?" This would be doing far less violence to the printed text, for it would only require the alteration of two letters in the word "and;" while it would preserve the Shakspearian character of the passage. "Wag" is a favourite expression in the comedies of the Bard, and occurs repeatedly in his works. The passage would then run thus—

"If such a one will smile and stroke his beard,
Bid sorrow wag—cry hem! when he should groan."

In p. 73. we find—

"Soul-tainted flesh," &c.

substituted for "*foul* tainted flesh;" and we are told that the critics have been all wrong, who supposed that Shakspeare intended any "metaphor from the kitchen!" If so, what meaning can be attached to the line—

"And salt too little which may season give?"

If that is not a metaphor from the kitchen, I know not what could be? I still believe that "foul tainted flesh" is the correct reading. The expression "*soul*-tainted flesh" is not intelligible. It should rather be "*soul-tainting* flesh." The *soul* may be tainted by the *flesh*: but how the *flesh* can be *soul-tainted*, I cannot understand.

Turning further back, to p. 69., we find it asserted, quite dogmatically, that the word "truths" of the folios ought to be "proofs;" but no reason whatever is offered for the change. I cannot help thinking that "seeming *truths*" is much the most poetical expression, while in "seeming *proofs*" there is something like redundancy,—to say nothing of the phrase being infinitely more common-place!

In the play of the *Tempest*, p. 4., the beautiful passage—

> "he being thus *lorded*
> Not only with what my revenue yielded," &c.,

is degraded into "he being thus *loaded*," &c. Can there be a moment's doubt that "lorded" was the word used by Shakspeare? It is completely in his style, which was on all occasions to coin verbs out of substantives, if he could. "He being thus *lorded*," i. e. *ennobled* "with what my revenue yielded," is surely a far superior expression to "being thus *loaded*,"—as if the poet were speaking of a costermonger's donkey!

Again, in p. 10.:

> "Wherefore *this* ghastly looking?"

or, this ghastly appearance? Who will venture to say, that the substitution of "*thus ghastly* looking" is not decidedly a change for the worse?

In the Merchant of Venice, p. 118.:

> "and leave itself *unfurnished*,"

is altered to "leave itself *unfinished*!" I confess I cannot see the slightest warrant for this change. The words—

> "having made one,
> Methinks IT should have power to steal *both his*,"

distinctly show that the author was alluding to the *eye* only, and not to the *portrait* and how could the eye (already *made*) describe itself as *unfinished*? Surely the sense is *unfurnished*, that is, *unfurnished* with its companion, or probably with the other accessories required to complete the portrait.

P. 119. has the line—

> "And swearing 'til my very *roof* was dry,"

transmogrified into—

> "And swearing 'til my very *tongue* was dry."

Now, why "this lame and impotent conclusion?" What can be a more common expression than the "roof of the mouth?" and it is just the part which is most affected by a sensation of dryness and pricking, after any excitement in speaking, whereas the *tongue* is not the member that suffers!

In *As You Like It*, p. 127., in the line—

"Mistress dispatch you with your *safest haste*,"

the last two words are made "fastest haste," which, to say the least, are tautology, and are like talking, of the "highest height", or the the "deepest depth!" Surely, the original form of words, "Dispatch you with your *safest haste*

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.