

CRITICAL NOTES.

ACT I., SCENE I.

Page 38. *The Heavens continue their love!*—The original has *Loves* instead of *love*. The latter is shown to be right by the next speech: "I think there is not in the world either malice or matter to alter *it*."

ACT I., SCENE 2.

P. 40. *I'm question'd by my fear of what may chance
Or breed upon our absence: may there blow
No sneaping winds at home, to make us say,*

This is put forth too truly!—In the first of these lines, the original has *fears* instead of *fear*, and, in the second, *that may* instead of *may there*. The latter is Warburton's reading, as it is also that of Collier's second folio. I do not see how the last clause can be understood otherwise than as referring to *fear*; so that either the antecedent ought evidently to be in the singular, or else we ought to read *These are* instead of *This is*. The passage has troubled the editors a good deal, and various other changes have been made or proposed.

P. 41. *I'll give you my commission,*

To let him there a month behind the gest, &c.—So Hamner. The original has "I'll give *him* my commission." Mr. Joseph Crosby sustains the old reading, as in accordance with the usage of the North of England. His comment at least throws light on the question: "Of the two directly opposite meanings of the word *let*, viz., to *detain* or *hinder*, and to *allow* or *permit*, the latter is, I believe, the only meaning used in the North. 'I'll *let* you do so and so,' is an every-day idiom for 'you have my permission to do so and so.' I have heard a

thousand times such expressions as these: 'I'll let my boy at school another year'; that is, 'I'll let him *remain*,' &c.: 'John is making a good job, and I think I had better *let him* at it awhile longer.' In the present instance, 'I'll give him my commission, to let him there a month behind the *gest*,' &c., a Westmoreland Hermione would be instantly recognized as meaning to say, 'I'll give *him* [his Majesty my husband] my permit to stay or remain at your Court a month after the day named on the royal scroll for his departure.'

P. 41. *I love thee not a jar o' the clock behind*

What lady e'er her lord. — The old text reads "What lady *she* her lord." The word *she* seems very odd here; editors have naturally questioned it; and some read "What lady *should* her lord"; adopting a change written in the margin of Lord Ellesmere's copy of the first folio. The abbreviation of *should* might indeed be easily misprinted *she*; but I think *should* misses the right sense. Not how any lady *ought* to love, but how any lady *does* love, her husband, seems to be the speaker's thought. See foot-note 7.

P. 43.

We knew not

*The doctrine of ill-doing, no, nor dream'd
That any did.* — So the second folio. The first lacks *no*.

P. 43. *God's grace to boot!* — So Walker. The original omits *God's*. See note on "God save his Majesty," *The Tempest*, page 157.

P. 44.

You may ride's

*With one soft kiss a thousand furlongs, ere
With spur we heat an acre.* — I at one time thought we ought to read, with Collier's second folio, "*we clear an acre.*" But further consideration and the judicious help of Mr. Joseph Crosby have convinced me that the old text is right. See foot-note II.

P. 45. *From heartiness, from bounty's fertile bosom.* — So Hammer and Collier's second folio. The old text, "from *Bountie, fertile Bosome.*"

P. 47. *Affection, thy intention stabs the centre!*

*Thou dost make possible, things not so held;
Communicatest with dreams, — how can this be? —*

*With what's unreal thou coactive art,
And fellow'st nothing: then 'tis very credent
Thou mayst cojoin with something; and thou dost,
And that beyond commission, (as I find it.)*

Ay, even to the infection of my brains

And hardening of my brows. — It would be something strange

if a transcriber or compositor or proof-reader found his way rightly through such a tangled puzzle, or rather bramble-bush, as we have here. Accordingly, the original has, in the seventh line, "*and I find it*," and, in the eighth, "*And that* to the infection." I have little doubt that, amidst so many *ands*, that word got repeated out of place in the seventh line, and that, in the eighth, *And that* crept in, for the same cause, from the line before. In other respects, I give the nine lines, *verbatim*, just as they stand in the original: the punctuation is there so disordered, that no one now thinks of adhering to it.

The commentators differ widely in their interpretation of this hard passage. In fact, the passage has been a standing poser to editors from Rowe downwards: to Rowe it was so much so, that he boldly changed the first line to "*Imagination, thou dost stab to centre.*" And some others understand *affection* as equivalent to *imagination*: but I more than doubt whether the word ever bears that sense in Shakespeare; though he certainly uses it with considerable latitude, not to say looseness, of meaning. I reproduce what seem to me the two best explanations I have met with:

"In this place, *affection* seems to be taken in its usual acceptance, and means the passion of love, which, from its possessing the powers which Leontes here describes, is often called in Shakespeare by the name of *Fancy*. Leontes addresses part of this speech to his son; but his wife and Polixenes, who are supposed to be in sight, are the principal objects of his attention; and, as he utters it in the utmost perturbation of mind, we are not to expect from him a connected discourse, but a kind of rhapsody, interrupted by frequent breaks and starts of passion; as thus: 'Sweet villain! — Most dearest! — My collop! — Can thy dam? — May it be?' In answer to this last question, *may it be?* and to show the possibility of Hermione's falsehood, he begins to descant upon the power of love; but has no sooner pronounced the word *affection* than, casting his eyes on Hermione, he says to her, rather of her, in a low voice, 'thy intention stabs the centre!'

And if we suppose that in speaking these words the actor strikes his breast, it would be a further explanation of his meaning. After that, he proceeds again in his argument for a line and a half, when we have another break, *How can this be?* He then proceeds with more connection, and says, 'If love can be coactive with what is unreal, and have communication with non-entities, it is probable that it may cojoin with something real in the case of Hermione'; and, having proved it possible, he concludes that it certainly must be so. The words *beyond commission* allude to the commission he had given Hermione to prevail on Polixenes to defer his departure. This is the light in which this passage strikes me; but I am by no means confident that my idea of it is just. — *Intention* in this passage means eagerness of attention, or of desire; and is used in the same sense as in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, where Falstaff says, 'She did course over my exteriors with such a greedy *intention*, that the appetite of her eye did seem to scorch me up like a burning-glass.' — MASON.

"*Affection* here means *sympathy*. *Intention* is *intensesness*. The *centre* is the solid globe conceived as the centre of the Universe. The allusion is to the powers ascribed to sympathy between the human system and all Nature, however remote or occult. Hence Leontes, like Othello, finds in his very agitation a proof that it corresponds not with a fancy but a reality. And that *beyond commission*, that is, it is very credent that sympathy shall betray a crime to the injured person, not only at the time of commission, but even after, — beyond the time of commission." — SINGER.

I should be not unwilling to accept this explanation, if I could see how to reconcile it with the latter part of the passage in question. Here I cannot but think that Leontes refers to something, not as acting in his own mind, and revealing to him what others have done in secret, but as acting in the person of his wife, and impelling her to crime, or causing her to do that which makes him "a horned monster." Nor can I understand the words *beyond commission* as having any reference to time. It seems to me that *commission* bears the same sense here as a little before, "I give you my *commission* to let him there a month," &c.; that is, *authority* or *permission*: beyond what is *allowed* or *warranted* by the bond of wedlock. So that the meaning, as I take it, is, that this something, whatever it may be, which holds intercourse with dreams, and co-operates with things that are not, has

so infected Hermione, as to make her transcend the lawful freedom of a wife, or pass beyond the limits prescribed by her marriage-vows. See foot-notes 21 and 23.

But perhaps the most indigestible part of my explanation lies in the meaning attached to *centre*. Yet I do not see how the word can well bear any other sense here than it does in the next scene, where, in accordance with the old astronomy, it clearly means the Earth: "If I mistake in those foundations which I build upon, the *centre* is not big enough to bear a schoolboy's top." So, again, in *Troilus and Cressida*, i. 3: "The heavens themselves, the planets, and this *centre*, observe degree, priority, and place," &c. Also in *Hamlet*, ii. 2: "I will find where truth is hid, though it were hid indeed within the *centre*."

Perhaps, after all, the passage in hand was not meant to be very intelligible; and so it may be an apt instance of a man losing his wits in a rapture of jealousy. For how can a man be expected to discourse in orderly sort, when his mind is thus all in a spasm?

Since writing the above, I have received the following well-considered note from Mr. Joseph Crosby:

"The King, already by nature predisposed to jealousy, while talking to his boy, sees the purely-gracious courtesies of Hermione towards her guest; and his abrupt interrogatories, 'Can thy dam? — May't be?' show the course his thoughts are leading him. Here the hiatus after his fragmentary musings is easily supplied; but his mind seeks some reconciling cause, — some motive-agent, — to account for the dreadful suspicion. He grasps it in the thought of that all-pervading carnal propensity which we name *lust*. The whole of the rest of the passage, commencing, 'Affection,' &c., is simply an apostrophe to the *intencion* of that cause. *Affection* may be defined as a term for any passion that violently *affects* the mind: and what more common or powerful passion is there than this of concupiscence or lust? It 'stabs the centre'; it pervades the whole globe; kings and queens, no less than peasants, are its subjects: 'tis powerful, think it, from east, west, north, and south': all barriers to its gratification it sweeps away, making possible, things not so held.' Nay, more; its potency is such, that even in sleep we are not exempt from its tyranny: it 'communicates with dreams,' though 'how this can be' is unaccountable: but, if it can 'coact with the unreal,' and 'fellow nothing,' then, *a fortiori*, 'tis very credent it may cojoin with something,' — some

sympathetic touch, some living, responsive object. He has now found his clew to the situation, and suspicion fast becomes conviction. He has built a logical bridge of what he deems a sufficiently reasonable strength, and rushes over it to certainty. It may be, — it is, — ‘THOU DOST!’—The soliloquy is admirably characteristic of the speaker’s agitation of mind; full of starts, abrupt turns, imperfectly-expressed sentences, incoherent ideas, one huddled upon another; and this style marks all the speeches of Leontes in the early part of the play, and indeed all through it.”

P. 48. Polix.

Ho, my lord!

What cheer? how is't with you, best brother?

Herm.

You look

As if you held a brow of much distraction:

Are you not moved, my lord?—In the first of these lines, the original reads “How? my lord?” *Ho!* is there often spelt *how*, and the relative position of the persons shows it should be *ho!* here; for Leontes is evidently standing apart from Polixenes and Hermione. Corrected by Dyce.—In the second line, also, the words “What cheer? how is't with you, best brother?” are assigned to Leontes in the old text. Corrected by Hanmer.—In the last line, the original lacks *not*, which is fairly required both for sense and for metre. Hanmer reads as in the text; Theobald, “Are not you moved?”

P. 48.

Looking on the lines

Of my boy's face, methought I did recoil

Twenty-three years.—In the original, “*me thoughts* I did recoil.” This has been changed by some to “*my thoughts* I did recoil”; which, I suspect, is hardly English. In the fifth line after, the original has *me thought*; and in *Richard III.*, i. 4, the first folio has “*Me thoughts* that I had broken from the Tower”; and also, “*Me thoughts* I saw a thousand fearful wrackes,” &c.

P. 49. He makes a July's day short as December's.—The old text reads “short as *December*.” This, it seems to me, is hardly an English expression of the thought.

P. 50. I am like you, they say.—So the second folio. The first omits *they*.

P. 53.

For cogitation

Resides not in that man that does not think't.—The original has “that does not *thinke*,” and some copies of the second folio, “*think it*.”

P. 53. My wife's a hobby-horse.—In the original, “a *Holy Horse*.” Corrected by Rowe.

P. 53. Hours, minutes? noon, midnight? and all eyes else
Blind with the pin-and-web.—So Walker. The original lacks *else*, and so leaves the verse maimed.

P. 54. Why, he that wears her like a medal hanging

About his neck.—So Collier's second folio. The original has “like *her* Medull,” *her* being repeated by mistake.

P. 55. How I am gall'd,—thou mightst bespice a cup.—So the second folio. The first omits *thou*, which is needful alike to sense and verse.

P. 57. So leaves me to consider. What is breeding,
That changes thus his manners?

Cam. *I dare not know, my lord.*—The original prints “leaves me, to consider what is breeding,” &c. And so most of the recent editors give the passage. But does not Camillo's reply fairly suppose the clause after *consider* to be interrogative? And where is the objection to taking *consider* as used absolutely, or without an object expressed?

P. 59. As he had seen't, or been an instrument

To vice you to't.—Instead of *vice*, it has been proposed to print *'tice*, meaning *entice*, which, it seems to me, is something too tame for the occasion. Dyce, however, adopts that reading. See footnote 56.

P. 60.

Swear this thought over

By each particular star in heaven.—The original reads “Swear *his* thought over.” Various changes have been proposed; but the substitution of *this* for *his* is much the simplest; and I fail to

appreciate the objections to it. Lettsom proposes "Swear *this oath over*"; which would give the same sense, with, I think, not much improvement in the language.

P. 61. *My people did expect my hence-departure*

Two days ago. This jealousy of his

Is for a precious creature.—So Walker. The original lacks *of his*. The words thus added complete the verse naturally; and we have many such omissions in the old copies: some occurring in the folio are corrected from the quartos, in the case of plays that were printed in that form, and *vice versa*.

P. 61. *Good expedition be my friend, and nothing*

The gracious Queen, part of his theme, discomfort

Of his ill-ta'en suspicion.—Most of the later editors have, perhaps justly, given this passage up as incurably corrupt. Instead of *nothing*, in the first line, the original has *comfort*; and *but nothing* instead of *discomfort* in the second line. With that reading, it may, I think, be safely said that neither sense nor English can possibly be made out of the passage. Hanmer prints "Good expedition be my friend! *Heaven comfort*," &c.; and Collier's second folio substitutes *dream* for *theme*; neither of which changes yields any relief. Many explanations also of the old text have been offered; but all to no purpose except that of proving it to be inexplicable. It is true, as Walker notes, that in one or two places the Poet uses *nothing of* simply as a strong negative, equivalent to *not at all*; but neither does that fact help the present difficulty. I have ventured to try a reading not hitherto proposed, so far as I am aware. This reading, it will be seen, makes no *literal* change except that of *but* into *dis*; while it supposes *comfort* and *nothing* to have crept each into the other's place; perhaps by mistake, perhaps by sophistication. The text as here given, I think, both yields a fitting sense, and is tolerable English; though, I confess, at the expense of one rather harsh inversion; yet not harsher, I believe, than some others in Shakespeare. See foot-note 59.

ACT II., SCENE I.

P. 64. *All's true that I mistrusted.*—Lettsom's correction. The old text reads "that *is* mistrusted."

P. 65. *More, she's a traitor, and Camillo is*

A fedary with her.—The original has *Federarie*, which is probably a misprint for *Fedarie*. At all events, it labours under the twofold difficulty of overfilling the verse and of not being English. The Poet has *fedary* in two other places.

P. 66.

No, no; if I mistake

In those foundations which I build upon, &c.—The second *no* is wanting in the old text. Lettsom's correction.

P. 67.

I'll keep my stable where

I lodge my wife; I'll go in couples with her, &c.—The original has *stables* instead of *stable*. But Dr. C. M. Ingleby, in his *Shakespeare Hermeneutics*, shows that *keeping one's stable* was a sort of proverbial phrase, having a peculiar meaning; and it appears from his quotations that the singular was always used for conveying that sense. Thus he quotes from Greene's *James the Fourth*: "A young stripling, that can wait in a gentlewoman's chamber when his master is a mile off, keep his *stable* when it is empty, and his purse when it is full." Here there is an equivoque on *stable*, one sense being the same as that in the text, the other that of a lodging for horses. See foot-note 14.

P. 68.

Would I knew the villain,

I would lant-dam him.—The original has "I would *Land-damne* him." No other instance of *land-damn* has been found, nor can anybody tell what it means. Collier's second folio substitutes *lamback*, which means *beat*,—a sense not strong enough for the place. *Lant-damm*, as the word would have been written, might easily be misprinted *land-damne*. Walker proposed *live-damn*, with the explanation, "I would damn him alive,—inflict the torments of Hell upon him while yet living." I was at one time minded to adopt this reading, and should probably have done so, had I not received the following from Mr. Joseph Crosby: "I have long been convinced that Hanmer's explanation of *land-damn*, in *The Winter's Tale*, ii. 1, was right. *Lant* is a common Lancashire provincialism for *urine*, to this day. All the glossaries and dictionaries, new and old, give this word as pure Saxon, although they mostly mark it *obsolete*. Coles gives "*Lant, urina*"; and both Coles and Skinner define 'to *lant, urinâ miscere*.' I have

myself seen, among the farmers, what they call a 'lant-trough'; a large stone trough, into which they empty the contents of the 'chambers'; as they use it to sprinkle, along with quick lime, over certain grain-seeds, before they sow them, to make them sprout the sooner, I suppose. It was also written *land* and *hland*. The word in question, then, if spelt *land-damm*, clearly means 'stop the urine,' dam or shut it off; which unquestionably in this case was to be done by *mutilation*. Antigonus, all through this passage, speaks in the most passionate manner; and it requires some such sense as this to be attached to the climax *land-damm*, to keep up his consistency." Then, after quoting the many changes of the text which have been proposed, the writer closes thus: "The whole context of unclean metaphors plainly requires *land-dam*, or, still better, *lant-dam*, (*lant* being the form of more common usage,) meaning to stop his water, and of course his life, by the horrible punishment of mutilation."

P. 69. *But I do see't and feel't,
As you feel doing this, and see withal*

The instruments that you feel.—The old text has *thus* instead of *this* in the second of these lines, and omits *you* in the third. Lettson proposed *this*, and *you* is clearly needful to the sense. Heath thought we ought to read "The instruments of that *you* feel."

P. 70. *Which if you—or stupefied,
Or seeming so in skill—cannot or will not
Relish as truth, like us, &c.*—The original has "Relish a truth." But is it, or was it ever, English to say "*which* if you cannot relish a truth?" The reading in the text is Rowe's.

P. 70. *Whose spiritual counsel had,
Shall stop or spur me on. Have I done well?*—So Hammer. The old text lacks *on*.

ACT II., SCENE 3.

P. 77. *And, I beseech you, hear me, who profess
Myself your loyal servant, your physician,
Your most obedient counsellor; yet that dare
Less appear so, &c.*—Instead of *profess* and *dare*, the old text has *professes* and *dares*. Corrected by Rowe.

P. 79. *Nay, the valleys,
The pretty dimples of's chin and cheek; &c.*—The original has *Valley* instead of *valleys*. Corrected by Hammer.

P. 81. *The bastard's brains with these my proper hands
Will I dash out.*—The old text has *bastard-brains*. Lettson proposed the change.

P. 81. *We've always truly served you; and beseech you
So to esteem of us.*—The original lacks the second *you*.

ACT III., SCENE 2.

P. 85. *This session—to our great grief, we pronounce—
Even pushes 'gainst our heart.*—In the original, "This *Sessions*." In the last speech of the preceding Act, we have "Summon a *session*."

P. 85. Crier. *Silence!*—In the original "Silence" is printed in Italic type, and without the prefix, as if it were a stage-direction. But it was customary to command silence in such cases, and it belonged to the public Crier to pronounce the order.

P. 87. *With what encounter so uncurrent I
Have strain'd t' appear thus.*—Collier's second folio substitutes *stray'd* for *strain'd*. The words, "if one jot beyond the bound of honour," certainly speak somewhat in favour of this change. But Shakespeare repeatedly uses the substantive *strain* in a way that strongly supports the old text. See foot-note 5.

P. 88. Leon. *You will not own it.
Herm. More than mistress of
Which comes to me in name of fault, I must not
At all acknowledge.*—Here "More than *mistress of*" seems to me a very strange expression. I greatly suspect we ought to read "More than *my distress*, Which," &c.; and so I believe some one has proposed to read.

P. 89. *As you were past all shame, —*
Those of your fact are so, — so past all truth. — Some difficulty has been felt about *fact* here. Farmer proposed to substitute *sect*, and so Walker would read. But I do not well understand the grounds of their objection to *fact*. The word seems to me legitimate and apt enough. "Those of your *fact*" means, of course, those guilty of your *deed*, or of such deeds as yours. This use of the word has long been familiar to me.

P. 89. *Thy brat hath been cast out, left to itself,*
No father owning it. — The old text has *like* instead of *left*. But what can be the meaning of "*like* to itself" here? I can make nothing of it; whereas "*left* to itself" expresses the actual fact rightly. The correction is Keightley's.

P. 89. *The innocent milk in its most innocent mouth.* — Here, instead of *its*, the original has *it* used possessively. So, again, near the close of the preceding Act: "And that there thou leave it to *it* own protection." The same thing occurs sometimes in other plays; as in *Hamlet*, i. 2: "It lifted up *it* head." Also in *King Lear*, i. 4: "The hedge-sparrow fed the cuckoo so long, that it had *it* head bit off by *it* young." This is perhaps a mark-worthy relic of old usage in regard to that word. I have more than once observed in foot-notes, that in Shakespeare's time *its* was not an accepted word, and that *his* or *her* was commonly used instead. The original edition of the English Bible does not use *its* at all; though in a few places we find *it* used possessively, which is changed to *its* in modern editions, and rightly, no doubt. It is true that *its* occurs several times in the original text of this play, for the word was then creeping into use; but the instances quoted above of *it* used possessively look as if the Poet had some scruples about using *its*. White and Staunton stick to the old printing in this point; which, it seems to me, is pushing conservatism one letter too far.

P. 90. *But yet hear this; mistake me not: My life,*
I prize it not a straw. — Instead of "*My life*," the old text has "*no Life*." The passage is sometimes printed "*No! life*, I prize it not," &c. Dyce prints "*for life*," &c. The reading in the text is White's.

P. 92. *Quit his fortunes here*
Which you knew great; and to the certain hazard
Of all uncertainties himself commended. — So the second folio. The first omits *certain*. See foot-note 13.

P. 93. *What wheels, racks, fires? what flaying, or what boiling*
In lead or oil? — The original has "what flaying? boyling? In Leads, or Oyles?" To complete the measure in the first line, the second folio added *burning*, and Capell printed "what flaying, rather?" Walker proposes "what flaying, *tearing*, boiling," &c. But the insertion of *or what* is the simplest remedy; and so Dyce gives it. "In *lead or oil*" is Walker's correction.

P. 95. *Do not revive affliction:*
At my petition, I beseech you, rather
Let me be punish'd, &c. — This passage has raised a deal of controversy. In the original it stands thus: "Do not *receive* affliction At my petition; I beseech you, rather," &c. For "*At my petition*" Collier's second folio substitutes "*At repetition*," and Lettsom proposes *By repetition*. But it seems to me that the simplest way out of the difficulty is by slightly changing the punctuation. The change of *receive* into *revive* is Staunton's; and it seems to me unquestionably right. See foot-note 18.

P. 95. *Unto these sorrows.* — So Walker. The original has "*To these sorrows.*"

ACT III, SCENE 3.

P. 96. *I never saw a vessel of like sorrow,*
So fill'd and so o'er-running. — So Collier's second folio. The original has "So fill'd, and so *becomming*." White explains *becomming* as meaning *decent*; Staunton, *self-restrained*; Singer, *dignified*. White denounces *o'er-running* as "ridiculous," Staunton as "ludicrous"; whereupon Lettsom comments as follows: "According to Johnson, *to over-run* is to be more than full. Surely 'a vessel filled and over-running' is a rather better expression than 'a vessel filled and dignified,' or 'a vessel filled and self-restrained.' Or, if we suppose that here, as elsewhere, Shakespeare has intermingled the comparison and

the thing compared, and that *filled* relates to *vessel*, and *becoming* to *Hermione*, how can this adjective be applied to a person? *A becoming bonnet, colour, or attitude*, I can understand; but what can be said of a *becoming young lady, or a becoming queen?*

P. 97. *There wend and leave it crying.*—So Collier's second folio. The original has *weepe* instead of *wend*.

P. 98. *I would there were no age between sixteen and three-and-twenty.*—Instead of *sixteen*, the old text has *ten*, which surely cannot be right. Hanmer substituted *thirteen*; the Cambridge Editors suggest *sixteen*, on the ground that 16 would be mistaken for 10, more easily than 13.

P. 98. *Mercy on's, a barn; a very pretty barn! A god, or a child, I wonder?*—The original reads "A boy, or a Childe I wonder?" The change was suggested to White by the corresponding passage in Greene's novel. It seems to me a very happy correction. See foot-note 7. The old reading has caused much perplexity to editors; and the best that has been alleged in its support is, that in some counties *child* appears to have been used especially for *female infant*: but this needs more confirmation than is yet forthcoming.

P. 99. *Sometimes to see 'em, and then not to see 'em.*—So Capell. The old text lacks *then*, which is plainly needful to the sense.

P. 100. *Would I had been by, to have help'd the nobleman.*—So Theobald. The original has "the old man." The Shepherd could not know that Antigonus was an *old man*; but the Clown has just told him "how he cried out to me for help, and said his name was Antigonus, a *nobleman*."

P. 100. *You're a made old man.*—The original has *mad*.

ACT IV., CHORUS.

P. 101. The authorship of this *Chorus* is, to say the least, exceedingly doubtful. Mr. White "more than suspects" it to have been written by Chapman. Certainly, if Shakespeare wrote it, his hand must have lapsed from or forgot its cunning for the time. The texture

and movement of the verse are very different from what a ripe Shakespearian tastes in the rest of the play. As compared with the *Choruses* in *King Henry V.*, the workmanship is at once clumsy, languid, and obscure. Shakespeare indeed is often obscure; but his obscurity almost always results from compression of thought, not from clumsiness of tongue or brain.

P. 102. *I witness'd to
The times that brought them in.*—So Capell. The old text has *witness* instead of *witness'd*.

P. 102. *And remember well
A mention'd son o' the King's, which Florizel
I now name to you.*—The original reads "I mentioned a sonne," &c.; where verse and statement are alike at fault; for so we have Time, honest old chorus as he is, telling a wrong story. It is true, mention has been made of a son of Polixenes; but the Chorus did not make it, nor has he, till now, said a word to us on any subject. Instead of *I mentioned*, Hanmer reads *There is*; which infers an improbable misprint. Most likely *I* got repeated by mistake from the next line, and then *a* was interpolated, in order to make apparent sense.

ACT IV., SCENE I.

P. 103. *It is sixteen years since I saw my country.*—The original here says "*fsfleene*," but it has *sixteen* both in the Chorus and in the last scene of the play.

P. 104. *But I have musingly noted.*—So Hanmer and Collier's second folio. The original has *missingly*, which can hardly be explained to any fitting sense. See foot-note 2.

P. 104. *That's likewise part of my intelligence; and I fear the angle that plucks our son thither.*—So Theobald. The old text has *but* instead of *and*. The former requires a very strained explanation, to make it fit the place.

ACT IV., SCENE 2.

P. 105. *With, hey! with, hey! the thrush and the jay.* — So the second folio. The second *with, hey!* is wanting in the first.

P. 110. *Let me be unroll'd, and my name put in the book of virtue.* — Lettsom believes *unroll'd* to be "a mere blunder of the ear for *un-rogued*." And he observes that "*unroll'd*, without any thing to determine its application, cannot well stand alone." I suspect he is right.

ACT IV., SCENE 3.

P. 111. *I should blush*

To see you so attir'd; more, I think,

To see myself i' the glass. — The old text reads "*sworne* I thinke, *To shew* my selfe a glasse." Here *sworn* must be taken as agreeing with *you*, and so may possibly be made to yield a fitting sense, but hardly. Hammer changed *sworn* to *swoon*, and is followed by Singer, Staunton, and Dyce: nevertheless I cannot abide that reading: *Perdita* could never speak so. Nor can I get the meaning, "*to see myself in a glass*," out of the words, "*to show myself a glass*." The change of *sworn* to *more* was proposed by Dr. C. M. Ingleby and by Mr. Samuel Bailey. Theobald made the other changes. The reading here printed is something bold indeed, but gives a sense so charmingly apt, that I cannot choose but adopt it.

P. 113. *Welcome, sir:*

It is my father's will I should take on me, &c. — So Capell. The original reads "*Sir, welcome*," which leaves the verse defective. Hammer printed "*Sir, you're welcome*." This accomplishes the same object, but not, I think, so well.

P. 115. *So, even that art*

Which you say adds to Nature is an art

That Nature makes. — The original reads "*so over that Art*," which is commonly printed "*so, o'er that art*." With *o'er*, I cannot make the expression tally with the context. The reading in the text is Craik's. Capell reads *e'er*.

P. 116. *O Proserpina,*

For th' flowers now, that, frighted, thou lett'st fall

From Dis's wagon! golden daffodils, &c. — *Golden* is wanting in the original; which leaves both verse and sense defective. Coleridge remarks upon the passage, "An epithet is wanted here, not merely or chiefly for the metre, but for the balance, for the æsthetic logic. Perhaps *golden* was the word which would set off the *violets dim*." What with Coleridge's authority, and Walker's approval, and the evident fitness of the thing, I venture to supply the word.

P. 118. *Nothing but that; move still, still so, and own*

No other function. Each your doing is

So singular in each particular,

Crowning what you have done i' the present deed,

That all your acts are queens. — The original gives these five

lines thus:

Nothing but that : move still, still so:

And owne no other Function. Each your doing,

(So singular, in each particular)

Crownes what you are doing, in the present deeds,

That all your Actes, are Queenes.

"Here," says Walker, "I think, a line, or possibly two have dropt out, which, if preserved, would have obviated the difficulty of construction, which forms the only blot on this most exquisite speech." I can hardly assent to this as regards the amount lost; but there is evidently some bad corruption in the passage, both sense and verse being out of joint: and I have no doubt that a word or two got lost from the text, and one or two other words changed. Instead of "what you are doing," the sense clearly requires "what you have done." In this point, my conjecture is, that *doing* got repeated from the second line before, and then *you have* was altered to *you are*, so as to accord with *doing*; thus rendering the clause incoherent with the context. With the changes I have ventured to make, both sense and verse seem brought into proper order. The old text is, to my sense, convicted of error by certain comments it has called forth; not explanations at all, but sheer obfuscations, and hyperbolical absurdities. "Each your doing crowns what you are doing, in the present deeds," is neither English nor sense, and no glozing can make it so. And the comments

aforsaid amount to just this, that the passage means something which, if the writers could only tell what it means, would be seen to be superlatively fine.

P. 118. *And the true blood which peeps so fairly through't.* — So Capell, Walker, and Collier's second folio. The original lacks *so*.

P. 118. *Nothing she does or seems*
But smacks of something greater than herself. — Instead of *seems*, Collier's second folio has *says*, which is adopted by White; perhaps rightly.

P. 118. *He tells her something*
That makes her blood look out. — So Theobald. The old text has "look on't." The misprint of *on't* for *out* occurs repeatedly. See note on "laid mine honour too unchary out," in *Twelfth Night*, p. 148.

P. 119. *Pray you, good shepherd, what fair swain is this*
Which dances with your daughter? — So Walker. The original lacks *you*. Hammer printed "I pray."

P. 119. *I but have it*
Upon his own report, and I believe it. — The original reads "but I have it," which quite untunes the sense of the passage. Corrected by Walker.

P. 120. *And break a foul jape into the matter.* — The original has *gap* instead of *jape*, which is from Collier's second folio. See foot-note 26.

P. 120. *Has he any embroided wares.* — So Collier's second folio. The original has "unbraided Wares." This has been explained "not braided, not knitted," and "undamaged, genuine"; but neither of these senses answers the occasion very well, or has much affinity with the context.

P. 122. *Clammer your tongues, and not a word more.* — So Crosby. The original has "clamor your tongues." The common reading is *clamour*, and various attempts have been made to connect it with the

ringing of bells. Dyce, though he prints *clamour*, thinks that "the attempts to explain this by referring it to bell-ringing ought to have ceased long ago." We have an instance of the word so applied in *Much Ado*, v. 2:

Bene. If a man do not erect in this age his own tomb ere he dies, he shall live no longer in monument than *the bell rings* and the widow weeps.

Beat. And how long is that, think you?

Bene. Question: — why, an hour in *clamour*, and a quarter in rheum.

But here the word is evidently used in a sense just the opposite of that required in the text. *Clamor* may there be an instance of phonographic spelling; or the two words, though quite distinct in origin and meaning, may have been sometimes spelt alike. Mr. Crosby writes me that "clammer in *The Winter's Tale* is the Clown's way of pronouncing *clam*; and in Westmoreland, England, the word is mainly pronounced *clammer*. Were I editing the play, I should assuredly print it *clammer*; and every Northern man would instantly know it meant *stop*; literally *stick, fasten up, or together*." In confirmation of what is quoted from Mr. Crosby in foot-note 36, it may be well to add the following from Richardson: "CLAM, or CLEM, to hold tight; Anglo-Saxon, *Clam*, a band. *Clamm'd*, in Gloucestershire, Mr. Grose says, means to be choked up, as the mill is *clamm'd* up; and in the North, *starved*. Ray: '*Clem'd* or *clam'd*, starved; because, by famine, the bowels are, as it were, *clammed* or stuck together. Sometimes it signifies *thirsty*; and we know in thirst the mouth is very often *clammy*.'"

P. 125. *Master, there is three goat-herds, three shepherds, three neat-herds, three swine-herds, &c.* — So Theobald and Walker. The original has *carters* instead of *goat-herds*. In the second speech after, Polixenes says, "pray, let's see these four threes of *herdsmen*."

P. 127. *Sooth, when I was young,*
And handled love as you do, &c. — So Collier's second folio. The old text has "And handed love."

P. 127. *You were straited*
For a reply, at least if you make care
Of happy holding her. — The original has "make a care." The interpolated *a* is among the commonest errors.

P. 127. *As soft as dove's down, and as white as it,
Or Ethiop's tooth.*—The original has "*Ethyopians tooth.*"
Corrected by Dyce.

P. 130. *If I may ever know thou dost but sigh
That thou no more shalt see this knack,—as never
I mean thou shalt, &c.*—The old text repeats *never* by antici-
pation,—“no more shalt *never* see.”

P. 131. *Hides not his visage from our cottage, but
Looks on's alike.*—In the original, “Looks on alike.” Of
course *on's* is a contraction of *on us*.

P. 132. *You know your father's temper.*—In the original, “my
Fathers temper.” An obvious error, corrected in the second folio.

P. 133. *For all the Sun sees, or
The close earth wombs, or the profound sea hides.*—The origi-
nal has “profound seas hides.” Capell's correction.

P. 133. *And, most oppórtune to our need.*—In the old text, “to
her need.” Corrected by Theobald.

P. 134. *I am so fraught with serious business, that
I leave out ceremony.*—So Collier's second folio. The old
text has *curious* instead of *serious*.

P. 135. *Asks thee, the son, forgiveness.*—In the original, “asks thee
there Sonne.”

P. 135. *Sent by the King your father
To greet him, and to give him comfort.*—The old text has
comforts. Corrected anonymously.

P. 136. *She is as forward of her breeding as
I' the rear our birth.*—The original has *She's* instead of *She*
is at the beginning of the first line, and also begins the second with
She is. Hanmer struck out the latter, as overfilling the verse to no
purpose; and Lettsom thinks the second *She is* to be “a mere double

of the first, as Hanmer saw, if indeed it is not a correction out of
place.” He means, that it was probably intended as a correction of
She's in the first line.

P. 137. *We are not furnish'd like Bohemia's son,
Nor shall appear so in Sicilia.*—So Lettsom. The original
lacks *so*. Staunton also proposed the insertion of *so*.

P. 137. *It shall be so my care
To have you royally appointed, as if
The scene you play'd were mine.*—The original has “as if The
scene you *play*.” The reading in the text is Lettsom's.

P. 138. *They throng'd who should buy first, as if my trinkets had
been hallowed.*—The original has “they *throng*.” An obvious error,
hardly worth noting.

P. 138. *I would have filed keys off that hung in chains.*—The origi-
nal reads “would have *fill'd* Keyes of”

P. 140. *For I do fear eyes over us.*—The original lacks *us*, which is
required both for sense and for metre.

P. 141. *If I thought it were not a piece of honesty to acquaint the
King withal, I would do't.*—The original transposes the *not* into the
last clause,—“I would *not* do't.” Corrected by Hanmer.

P. 141. *And then your blood had been dearer by I know not how
much an ounce.*—Here *not* is wanting in the old text. Inserted by
Hanmer.

P. 145. *There stand till he be three quarters and a dram dead.*—
So Capell. The old text has “*then* stand.”

P. 146. *Which who knows but luck may turn to my advancement?
—The old text reads “which who knows how that may turn back,”
&c.; which is neither English nor sense. Collier's second folio changes
back to luck.* The reading in the text is Lettsom's.

ACT V., SCENE I.

P. 147. True, too true, my lord. — The original misprints the first true at the close of the preceding speech. Corrected by Theobald.

P. 147. *I think so. Kill'd!*
Kill'd! — she I kill'd! I did so: but thou strikest me
Sorely, to say I did. — So Theobald and Walker. The second
Kill'd! is wanting in the old text.

P. 147. You might have spoke a thousand things. — The original has spoken. Not worth noting, perhaps.

P. 149. Thou good Paulina,
Who hast the memory of Hermione, &c. — So Capell. The
original lacks Thou.

P. 149. No more such wives; therefore, no wife: one worse,
And better used, would make her sainted spirit
Again possess her corpse, and on this stage —
Where we offend her now — appear, soul-vex'd,
And begin, Why to me? — So Theobald. In the old text the
fourth line stands thus: “(Where we offenders now appear) Soul-
vex’t.” Theobald makes the following just note: “’Tis obvious that
the grammar is defective, and the sense consequently wants supporting.
The slight change I have made cures both; and surely ’tis an im-
provement to the sentiment for the King to say, that Paulina and he
offended his dead wife’s ghost with the subject of a second match,
rather than in general terms to call themselves offenders, sinners.”

P. 149. Had she such power,
She had just cause. — The original repeats such in the last
clause, — “She had just such cause.” Palpably wrong.

P. 150. Cleo. Good madam, —
Paul. I have done.
Yet, if my lord will marry, — if you will, sir, —

No remedy, but you will, — give me the office
To choose your Queen. — The original prints “I have done” as
part of the preceding speech. Corrected by Capell. In the last line,
the original has “chuse you a Queene.” Corrected by Walker.

P. 151. So must thy grave
Give way to what is seen now. — Instead of grave, Hanmer has
graces, and Lord Ellesmere’s folio grace; rightly, perhaps, though, I
think, rather tamely. See foot-note 5.

P. 151. This is such a creature. — So Hanmer. The original lacks
such.

P. 152. Pr’ythee, no more; thou know’st
He dies to me again when talk’d of. — So Hanmer. The old
text has “Prethee no more; cease: thou know’st,” &c. Lettsom
thinks that “Pr’ythee, no more,” and “I pr’ythee, cease,” are both
genuine readings, the one being a correction of the other, and the two
having got jumbled in the printing or the transcribing.

ACT V., SCENE 2.

P. 160. That she might no more be in danger of losing her. — So
Collier’s second folio. The old text omits her.

ACT V., SCENE 3.

P. 166. Scarce any joy
Did ever so long live; no sorrow but
It kill’d itself much sooner. — So Walker. The original has
but at the beginning of the last line, and lacks It. Capell completed
the verse by printing sir instead of transferring but.

P. 167. The fixure of her eye has motion in’t,
And we are mock’d with art. — So Capell. The original has
“As we are mock’d with art.” Rowe prints “As we were mock’d with
art.”

P. 168.

Then all stand still;

Or those that think it is unlawful business, &c. — The original has *On* instead of *Or*. Corrected by Hammer.

P. 171.

*This is your son-in-law,**And son unto the King, who — Heavens directing —*

Is troth-plight to your daughter. — In the original the *is* after *this* is wanting; but the sense plainly requires it, either expressed or understood. Nor is there any real objection to it on the score of metre, since it only makes the fourth foot in the line an Anapest instead of an Iamb; which is among the commonest variations in the Poet's verse. — In the next line, also, the old text has *whom* instead of *who*; thus making it the object of *directing*, and not the subject of *is troth-plight*, as the sense requires.

HIGHER ENGLISH.

(See also *Classics for Children*, pages 3 to 8.)

Minto's Manual of English Prose Literature.

Designed mainly to show characteristics of style. By WILLIAM MINTO, M.A., Professor of Logic and English Literature in the University of Aberdeen, Scotland. 12mo. Cloth. 566 pages. Mailing Price, \$1.65; Introduction, \$1.50; Allowance, 40 cents.

THE main design is to assist in directing students in English composition to the merits and defects of our principal writers of prose, enabling them, in some degree at least, to acquire the one and avoid the other. The Introduction analyzes style: elements of style, qualities of style, kinds of composition. Part First gives exhaustive analyses of De Quincey, Macaulay, and Carlyle. These serve as a key to all the other authors treated. Part Second takes up the prose authors in historical order, from the fourteenth century up to the early part of the nineteenth.

H. C. De Motte, *Pres. of Chaddock College, Quincy, Ill.*: We are delighted with it. It is one of the most serviceable books I have seen on the subject. I shall recommend it for our work here. (Sept. 23, 1886.)

Literature, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y.: Without going outside of this book, an earnest student could get a knowledge of English prose styles, based on the soundest principles of criticism, such as he could not get in any twenty volumes which I know of. (May 14, 1886.)

Hiram Corson, *Prof. of English*

Minto's Characteristics of the English Poets,

from Chaucer to Shirley.

By WILLIAM MINTO, M.A., Professor of Logic and English Literature in the University of Aberdeen, Scotland. 12mo. Cloth. xi + 382 pages. Mailing Price, \$1.65; for Introduction, \$1.50; Allowance, 40 cents.

THE chief objects of the author are: (1) To bring into clear light the characteristics of the several poets; and (2) to trace how far each was influenced by his literary predecessors and his contemporaries.