VARIOUS

NOTES AND QUERIES, NUMBER 203, SEPTEMBER 17, 1853

Various

Notes and Queries, Number 203, September 17, 1853

Various

Notes and Queries, Number 203, September 17, 1853 / Various — «Public Domain»,

Содержание

Various
Notes and Queries, Number 203, September 17, 1853 / A Medium of Inter-communication for Literary Men, Artists, Antiquaries, Genealogists, etc

OUR SHAKSPEARIAN CORRESPONDENCE

We have received from a valued and kind correspondent (not one of those emphatically good-natured friends so wittily described by Sheridan) the following temperate remonstrance against the tone which has distinguished several of our recent articles on Shakspeare:—

Shakspeare Suggestions (Vol. viii., pp. 124. 169.).—

"Most busy, when least I do."

I am grateful to A. E. B. for referring me to the article on "Shakspeare Criticism" in the last number of *Blackwood's Magazine*. It is a very able paper, and worthy of general attention.

I ought to add some few explanatory observations upon the subject of my former communication, but the tone of A. E. B.'s comments forbids me to proceed with the discussion; the more especially as my suggestion has been made a reason for introducing into your pages comments which seem to me to be altogether unwarrantable upon other portions of the article in Blackwood. Whoever may be the writer of that article—I do not know—he needs no other defence than a reference to his paper. It is not on his account that I venture to allude to this subject; it is rather on yours, Mr. Editor, and with a view to the welfare of your paper. I cannot think that you or it will be benefited by converting conversational gossip about Shakspeare difficulties into "a duel in the form of a debate," seasoned with sarcasm, insinuation, and satiric point. This is not the kind of matter one expects to find in "N. & Q." neither do I think your pages should be made a vehicle for "showing up" such of "the herd of menstrual Aristarchi" as chance to differ in opinion from some of your smart and peremptory, but not unfrequently inaccurate and illiberal correspondents.

I know that you yourself are in this respect much in the power of your contributors. Probably you were as ignorant of the existence of the article in Blackwood as I was.[1] It is now brought before your notice, and I invite you to look at it, and judge for yourself whether A. E. B. has treated you, your paper, or the writer of that very excellent article, with common fairness in the remarks to which I allude.

I make these observations on two grounds: first, as one who has many reasons for being anxious for the prosperity of "N. & Q.;" and secondly, because I know it to be the opinion of several of your earliest and warmest friends, that there is a tendency in some of your Shakspeare contributors to indulge in insinuation, imputation of motives, and many other things which ought never to appear in your pages. We lately observed, with deep regret, that you were misled (not by A. E. B.) into the insertion of unjustifiable insinuations, levelled against a gentleman whom we all know to be a man of the highest personal honour.

[1] We had not seen this very able article until our attention was called to it by this letter. We regret that the author of it was not aware of what had been written in "N. & Q." on many of the points discussed by him. Such knowledge might have modified some of his views.

The questions which are mooted in your pages ought to be discussed with the mutual forbearance and enlarged liberality which are predominant in the general society of our metropolis; not with the keen and angry partizanship which distinguishes the petty squabbles of a country town.

Icon.

Our readers know that we ourselves recently noticed the tendency of too many of our correspondents to depart from the courteous spirit by which the earlier communications to this Journal were distinguished. The intention we then announced of playing the tyrant in future, and exercising with greater freedom our "editorial privilege of omission," we now repeat yet more emphatically. Icon well remarks that we are much in the power of our contributors. Indeed we are more so than even he supposes.

An article on the *Notes and Emendations* which lately appeared in our columns concluded, in its original form, with an argument against their genuineness, based on the use of a word unknown to Shakspeare and his cotemporaries. This appeared to us somewhat extraordinary, and a reference to Richardson's excellent Dictionary proved that our correspondent was altogether wrong *as to his facts*. We of course omitted the passage; but we ought not to have received a statement founded on a mistake which might have been avoided by a single reference to so common a book.

Again, at p. 194. of the present volume, another correspondent, after pointing out some coincidences between the old Emendator and some suggested corrections by Z. Jackson, and stating that Mr. Collier never once refers to Jackson, proceeds: "Mr. Singer, however, talks familiarly about Jackson, in his *Shakspeare Vindicated*, as if he had him at his fingers' ends; and yet, at p. 239., he favours the world with an *original* emendation (viz. 'He did *behood* his anger,' *Timon*, Act III. Sc. 1.), which, however, will be found at page 389. of Jackson's book." Now, after this, who would have supposed that, as we learn from Mr. Singer, "Mr. Ingleby has founded his charge on such slender grounds as one cursory notice of Jackson at p. 288. of my book, where I mentioned him merely on the authority of Mr. Collier." And who that knows Mr. Singer will doubt the truth of his assertion, that he has not even seen Jackson's book for near a quarter of a century, and that he had not the slightest reason to doubt that the conjecture of *behood* for *behave* was his own property?[2]

But there is another gentleman who, although he has never whispered a remonstrance to us upon the subject, has even more grounds of complaint than Mr. Singer, for the treatment which he has received in our columns; we mean our valued friend and contributor Mr. Collier, who we feel has received some injustice in our pages. But the fact is that, holding, as we do unchanged, the opinion which we originally expressed of the great value of the *Notes and Emendations*—knowing Mr. Collier's character to be above suspicion—and believing that the result of all the discussions to which the *Notes and Emendations* have given rise, will eventually be to satisfy the world of their great value,—*we* have not looked so strictly as we ought to have done, and as we shall do in future, to the tone in which they have been discussed in "N. & Q."

And here let us take the opportunity of offering a few suggestions which we think worthy of being borne in mind in all discussions on the text of Shakspeare,

[2] On this point we would call especial attention to Mr. Halliwell's communication on the *Difficulty of avoiding Coincident Suggestions on the Text of Shakspeare*, which will be found in our present Number.

whether the object under consideration be what Shakspeare actually wrote, or what Shakspeare really meant by what he did write.

First, as to this latter point. Some years ago a distinguished scholar, when engaged in translating Göthe's *Faust*, came to a passage involved in considerable obscurity, and which he found was interpreted very differently by different admirers of the poem. Unable, under these circumstances, to procure any satisfactory solution of the poet's meaning, the translator applied to Göthe himself, and received from him the candid reply which we think it far from improbable that Shakspeare himself might give with reference to many passages in his own writings,—"That he was very sorry he could not assist him, but he really did not know exactly what he meant when he wrote it." We doubt not some of our contributors could supply us with many similar avowals.

This opinion will no doubt offend many of those blind worshippers of Shakspeare, who will not believe that he could have written a passage which is not perfect, and who, consequently, will not be satisfied with any note, emendation, or restoration which does not make the passage into which it is introduced "one entire and perfect chrysolite." But this is unreasonable. We have direct evidence of the imperfect character of much that Shakspeare wrote. When told that Shakspeare had never blotted a line, Ben Jonson—no mean critic, and no unfriendly one—wished he had "blotted a thousand." Would rare Ben have uttered such a wish ignorantly and without cause? We believe the existence of such defects in the writings of Shakspeare, as they were left by him. It follows, therefore, that in our opinion Shakspeare is under great obligations to the undeservedly-abused commentators.[3] It would be strange indeed, when we consider how many men of genius and learning have busied themselves to illustrate his writings, if none of them should have caught any inspiration from his genius. We believe they have done so. We believe Theobald's "babbled o' green fields" to be one of many instances in which, with reference to some one particular passage, the scholiast has proved himself worthy of and excelling his author. Yes, Shakspeare, the greatest of all uninspired writers, was but mortal; and his worshippers would sometimes do well bear in mind that their golden image had but feet of clay.

[3] One of the most specious arguments which have been advanced against the genuineness of the *Notes and Emendations* is, that they agree in many instances with readings which had been suggested many years before the discovery of the MS. Notes. Of course it is obvious that, wherever the readings are right, they must do so; and these coincidences serve to satisfy us of the correctness of both.

Notes

MR. PEPYS AND EAST LONDON TOPOGRAPHY, ETC

In "N. & Q." (Vol. i., p. 141.) there appeared an article upon the Isle of Dogs, &c., which spoke of the neglected topography of the east of London, and requested information on one or two points. Having felt much interested in this matter, I have endeavoured to obtain information by personal investigation, and send you the following from among a mass of Notes:—

1. *Isle of Dogs.* In a map drawn up in 1588 by Robert Adams, engraved in 1738, this name is applied to an islet in the river Thames, still in part existing, at the south-west corner of the peninsula. From this spot the name appears to have extended to the entire marsh.

2. *Dick Shore*, Limehouse. This is now called *Duke Shore*, Fore Street. In Gascoyne's Map of Stepney, 1703, it is called *Dick Shoar*. Since that time *Dick* has become a *Duke*. Mr. Pepys would find boats there now if he visited the spot.

3. Mr. Pepys, in his *Diary* of Mar. 23, 1660, speaks of "the great breach," near Limehouse. The spot now forming the entrance to the City Canal or South Dock of the West India Dock Company was called "the breach," when the canal was formed.

4. July 31, 1665. Mr. Pepys speaks of the *Ferry* in the Isle of Dogs. This ferry is named as a horse-ferry by Norden in the *Britanniæ Speculum*, 1592 (MS.). The ferry is still used, but only seldom as a horse-ferry.

5. Oct. 9, 1661. Mr. P. mentions Captain Marshe's, at Limehouse, close by the lime-house. There is still standing there a large old brick house, which may be the same; and the lime-kiln yet exists, for, as Norden says, "ther is a kiln contynually used."

6. Sept. 22, 1665. Mr. P. speaks of a discovery made "in digging the late docke." This discovery consisted of nut trees, nuts, yew, ivy, &c., twelve feet below the surface. Johnson no doubt told him the truth. The same discovery was made in 1789, in digging the Brunswick Dock, also at Blackwall, and elsewhere in the neighbourhood.

This very week (Aug. 25, 1853) I procured specimens of several kinds of wood, with land and freshwater shells, from as great a depth in an excavation at the West India Docks; the wood from a bed of peat, the shells from a bed of clay resting upon it. There exists an ancient house at the dock which Mr. P. visited, and which is probably the same.

Other illustrations of the *Diary* from this quarter might be adduced; let these, however, suffice as a specimen.

It may probably be new to most of your readers, as it is to me, that an ancient house in Blackwall (opposite the Artichoke Tavern) is said to have been the residence of Sebastian Cabot at one time, and at another that of *Sir Walter Raleigh*. Whether the tradition be true or not, the house is very curious, and worth a visit, if not worthy of being sketched and engraved to preserve its memory. Perhaps the photograph in this case could be applied.

It is not impossible that Sir John de Pulteney or Poultney, to whom the manor of Poplar was granted in the 24th of Edward III., resided on this spot. My reasons for thinking it are—this fact, which connects him with the neighbourhood; and the inference from two other facts, viz. that the house in which Sir John resided in town was called *Cold Harbour*, and that *Cold Harbour* is here also to be found. Sir John Pulteney is thus connected with both the places known by this name.

I would give my name in verification, but you have it, as you should have the names and addresses of all your correspondents.

B. H. C.

Poplar.

PICTS' HOUSES IN ABERDEENSHIRE

A short time ago, one of those remarkable remains of a very remote antiquity, and called by the country-people Picts' Houses, Yird, Eirde, or Erde houses, was discovered by Mr. Douglass, farmer, Culsh, in the parish of Tarland, Aberdeenshire, near his farm-steading, on the property of our noble Premier. It is a subterranean vault, of a form approaching the semicircular, but elongated at the farther end. Its extreme length is thirty-eight feet; its breadth at the entrance a little more than two feet, gradually widening towards the middle, where the width is about six feet, and it continues at about that average. The height is from five and a half to six feet. The sides are built with stones, some of them in the bottom very large; the roof is formed of large stones, six or seven feet long, and some of them weighing above a ton and a half. They must have been brought from the neighbouring hill of Saddle-lick, about two miles distant, being of a kind of granite not found nearer the spot. The floor is formed of the native rock (hornblende), and is very uneven. When discovered it was full of earth, and in the process of excavation there was found some wood ashes, fragments of a glass bottle, and an earthenware jar (modern), some small fragments of bones, and one or two teeth of a ruminant animal, and the upper stone of a querne (hand-corn-mill, mica schist), together with a small fragment, probably of the lower stone. But, alas! there were no hieroglyphics or cuneiform inscriptions to assist the antiquary in his researches. These underground excavations have been found in various parishes in Aberdeenshire, as well as in several of the neighbouring counties. In the parish of Old Deer, about fifty years ago, a whole village of them was come upon; and about the same time, in a den at the back of Stirlinghill, in the parish of Peterhead, one was discovered which contained some fragments of bones and several flint arrow-heads, and battle-axes in the various stages of manufacture. In no case, however, have any of those previously discovered been of the same magnitude as the one described above. They were generally of from twelve to fifteen feet in length, and from three to four feet in height, and some only six feet in length, so that this must have been in its day (when?) a rather aristocratic affair. Have any similar excavations been found in England? The earliest mention of the parish of Tarland, of which there is any account, is in a charter granted by Moregun, Earl of Mar, to the Canons of St. Andrews, of the Church of S. Machulnoche (S. Mochtens, Bishop and Confessor) of Tharuclund, with its tithes and oblations, its land and mill, and timber from the Earl's woods for the buildings of the canons, A.D. 1165-71; and a charter of King William the Lion, and one of Eadward, Bishop of Aberdeen, both of same date, confirming the said grant.

Abredonensis.

FOLK LORE

Legends of the County Clare.—How Fuen-Vic-Couil (Fingall) obtained the knowledge of future events.—Once upon a time, when Fuen-Vic-Couil was young, he fell into the hands of a giant, and was compelled to serve him for seven years, during which time the giant was fishing for the salmon which had this property—that whoever ate the first bit of it he would obtain the gift of prophecy; and during the seven years the only nourishment which the giant could take was after this manner: a sheaf of oats was placed to windward of him, and he held a needle before his mouth, and lived on the nourishment that was blown from the sheaf of corn through the eye of the needle. At length, when the seven years were passed, the giant's perseverance was rewarded, and he caught the famous salmon and gave it to Fuen-Vic-Couil to roast, with threats of instant destruction if he allowed any accident to happen to it. Fuen-Vic-Couil hung the fish before the fire by a string, but, like Alfred in a similar situation, being too much occupied with his own reflections, forgot to turn the fish, so that a blister rose on the side of it. Terrified at the probable consequences of his carelessness, he attempted to press down the blister with his thumb, and feeling the smart caused by the burning fish, by a natural action put the injured member into his mouth. A morsel of the fish adhered to his thumb, and immediately he received the knowledge for which the giant had toiled so long in vain. Knowing that his master would kill him if he remained, he fled, and was soon pursued by the giant breathing vengeance: the chace was long, but whenever he was in danger of being caught, his thumb used to pain him, and on putting it to his mouth he always obtained knowledge how to escape, until at last he succeeded in putting out the giant's eyes and killing him; and always afterwards, when in difficulty or danger, his thumb used to pain him, and on putting it to his mouth he obtained knowledge how to escape.

Compare this legend with the legend of Ceridwen, Hanes Taliessin, *Mabinogion*, vol. iii. pp. 322, 323., the coincidence of which is very curious. Where also did Shakspeare get the speech he makes one of the witches utter in *Macbeth*:

> "By the *pricking of my thumbs*,
> Something wicked this way comes."

Francis Robert Davies.

Devonshire Cures for the Thrush.—"Take three rushes from any running stream, and pass them separately through the mouth of the infant: then plunge the rushes again into the stream, and as the current bears them away, so will the thrush depart from the child."

Should this, as is not unlikely, prove ineffectual, "Capture the nearest duck that can be met with, and place its mouth, wide open, within the mouth of the sufferer. The cold breath of the duck will be inhaled by the child, and the disease will gradually, and as I have been informed, not the less surely, take its departure."

T. Hughes.

Chester.

HERALDIC NOTES

Arms of Granville.—The meaning of the peculiar bearing which, since the thirteenth century, has appertained to this noble family, has always been a matter of uncertainty to heraldic writers: it has been variously blazoned as a clarion, clavicord, organ-rest, lance-rest, and sufflue. The majority of heralds, ancient and modern, term it a clarion without quite defining what a clarion is: that it is meant for a musical instrument (probably a kind of hand-organ), I have very little doubt; for, in the woodcut Mrs. Jameson gives in her *Legends of the Madonna* (p. 19.) of Piero Laurati's painting of the "Maria Coronata," the uppermost angel on the left is represented as carrying an instrument exactly similar to this charge as it is usually drawn. The date of this painting is 1340. This is probably about the date of the painted glass window in the choir of Tewkesbury Abbey Church, where Robert Earl of Gloucester bears three of these clarions on his surcoat; and upon a careful examination of these, I was convinced that they were intended to represent instruments similar to that carried by the angel in Laurati's painting.

Arms of Richard, King of the Romans.—This celebrated man, the second son of King John, Earl of Cornwall and Poictou, was elected King of the Romans at Frankfort on St. Hilary's Day (Jan. 13th) 1256. His earldom of Cornwall was represented by—Argent, a lion rampant gules crowned or; his earldom of Poictou by a bordure sable, bezantée, or rather of peas (*poix*) in reference to the name *Poictou*; and as king of the Romans he is said to have borne these arms upon the breast of the German double-headed eagle displayed sable, which represented that dignity. I do not recollect having seen them under this last form, but I have "made a Note of" several other variations I have met with:—

1. In Dorchester Church, Oxfordshire, in painted glass: Argent, a lion rampant, gules crowned or, within a bordure sable bezantée.

2. On the seal of a charter granted by the earl to the monks of Okeburry: a lion rampant crowned. No bordure.

3. On an encaustic tile in the old Singing-school at Worcester: A lion rampant *not* crowned, with a bordure bezantée. Another tile has the eagle, single-headed, displayed.

4. Encaustic tiles at Woodperry, Oxfordshire: A row of tiles with the lion rampant, apparently within a bordure, but without the bezants; followed by another row which has the eagle displayed, but not double-headed.

5. On an encaustic tile at Hailes Abbey, Gloucestershire, founded by him: The double-headed eagle only, *countercharged*.

6. On a tile in the Priory Church of Great Malvern: The double-headed eagle displayed, within a circular bordure bezantée.

7. On a tile which I have seen, but cannot just now recollect where: The double-headed eagle, bezantée, without any bordure.

A curious instance of ex-officio arms added to the paternal coat, occurs on the monument of Dr. Samuel Blythe, at the east end of St. Edward's Church, Cambridge. He was Master of Clare Hall, and in this example his paternal arms—Argent, a chevron gules, between three lions rampant sable—occupy the lower part of the shield, being divided at the fess point by something like an inverted chevron, from the arms of Clare Hall, which thus occupy the upper half of the shield. The date is 1713. Is this way of dividing the arms a blunder of the painter's, or can any of your readers point out a similar instance?

Norris Deck.

SHAKSPEARE CORRESPONDENCE

Difficulty of avoiding Coincident Suggestions on the Text of Shakspeare.—A correspondent in Vol. viii., p. 193., is somewhat unnecessarily severe on Mr. Collier and Mr. Singer, for having overlooked some suggestions in Jackson's work: the enormous number of useless conjectures in that publication rendering it so tedious and unprofitable to consider them attentively, the student is apt to think his time better engaged in investigating other sources of information. I think, therefore, little of Mr. Collier overlooking the few coincident suggestions in Jackson, which are smaller in number than I had anticipated; the real cause for wonder consisting in the ignoring so many conjectures that have been treated of years ago, often at great length, by some of the most distinguished critics this country has produced. Generally speaking, however, there is in these matters such a tendency for reproduction, I should for one hesitate to accuse any critic of intentional unfairness, merely because he puts forth conjectures as new, when they have been previously published; and I have found so many of my own attempts at emendation, thought to be original, in other sources, that I now hesitate at introducing any as novel. These attempts, like most others, have only resulted occasionally in one that will bear the test of examination after it has been placed aside, and carefully considered when the impression of novelty has worn off. I think we may safely appeal to all critics who occupy themselves much with conjectural criticism, and ask them if Time does not frequently impair the complacency with which they regard their efforts on their first production.

Vol. viii., p. 216., contains more instances of coincident suggestions, R. H. C. indulging in two conjectures, both supported very ably, but in the perfect unconsciousness that the first, *rude day's*, was long since mentioned by Mr. Dyce, in his *Remarks*, 1844, p. 172., and that the second, the change of punctuation in *All's Well that Ends Well*, is the reading adopted by Theobald, and it is also introduced by Mr. Knight in the text of his "National Edition," p 262., and has, I believe, been mentioned elsewhere. It may be said that this kind of repetition might be obviated by the publication of the various readings that have been suggested in the text of Shakspeare, but who is there to be found Quixotic enough to undertake so large and thankless a task, one which at best can only be most imperfectly executed: the materials being so scattered, and often so worthless, the compiler would, I imagine, abandon the design before he had made great progress in it. No fair comparison can be entertained in this respect between the text of Shakspeare and the texts of the classic authors. What has happened to R. H. C., happens, as I am about to show, to all who indulge in conjectural criticism.

Any reader who will take a quantity of disputed passages in Shakspeare, and happens to be ignorant of what has been suggested by others, will discover that, in most of the cases, if he merely tries his skill on a few simple permutations of the letters, he will in one way or another stumble on the suggested words. Let us take, for example, what may be considered in its way as one of the most incomprehensible lines in Shakspeare—"Will you go, *An-heires*?" the last word being printed with a capital. Running down with the vowels from *a*, we get at once an apparently plausible suggestion, "Will you go *on here*?" but a little consideration will show how extremely unlikely this is to be the genuine reading, and that Mr. Dyce is correct in preferring *Mynheers*—a suggestion which belongs to Theobald, and not, as he mentions, to Hanmer. But what I maintain is, that *on here* would be the correction that would occur to most readers, in all probability to be at once dismissed. Mr. Collier, however, says "it is singular that nobody seems ever to have conjectured that *on here* might be concealed under *An-heires*;" and it would have been singular had this been the case, but the suggestion of *on here* is to be found in Theobald's common edition. Oddly enough, about a year before Mr. Collier's volume appeared, it was again suggested as if it were new.

Let us select a still more palpable instance (*Measure for Measure*, Act II. Sc. 1.): "If this law hold in Vienna ten years, I'll rent the fairest house in it after threepence a *bay*." If this reading be wrong, which I do not admit, the second change in the first letter creates an obvious alteration, *day*,

making at least some sort of sense, if not the correct one. Some years ago, I was rash enough to suggest *day*, not then observing the alteration was to be found in Pope's edition, and Mr. Collier has fallen into the same oversight, when he gives it as one of the corrector's new emendations. I regard these oversights as very pardonable, and inseparable from any extensive attempt to correct the state of the text. All Shakspearian conjectures either anticipate or are anticipated.

Mr. Dyce being *par excellence* the most judicious verbal critic of the day, it will scarcely be thought egotistical to claim for myself the priority for one of his emendations—"*Avoid thee*, friend," in the *Few Notes*, p. 31., a reading I had mentioned in print before the appearance of that work. This is merely one of the many evidences that all verbal conjecturers must often stumble on the same suggestions. Even the MS. corrector's alteration of the passage is not new, it being found in Pope's and in several other editions of the last century; another circumstance that exhibits the great difficulty and danger of asserting a conjecture to be absolutely unknown.

J. O. Halliwell

P.S. The subject is, of course, capable of almost indefinite extension, but the above hasty notes will probably occupy as much space as you would be willing to spare for its consideration.

Alcides' Shoes.—There is merit, in my opinion, in elucidating, if it were only a single word in our great dramatist. Even the attempt, though mayhap a failure, is laudable. I therefore have made, and shall make, hit or miss, some efforts that way. For example, I now grapple with that very odd line—

> "As great Alcides' shoes upon an ass."—*King John*, Act II. Sc. 1.

out of which no one has as yet extracted, or I think ever will extract, any good meaning: *Argal*, it is corrupt. Now it appears to me that the critic who proposed to read *shows*, came very near the truth, and would have hit it completely if he had retained *Alcides'*, for it is the genitive with *robe* understood. To explain:

Austria has on him the "skin-coat" of Cœur-de-Lion, and Blanch cries,—

> "O! well did he become that lion's robe,
> That did disrobe the lion of that robe."

"It lies," observes the Bastard,

> "It lies as sightly on the back of him (*Austria*)
> As great Alcides' (*robe*) shows upon an ass:—
> But, ass, I'll take that burden from your back," &c.

Were it not that *doth* is the usual word in this play, I might be tempted to read *does*. In reading or acting, then, the *cæsura* should be made at *Alcides'*, with a slight pause to give the hearer time to supply *robe*. I need not say that the robe is the lion's skin, and that there is an allusion to the fable of the ass.

Now to justify this reading. Our ancestors knew nothing of our mode of making genitives by turned commas. They formed the gen. sing., and nom. and gen. pl., by simply adding *s* to the nom. sing.; thus king made *kings*, *kings*, *kings* (not *king's*, *kings*, *kings'*), and the context gave the case. If the noun ended in *se*, *ce*, *she*, or *che*, the addition of *s* added a syllable, as *horses*, *princes*, &c., but it was not always added. Shakspeare, for example, uses *Lucrece* and *cockatrice* as genitives. I find the first instances of such words as *James's*, &c., about the middle of the seventeenth century, but I am not deeply read in old books, so it may have been used earlier.

In foreign words like *Alcides*, no change ever took place; it was the same for all numbers and cases, and the explanation was left to the context. Here are a couple of examples from Shakspeare himself:

> "My fortunes every way as fairly ranked—
> If not with vantage—as Demetrius."
>
> —*Midsummer Night's Dream, Act I. Sc. 1.*

> "To Brutus, to Cassius. Burn all. Some to Decius house, and some to Cascas; some to Ligarius. Away! go!"—*Julius Cæsar*, Act III. Sc. 3.

All here are genitives, as well as *Cascas*. If any doubt, Brutus and Cassius, we have just been told, "Are rid like madmen through the gates of Rome," so *they*

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.