SHAKESPEARE CRITICISM IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
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The history of Shakespeare criticism in the eighteenth century begins with the publication, in 1709, of Rowe’s preface to his edition of the poet. The preface at once proclaims him a man of fine taste and discrimination. With only Dryden’s general appreciation before him, his appraisal of the merits and defects of the poet has, with minor exceptions, stood the test of time. Almost the only major point of difference with the generally accepted estimate of later times consists in his distaste for tragi-comedy which he characterized as “the common mistake of that age.”1 Even this criticism is made with so much tentativeness as to exempt Rowe from any imputation of dogmatism. He suggests that only the severe critic with a scholastic background can take offence at this species of drama. “The generality of our audiences are better pleased with it than an exact tragedy.”2

A consideration of Shakespeare’s learning, an attempt at determining the chronology of some of the plays from internal evidence, Shakespeare’s friendships with Spenser, Ben Jonson, etc., a rapid survey of the several plays paying chief attention to the imagery and characters, a vindication of Shakespeare’s methods though they grossly violated the Aristotelian canons, and a few traditions as to the events in Shakespeare’s life form the chief topics in the preface.

The main interest for us in this preface lies in following the trend of Rowe’s criticism of Shakespeare as a dramatist. The plenitude of the poet’s abilities was such that he could afford to neglect the rules of his art. That, in short, is Rowe’s point of view. Speaking of the criteria which are to influence one in determining Shakespeare’s first play, he remarks as follows:

“Perhaps we are not to look for his beginnings, like those of other authors, among their least perfect writings; art had so little, and nature so large a share in what he did, that for aught I know, the performances of his youth, as they were the most vigorous, and had the most fire and strength of imagination in ’em, were the best.”3

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p. vi.
Again, in discussing the tragedies, he says:

"If one undertook to examine the greatest part of these by those rules which are established by Aristotle, and taken from the model of the Grecian stage, it would be no very hard task to find a great many faults. But as Shakespeare lived under a kind of mere light of nature and had never been made acquainted with the regularity of those written precepts, so it would be hard to judge him by a law he knew nothing of."\(^4\)

The apologetic note sounded in the last few lines, that only ignorance of the rules of drama kept Shakespeare from adopting them, is a characteristic of some parts of the preface. It is a feeling akin to this that kept the scholars of that day from regarding the works of Shakespeare in the same light that they would have done a classic. He was not precise enough to deserve scholastic attention. That is why Rowe's edition of the poet is so very haphazard. The six octavo volumes published by Tonson have this remarkable quality that they are not encumbered by notes at the foot of the text. Though he professes to have collated old copies to arrive at his present text (see the "Dedication")\(^*\) one does not know from his edition either the labour or accuracy of this collation. Later research has shown that this collation was very random and haphazard. His method of editing is comparable to a certain extent with Pope's in that it is the free-lance method of editing by taste. Rowe escapes the justly severe strictures passed on Pope as an editor in that there was not much of the noise and pretensions of editorial qualifications which heralded Pope's edition.

As a textual critic, then, Rowe has no pretensions whatever. His main contribution lay in (1) giving list of dramatis personæ for every one of the plays and (2) division of the plays into acts and scenes. Only eight of the thirty-six plays had the list of dramatis personæ in the first folio.

Rowe was asked to edit Shakespeare because it was thought that only a poet could thoroughly comprehend the mainsprings of Shakespeare's art. That very trend of thought led Tonson (besides reasons of rivalry with Lintot) to approach Pope to give to the world an edition of the poet. What


\(^*\) ROWE IN HIS DEDICATION to His Grace the Duke of Somerset:

"......I have taken some care to redeem him from the injuries of former impressions. I must not pretend to have restored this work to the exactness of the author's original manuscripts: Those are lost, or, at least, are gone beyond any inquiry I could make; so that there was nothing left, but to compare the several editions, and give the true reading as well as I could from thence. This I have endeavoured to do pretty carefully, and rendered very many places intelligible, that were not so before. In some of the editions, especially the last, there were many lines, (and in Hamlet one whole scene) left out together; these are now all supply'd......"
a triumph it would be! The acknowledged master poet of one age to reveal the glories of the poet of all time! The announcement of the edition-to-be was made and expectations roused. The translator of the *Iliad* (which proved such a success placing Pope’s reputation beyond dispute) was to edit *Shakespeare*. Subscriptions rapidly poured in and sixteen years after Rowe’s publication, Pope’s *Shakespeare* saw the light of day.

Before criticising the edition it is well to take note of the preface that introduced it to the world. A genuine enthusiasm for the poet is evinced in it and expressed with all Pope’s mastery in prose. The first few paragraphs of the preface containing a general appreciation of the poet are as good as anything written then or since about Shakespeare.

“——and ’tis not so just to say that he speaks from her, as that she speaks thro’ him.”

“To judge….Shakespeare by Aristotle’s rules, is like trying a man by the laws of one Country, who acted under those of another.”

The above household quotations of Shakespearian critics are from those paragraphs. When dealing with the spontaneity of Shakespeare’s Art, his intuitive knowledge of the world, and the characterization in the plays, Pope was in his right element and though he might not have said anything profound, he at least did not blunder egregiously. But when he proceeds to speak of Shakespeare’s learning and instances the speeches in *Coriolanus* as proof of Shakespeare’s direct acquaintance with *Plutarch*, he betrays his ignorance of North’s translation of that writer. This is but a single instance of the lack of scholarly equipment on the part of Pope.

His discussion of the respective merits of the quartos and folios is very offhand, though his strictures on the 1623 folio are only too well deserved. He says nothing of the interrelation of the quartos. The student of to-day acquainted with “Original Quartos”, “Derived Quartos” and “Double Quartos” would find nothing in Pope’s preface which even hinted at such problems existing with regard to the quartos. All that we know from the discussion is that several of the plays were printed separately in quarto and that they are generally better than the folio edition of the plays.

---

10 See the Cambridge editors.
The conclusion of the preface is interesting in view of the gulf that is revealed betwixt the professions contained here as to how the work is edited and the actual execution of the work itself.

"The method taken in this edition," says Pope,\(^\text{11}\) "will show itself. The various readings are fairly put in the margin, so that everyone may compare 'em; and those I have preferred into the text are constantly \textit{ex fide codicum}, upon authority. The Alterations or Additions which \textit{Shakespeare} himself made, (!) are taken notice of as they occur.............. The more obsolete or unusual words are explained... There is also subjoin'd a catalogue of those first editions by which the greater part of the various readings and of the corrected passages are authorised (most of which are such as carry their own evidence along with them)."

Pope did not stop at this enumeration of his editorial duties. He went further and said that he had "discharged the dull duty of an Editor.... with a religious abhorrence of all innovation, and without any indulgence to my private sense or conjecture."\(^\text{12}\)

It is to be expected then, from these professions, that his edition was characterized by a careful collation, relevant explanation, and cautious emendation.

Pope's enormous reputation at that moment consequent on his translation of Homer was sufficient to make for an unquestioning acceptance of his Shakespeare by the public, and at least during his lifetime, he would have been considered as the Refiner and Corrector of Shakespeare \textit{par excellence}. It would have required scholarship of undoubted ability and a courage of an extraordinary kind to criticize the edition. Courage, because Pope's virulence towards those who disagreed with him was relentless in the extreme, and everyone knew it.

 Barely a year passed after the publication of Pope's edition when a large thin quarto volume, uniform in size with Pope's edition, entitled \textit{Shakespeare Restored}, was published. Its contents and purpose are challengingly given in the full title which reads as follows:—"Shakespeare Restored: or, a specimen of the many errors, as well committed, as unamended, by Mr. Pope in his late edition of the poet. Designed not only to correct the said Edition, but to restore the True Reading of Shakespeare in all the editions ever yet published." It is difficult to reconcile this most provoking title with the statement in the preface (p. iii) that the author had not the least intention

---


\(^\text{12}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. xliv.
of derogating from Pope's merits in his attempt to restore the true reading of Shakespeare. Also a perusal of the 194 pages of the book reveals the author exposing in great detail and many times with great gusto, all the shortcomings of "Mr. Pope" as an editor. The man with the necessary courage and scholarship had arrived, and for once, Pope felt insecure on his throne. His name was Lewis Theobald, born in the same year as Pope. Theobald's own edition of Shakespeare, its genesis and its qualities, will be examined later. We are concerned with him at this juncture as the critic of Pope in his capacity as an editor of Shakespeare. The professions of Pope in his preface as to what he had done to the text of Shakespeare were conclusively proved by Theobald to be little more than pretensions.

Again and again Pope's carelessness in collation is exposed. As for instance, while detecting a halt in versification in the line "shall I strike ( ) it with my partizan" (Hamlet, Act I, sc. 1). Theobald observes as follows:—

"The second Edition in Folio, printed in 1632, and which is one of those that Mr. Pope professes to have collated, makes out the numbers of this line by reading,

Shall I strike at it with my partizan."\(^{13}\)

This is a typical remark to be met with in every other page of Theobald's work. The unsoundness of Pope's explanation of words due to an ignorance of correct etymology, is exposed as in his explanation of "unanel'd" as "no knell rung" (Hamlet, Act I, sc. 8). Theobald pointed out that "unanel'd" stood for "Unanealed" which had to be derived from the Teut: \(An\) and \(Ole\) oleum, and meant "not having the extream unction".\(^{14}\)

As to ex cathedra emendation, in which sort Pope specialized, Theobald has laid bare his deficiencies in so signal a manner as to leave no doubt about Pope's unfitness for the task. It is worth while in this connection to recall, in some detail, the history of what is generally described as the "most famous single emendation" in Shakespeare.

In her description of the death-bed scene of Falstaff, Mistress Quickly says, among other things, that "his nose was as sharp as a pen, and a Table of green fields"\(^{15}\) (according to the folio reading). In omitting "and a Table of green fields" from his edition, Pope gave the following reasons:

"These words, 'and a table of green fields' are not to be found in the old editions of 1600 and 1608. The nonsense got into all the editions by a

\(^{13}\) Shakespeare Restored, p. 3.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 52-53.

\(^{15}\) Shakespeare, ed. Pope, K. Henry V, p. 422.
pleasant mistake of the stage editors, who printed from the common piece-
meal written parts in the playhouse. A table was here directed to be brought
in (it being a scene in a tavern where they drink at parting), and this direction
crept into the text from the margin. Greenfield was the name of the property
man in that time who furnished implements, etc., for the actors."\(^{16}\)

Anybody would conclude from the tone of finality in this note that Pope
had substantial reasons for talking about "Greenfield," the property man.
Theobald conclusively proves\(^{17}\) that it was not customary to add the property
man's name in either the prompter's book or piecemeal parts. He also proves
that properties that were required in the scene were "marked in the Book
at about a page in quantity before the actors quoted are to enter, or the pro-
properties be carried on". By his comment on Pope's remarks he justifies his
statement made earlier in his note that "something more than ingenuity is
wanting; and that is, a competent knowledge of the stage and its customs",
thereby implying an ignorance about them on the part of Pope. So con-
vincing was Theobald's reasoning in the matter that in his second edition,
Pope omitted all reference to "Greenfield" and admitted Theobald's
reading, though with exceeding bad grace.

One would have thought that though Pope signally failed in his duties
as a textual editor, he would have been very successful in the critical aspect
of his duties. His taste we should have believed, in the rejection of unpoeti-
cal lines, turgid passages, etc., to be fairly trustworthy. But what is to be
said when he consigns to the margin as corrupt interpolations lines such as:

"Sleep that knits up the ravelled sleeve of care";\(^ {18}\)

"The multitudinous seas incarnadine"\(^ {19}\)

and that passage in "Hamlet" beginning,

"This heavy-headed revel, east and west", etc.\(^ {20}\)

It only points to a woeful lack of imagination. Not content with dropping
out such lines he took upon himself to guide the reader through the shining
passages of the plays by marking them with inverted commas—a practice
which led Johnson to observe that he

"never observed that mankind was much delighted with and improved
by these asterisks or double commas; of which the only effect is that they

---

\(^{16}\) *Shakespeare, ed. Pope, K. Henry V*, p. 422.

\(^{17}\) *Shakespeare Restored*, pp. 137-8.

\(^{18}\) *Macbeth*, Act 2, sc. 2, l. 37.

\(^{19}\) *Ibid.*, l. 62.

\(^{20}\) *Hamlet*, Act I, sc. 4.
preclude the young and ignorant to decide without principles: defeat curiosity and discernment by leaving them less to discover: and at last show the opinion of the critic without the reason on which it was founded, and without affording any light by which it may be examined."

Rude Shakespeare in warbling his wood-notes wild had writ verse as he thought fit, and these crudities of versification had to be put right in interpreting him to a refined age. And Pope, with his extensive experience of the couplet, tried his hand at a task very pleasant to him. He laboured incessantly in reducing to the regularity of eighteenth century versification much of Shakespeare's verse. With a freedom which would have petrified a conscientious textual editor he inserted and rejected words to fit versification.

It is because the merits of Pope's edition are very slight in comparison with its defects, and also because the above examples provide an efficient contrast to Theobald's methods, that the drawbacks have been analysed in such detail. Pope's merit as an editor is that he was the first to realize the importance of the quartos. So great, indeed, was his deference to them that he regarded even the worst of them as of unimpeachable authority. In "King Lear" he restored 150 lines from an old quarto. Even here no settled principles governed his collation of the quartos. Taste—his own taste, was the supreme arbiter in either admitting or rejecting passages. With the publication of "Shakespeare Restored", there was revealed to the world an entirely new approach to the textual problems in Shakespeare. Though this was the first time that anybody thought of treating Shakespeare in this manner, the method of approach was not entirely new. Barely two years after Rowe's edition of Shakespeare in 1709, Dr. Bentley had brought out his edition of "Horace" in which is to be seen the method of textual emendation that has influenced Classical scholarship so very deeply, that it has come to stay for ever. To-day the fundamentals of this method are still applied, though considerably shorn of the many extravagances that attended the method for a time.

For a successful application of this method one must be possessed of great erudition, a systematic and logical mind, and infinite capacity for an attention to detail. The method itself is excellently described by R. F. Jones in his "Lewis Theobald" as follows:

"The passage with the common or accepted reading is first introduced, and together with the various manuscript readings and previous emendations is critically examined. One by one the different readings are subjected to a
searching examination. Where grammatical, historical or aesthetic tests prove a corruption in the manuscript and failure on the part of previous scholars to remove it, Bentley flashes upon us his emendation. Immediately he begins to apply the test again in support of his conjecture. He brings forth his knowledge of grammar, metrics, history, and the customs of the ancients, and shows the consistency of his correction with the rest of the passage. As one of his main supports he quotes from various authors passages in which the word he puts forward is used in a similar way, or passages which prove a historical or grammatical fact which he asserts in support of his emendation. Even where his corrections are absolutely unconvincing, these commentaries are often of value, so that Bentley teaches even when he is wrong.

"So well defined is this method that the qualities that came to be attributed to critics can with some definiteness be localized. Judgment (judicium) operated in ascertaining that there was an error in the text, sagacity (sagacitas or ingenium) invented the emendation, and learning (eruditio) tested and supported the emendation. Of course learning was brought to play on all parts of the method (as was to a less degree, judgment), but it was shown more conspicuously in support of a reading."[22]

The danger with this method was that, in inferior hands, judgment gave place, often, to fancy, sagacity was displaced by preciosity, and erudition degenerated into literary exhibitionism. Even the great Bentley was caught in the defects of his system as is to be seen in his edition of Milton in 1732 where, instead of establishing Milton’s text, he spent his powers in showing how Milton ought to have written. Also Bentley’s laborious efforts in seeing to the correctness of the punctuation and to the propriety of place of interjection and particles led to a guying of the method of which the following anonymous verse satire is a fair example.

"Bentley immortal honour gets
By changing Que’s to nobler Et’s:
From Cam to Isis see him roam
To fetch stray’d interjections home;
While the glad shores with Joy rebound,
For periods and lost commas found:
Poor Adverbs, that had long deplor’d
Their injur’d rights, by him restor’d
Smiled to survey a rival’s doom,
While they possess’d the envied room;

... ... ...
   ... ... ...
   ... ... ...

The Roman nymphs, for want of notes
More tender, strain’d their little throats,
Till Bentley to relieve their woes
Gave them a sett of Ah’s and Oh’s:
More musically to complain,
And warble forth their gentle pain.
The suffering fair no more repine,
For vowels now to sob and whine;
In softest air their passion try,
And, without spoiling metre, die.”

It was because Theobald followed Bentley in the insistence of minutiae that Pope pillorised him as “pidling.” Pope and those of his mind had nothing but contempt for this method. They considered it beneath them to condescend to such labours. To them the method was nothing but poring over books to set right irrelevant details. While concerning themselves with “higher criticism” they forgot the important fact that such criticism could only be reared on the basis of ascertained texts. But this much must be said in justice to them that the passion for fault-finding and unnecessary correcting was quite a craze with the post-Bentley scholars of the day. They may be said to have been suffering from a nightmare of interpolation and corruption of texts. So much so that passages of great clarity were rendered incomprehensible by these analysers, which provoked Pope to say:

“For thee explain a thing till all men doubt it
And write about it, Goddess, and about it.”

This short review of the Bentley method in emendation seems necessary for a correct comprehension of Theobald’s work. For it is to this method that he owes all his success. He shows his direct indebtedness by the very form of his first venture in Shakespeare emendation. “Shakespeare Restored” corresponds exactly to the fashion then prevalent of issuing notes on an author independent of any text. And what is more, in the preface to his edition of Shakespeare he introduced some Greek notes to help his reputation. Writing to Warburton he says:

“The occasional insertion of a few emendations from some Greek authors,
I certainly think may be of signal service to my Reputation: if you think they may safely be interspersed without suspicion of pedantry.”

23 Lewis Theobald, Jones, pp. 55-6.
24 Prologue to Satires, to Arbuthnot.
25 Dunciad, ed. 1728, Bk. 1, ll. 159-60.
It is now left for us actually to examine certain of Theobald’s emendations, bearing in mind their indebtedness to the classical scholarship of the day. The very first example from the Appendix to “Shakespeare Restored”, though lengthy, is thoroughly illustrative of the main principles of emendation discussed above. The passage is from “Troilus and Cressida”.

“Paris and Troilus, you have both said well:
And on the cause and question now in hand
Have gloss’d but superficially; not much
Unlike young men, whom GRAVER SAGES think
Unfit to hear moral philosophy.”

“The Editor, I remember, in his Preface speaking of the method taken in his Edition, tells us that the various readings are fairly put in the margin, so that everyone may compare them; and those he has preferred into the text are CONSTANTLY ex fide codicum, upon authority. I heartily beg the pardon of this gentleman, if, thro’ ignorance, I shall assert a falsehood here, in being bold to say, that this may be called an exception to his rule; that Graver sages is preferred into the text without any authority, and that all the printed copies read the passage thus:—

“..........................not much
Unlike young men, whom ARISTOTLE thought
Unfit to hear moral philosophy.

’Tis certain, indeed, that Aristotle was at least 800 years subsequent in time to Hector; and therefore the Poet makes a remarkable innovation upon chronology. But Mr. Pope will have this to be one of those palpable blunders which the illiteracy of the first publishers of his works has fathered upon the Poet’s memory, and is of opinion that it could not be of our author’s penning; ‘it not being at all credible that these could be the errors of any man who had the least tincture of a school, or the least conversation with such as had’. ’Tis for this reason, and to shelter our author from such an absurdity, that the Editor has expunged the name of Aristotle, and substituted in its place graver sages. But, with submission, even herein he has made at best but half a cure. If the Poet must be fettered down strictly to the chronology of things, it is every whit as absurd for Hector, to talk of Philosophy, as for him to talk of Aristotle. We have sufficient proofs, Diogenes Laertius, and Cicero, from Heraclides Ponticus; Iamblichus, in the life of Pythagoras, etc., that Pythagoras was the first who invented the word Philosophy, and called himself Philosopher. And he was near 600 years after the date of Hector, even from his beginning to flourish. ’Tis true, the thing which we now understand by Philosophy, was then known; but it was only till then call’d Knowledge and Wisdom. But to dismiss this point; I believe this

27 Shakespeare Restored, pp. 134-5.
anachronism of our Poet, (and, perhaps, all the others that he is guilty of), was the effect of poetick license to him, rather than ignorance.

It has been very familiar with the poets, of the stage especially, upon a supposition that their audience were not so exactly informed in chronology, to anticipate the mention of persons and things, before either the first were born, or the latter thought of. Shakespeare again in the same play compares the nerves of AJAX with those of bull-bearing MILO of Crotona, who was not in being till 600 years after that Greek; and was a disciple of Pythagoras, Strabo, Aulus Gellius, etc. Again Pandarus, at the conclusion of the play, talks of a Winchester-goose: indeed it is an address to the audience; and then there may be an allowance, and greater latitude for going out of character. Again in Coriolanus, Menenius talks of Galen, who was not born till the second century of the Christian Aera and the very hero of the play talks of the grievance that he must stoop to, in begging Voices of Dick and Hob: names which I dare say the Editor does not imagine, that Shakespeare believed were ever heard of by that Roman. From his many plays founded on our English Annals, and the many points of history accurately transmitted down in them, I suppose it must be confessed that he was intimately versed in that part of reading; yet in his 'King Lear', he has ventured to make Edgar talk of the Curfew, a thing not known in Britian, till the Norman invasion: In his King John he above fifty times mentions Cannons, tho’ Gunpowder was not invented till above a century and an half after the death of that Monarch; and what is yet more singular, (as he could not be a stranger to the date of a remarkable man, who lived so near his own time;) twice in the story of Henry VI he makes mention of Machiavel as a subtle politician: tho’ ’tis very well known, he was Chief Counsellor to the wicked Caesar Borgia, and a favourite to the popes Leo X, and Clement VII. The latter of whom did not come to the Papal Chair till the 15th year of K. Henry VIII.

All these transgressions in time therefore, as I said before, are liberties taken knowingly by the Poet; and not absurdities flowing from his ignorance. There is one passage, I remember, in our author, in which, if I am not mistaken, he may be presumed to sneer at his own licentiousness in these points. It is in his Lear: The King’s Fool pronounces a sort of doggerel prophecy; and as soon as he has finished it, cries, This Prophecy Merlin shall make, for I do live before his time.

Nor have these liberties been taken alone by Shakespeare among our poets: In the Humorous Lieutenant of Beaumont and Fletcher, all the characters of which play are the immediate successors of Alexander the Great: Demetrius Prince of Macedon, comes out of his chamber with a Pistol in his hand, above 1500 years before Fire-arms were ever thought of. So in the Oedipus of Dryden and Lee, there is a mention of the Machines in the Theatre at Athens; tho’ neither Plays nor Theatres were so much as known to the world till about
500 years after that prince's days. And yet I daresay, neither Beaumont and Fletcher ever supposed, or thought to make their audiences believe, that pistols were used in Demetrius's time: nor were Dryden and Lee so ignorant in Dramatical Chronology, as to suppose Tragedy of as early a date as Oedipus.

But that the poets of our own nation may be justified in these liberties by examples of the Antients, I'll throw in a few instances of the like sort from their predecessors in the art of Greece. The great Sophocles in his Electra, supposes that Orestes was thrown from his chariot, and killed at the Pythian games; which games, as the Scholiast tells us, were not instituted till 600 years afterwards by Triptolemus. And frequent instances occur in Athenaeus that shew, beyond exception, how free the Comic Poets made with chronology. Alexis, in his Comedy called Hesione, introduces Hercules drinking out of a Thriclean Cup: Now this was a species of Cups, invented by Thericles, a Corinthian Potter, who was contemporary with Aristophanes; above 800 years after the period of Hercules. Anaxandrides, in his Protisilaus, a hero that was killed by Hector, brings in Hercules again, and talks of Iphicrates the Athenian general, and Cotys the Thracian King, both living in the Poet's own days. And Diphilus in his Sappho, makes Archilochus, and Hipponax, both address that poetical lady, tho' the first was dead a century before she was born; and tho' she was dead and rotten before the latter was born.

If these instances of transgression in time may go any way towards acquitting our poet for the like inconsistencies, I'll at any time engage to strengthen them with ten times the number, fetch'd from the writings of the best poets, ancient and modern, foreign and domestick."

In this note of Theobald's we have, first, a priori argument which is helped out by the Reductio-ad-absurdum method to an incontrovertible conclusion; and secondly, analogy (in the way of similar examples in the same play) buttressing this conclusion: this analogy is extended first to plays of the same type and then to the plays in general: the conclusion is further consolidated by appealing from Shakespeare's own practice to that of his brother dramatists and that of the later ones. A final reference to the classical dramatists of different ages proves beyond doubt that Anachronism in drama is as old as the hills. Thus by arguing from the particular to the general Theobald proves his point. Here erudition is not exhibitionist in character but effective and forceful. And what is more remarkable, Theobald, at the end of the note is not exhausted but indicates to us the reserve of examples in his mind which exceed those quoted by ten times. Even if this number is a literary flourish, one is inclined to believe that he has at least as many examples in his mind as there are in his note.
Ever since Pope slandered Theobald as "pidling" the heresy has been handed down\(^{28}\) that the great Critic lacked imagination. We have already seen Pope's own lack of this quality in relegating to the margin lines of rare beauty. But how can the charge be maintained against Theobald when, in "Romeo and Juliet" he alters

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{"As in the bud bit with an envious worm} \\
&E'\text{re he can spread his sweet leaves to the air} \\
&\text{Or dedicate his beauty to the SAME}" \\
\end{align*}
\]

into

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{"Or dedicate his beauty to the SUN";}^{29}
\end{align*}
\]

or again in "Antony and Cleopatra" he alters

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{"near lust wearied Antony"} \\
\end{align*}
\]

into

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{"ne'er lust-wearied Antony,"};^{30}
\end{align*}
\]

or when he defends

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{"... to take arms against a SEA of troubles"};^{31}
\end{align*}
\]

in "Hamlet" as against the "SIEGE" suggested by Pope? I have purposely left out of this enumeration, the famous "a babled of green fields" because Theobald in his devotion to documentary evidence justifies his emendation by a deplorable reference to "those in a calenture" whose "heads run on green fields".* It is not so much sought to prove any superiority of Theobald over Pope in the matter of imagination as to defend him from such remarks as Dr. Johnson's, when he said that Warburton (of all people!!) would make "two and fifty Theobalds cut into slices".\(^{32}\)

Theobald's edition of Shakespeare in 1734 was but an amplification of the method in "Shakespeare Restored". In bringing out this edition he had the continued assistance of William Warburton, whose acquaintance he had made in the very year in which he had published "Shakespeare Restored". It has been very seriously contended that much of the merit of this edition has been due to the collaborator. Thus, Professor Nichol Smith observes\(^{33}\) :—


\(^{29}\) *Shakespeare*, ed. Theobald, Vol. 8, p. 12.


“A considerable share of the merit of Theobald's edition—though the share is mostly negative—belongs to Warburton, for Theobald had not taste enough to keep him right when he stepped beyond collation of the older editions or explanation by parallel passages.”

Again he remarks that:

“... early editor of Shakespeare has gained more than Theobald and suffered more than Warburton by the custom of attributing the whole merit of an edition to him whose name is on the title page. When we read their correspondence and see their editions in the making, it is not difficult to realize what Johnson meant when he said that Warburton as a critic would make two and fifty Theobalds cut into slices.”

At another place in the Introduction (p. lxvi) Warburton is represented as saving Theobald from himself whenever the latter “submitted his conjectures anxiously to the judgment of Warburton.”

The style of Warburton’s title-page is reminiscent of Theobald’s alternative title for “Shakespeare Restored”.

“The works of Shakespeare, in eight volumes. The Genuine text (collated with all the former editions, and then corrected and emended) is here settled: being restored from the Blunders of the first editors, and the Interpolations of the two last: with A Comment and notes, critical and explanatory. By Mr. Pope and Mr. Warburton.”

Even as we have verified Theobald’s title-page by an examination of his actual accomplishment, it remains for us now to do the same with Warburton.

Hamlet is of all the plays of Shakespeare that which most exercises the ingenuity of the editor in emendation and criticism.

“Discussion of Shakespeare,” says W. W. Greg, “usually comes round in the end to Hamlet; ... Hamlet is not only, from the literary point of view, the most discussed play in the Canon, it is also the one that presents the most complex problem to the textual student.”

So when Theobald decided to prove his skill in editing, it was to Hamlet that he turned his attention most. There we have Theobald’s own principles of editing manifested without any collaboration from Warburton. In this very play is also contained the emendation of Warburton which earned Dr. Johnson’s admiration when, he remarked of it: “This is a noble emendation which almost sets the critic on a level with the author.”

---

Act I, sc. 4, l. 42.

"Be thy intents wicked or charitable."

Some of the old editions read events; from whence I suspect Shakespeare wrote, "Be thy advent wicked or charitable, i.e., thy coming". 38

In both these instances emendations have been suggested without any reason to back them up except the fancy of the editor who has definite ideas as to how Shakespeare wrote. There is no citation of examples to prove that the existing reading is inconsistent with Shakespeare’s manner. Nor is the new reading justified by the quotation of parallel passages. And what is worse, the reasons given are not nearly good enough for the suggested alteration. Dr. Johnson himself commenting on the first of these notes calls it “an affectation of subtility without accuracy”. 39 He proves his point by a very parody of the Warburtonian manner.

"Fear is every day considered as an agent. Fear laid hold on him Fear drove him away. If it were proper to be rigorous in examining trifles it might be replied, that Shakespeare would write more erroneously, if he wrote by the direction of this critic; they were not distilled, whatever the word may mean, by the effect of fear; for that distillation was itself the effect, Fear was the cause, that distilled them by that force of operation which we strictly call act in Voluntary, and Power in Involuntary agents, but popularly call act in both. But of this too much." 40

These two examples are typical of many others throughout Warburton’s edition. There are instances where he has indulged his fancy to such an extent that whole pages have been written on a line or two without quoting a single parallel passage or any variant reading. All through it is the Ex-cathedra method in operation. All the suggestions are in vacuo.

“The worst of Warburton is,” said Dr. Johnson in reply to a question of Dr. Burney, “that he has a rage for saying something when there’s nothing to be said.” 41 The examples of this rage in Warburton are so profusely to be met with in almost every page of his work that selection is not a matter of much difficulty. By the very nature of the point which it is sought to illustrate here, citation of examples has to be very limited.

_Hamlet_, Act I, sc. 3, l. 79.

"And it must follow, as the night the day."

The sense here requires, that the similitude should give an image not of two

---

38  _Sha espeare, ed._ Warburton, p. 142, note 9.
39  _Sha espeare, ed._ Johnson, p. 248, note (Vol. 8).
40  _Ibid._
Act I, sc. 4, l. 42.

"Be thy intents wicked or charitable."

Some of the old editions read events; from whence I suspect Shakespeare wrote, "Be thy advent wicked or charitable, i.e., thy coming".\footnote{Sha espeare, ed. Warburton, p. 142, note 9.}

In both these instances emendations have been suggested without any reason to back them up except the fancy of the editor who has definite ideas as to how Shakespeare wrote. There is no citation of examples to prove that the existing reading is inconsistent with Shakespeare’s manner. Nor is the new reading justified by the quotation of parallel passages. And what is worse, the reasons given are not nearly good enough for the suggested alteration. Dr. Johnson himself commenting on the first of these notes calls it “an affectation of subtility without accuracy”.\footnote{Sha espeare, ed. Johnson, p. 248, note (Vol. 8).} He proves his point by a very parody of the Warburtonian manner.

"Fear is every day considered as an agent. Fear laid hold on him Fear drove him away. If it were proper to be rigorous in examining trifles it might be replied, that Shakespeare would write more erroneously, if he wrote by the direction of this critic; they were not distilled, whatever the word may mean, by the effect of fear; for that distillation was itself the effect, Fear was the cause, that distilled them by that force of operation which we strictly call act in Voluntary, and Power in Involuntary agents, but popularly call act in both. But of this too much."\footnote{Ibid.}

These two examples are typical of many others throughout Warburton’s edition. There are instances where he has indulged his fancy to such an extent that whole pages have been written on a line or two without quoting a single parallel passage or any variant reading. All through it is the Ex-cathedra method in operation. All the suggestions are in vacuo.

"The worst of Warburton is," said Dr. Johnson in reply to a question of Dr. Burney, "that he has a rage for saying something when there’s nothing to be said."\footnote{Boswell: Life of Johnson, Vol. 1, p. 329.} The examples of this rage in Warburton are so profusely to be met with in almost every page of his work that selection is not a matter of much difficulty. By the very nature of the point which it is sought to illustrate here, citation of examples has to be very limited.

Hamlet, Act I, sc. 3, l. 79.

"And it must follow, as the night the day."

The sense here requires, that the similitude should give an image not of two
effects of different natures, that follow one another alternately, but of a cause and effect, where the effect follows the cause by a physical necessity. For the assertion is, be true to thyself, and then thou must necessarily be true to others. Truth to himself then was the cause, truth to others the effect. To illustrate this necessity, the speaker employs a similitude: but no similitude can illustrate it but what presents an image of a cause and effect; and such a cause as that, where the effect follows by a physical not a moral necessity; for if only by a moral necessity, the thing illustrating would not be more certain than the thing illustrated; which would be a great absurdity. This being premised let us see what the text says,

"And it must follow as the night the day."

In this we are so far from being presented with an effect following a cause by a physical necessity, that there is no Cause at all; but only two different effects, proceeding from two different Causes, and succeeding one another alternately. Shakespeare, therefore, without question wrote

"And it must follow as the light the day."

As much as to say. Truth to thyself, and truth to others, are inseparable, the latter depending necessarily on the former, as light depends upon the day! Where it is to be observed, that day is used figuratively for the Sun. The ignorance of which, I suppose, contributed to mislead the editors.  

Dr. Johnson commenting on some other note of Warburton observes as follows:—"I should not have suspected this passage of ambiguity or obscurity, had I not found my opinion of it differing from the learned critick". This is a relevant observation for ninety per cent. of Warburton's notes. For all the length of his notes, we are no nearer to the meaning of the passage. This would not have mattered so much, had not the prolixity of the notes added to the confusion of the already difficult passage. But it is most exasperating when a line crystal-clear in its meaning, as in the above case, is beclouded by tortuous explanation. What exactly do we gather from the constant repetition of the words cause, effect, physical necessity, and moral necessity in the above note? Sir Walter Raleigh has been quoted as saying that Warburton's "long, fantastic, unnecessary notes on Shakespeare are, almost without exception, good reading". It were desirable to have had a further amplification of the latter part of the statement. For if notes like the one quoted above and the one to follow are "good reading", then a drastic overhaul of standards of judgment becomes an urgent necessity.

42 Shakespeare, ed. Warburton, p. 137, note 8 (Vol. 8.)
43 Shakespeare, ed. Johnson, p. 159. note (Vol. 8.)
Act I, sc. 4, 11. 46-8.

".................................tell
Why thy Canonized bones, hearsed in Death
Have burst their cearments?"

Hamlet here speaks with wonder, that he who was dead should rise again and walk. But this, according to the Vulgar superstition here followed, was no wonder. Their only wonder was, that one, who had the rites of sepulture performed to him, should walk; the want of which was supposed to be the reason of walking ghosts. Hamlet's wonder then should have been placed here: and so Shakespeare placed it, as we shall see presently. For, hearsed is used figuratively to signify reposited, therefore the place where, should be designed; but death being no place but a privation only, hearsed in death is nonsense. We should read

".................................tell
Why thy Canonized bones hearsed in earth,
Have burst their cearments."

It appears from the two reasons given above, that earth is the true reading. It will further appear for these two other reasons. First, from the words "Canonized bones": by which is not meant (as one would imagine) a compliment, for, made holy, or sainted. For we are told he was murdered with all his sins fresh upon him and therefore in no way to be sainted. But if this licentious use of the word Canonized be allowed, then earth must be the true reading, for inhuming bodies was one of the essential parts of sepulchral rites. Secondly, from the words have burst their cearments, which imply the preceding mention of inhuming, but no mention is made of it in the Common reading. This enabled the Oxford editor to improve upon the emendation; so he reads,

"Why thy bones hearsed in Canonized earth, I suppose for the sake of harmony, not of sense. For tho' the rites of sepulture performed Canonizes the body buried; yet it does not Canonize the earth in which it is laid, unless every funeral service be a new Consecration."44

While discussing the Bentley method in emendation, the qualities of the critic were denominated in their respective order of functioning as judgment (in ascertaining the error), sagacity (in inventing the emendation) and learning (to support the emendation). In Warburton the first-named of these qualities so changes its aspect that one recognizes it as mere fancy; sagacity transforms itself into Subilety, and learning parades as pedantry. In the note just quoted all these qualities are apparent. Commenting upon it, Dr. Johnson observes as follows:—

"It were too long to examine the note period by period, tho' almost every period seems to me to contain something reprehensible. The

critick, in his zeal to change, writes with so little consideration, as to say, that Hamlet cannot call his father canonized, because we are told he was murdered with all his sins fresh upon him. He was not then told it, and had so little the power of knowing it, that he was to be told it by an apparition. The long succession of reasons upon reasons prove nothing, but what every reader discovers, that the king had been buried, which is implied by so many adjuncts of burial, that the direct mention of earth is not necessary .... ......... Had the change of the word remove'd any obscurity, or added any beauty, it might have been worth a struggle, but either reading leaves the sense the same.."45

The most famous of all Warburton's emendations which earned Dr. Johnson's reverential admiration deserves some analysis. Dr. Johnson's commendation is unreserved and unambiguous. "This is a noble emendation," he said, "which almost sets the critic on a level with the author".46 The very readiness with which Dr. Johnson condemned many of Warburton's notes, must make us pause and listen when he so liberally praises the editor. The importance of the note to Warburton's reputation is such that a full quotation of it, in this context, has some justification. The passage occurs in Act II, sc. 2 (l. 181) where Hamlet confounds Polonius by his wayward replies.

"For if the Sun breed maggots in a dead dog,
Being a good, kissing carrion........
Have you a daughter?

The editors seeing Hamlet Counterfeit Madness, thought they might safely put any nonsense into his mouth. But this strange passage when set right, will be seen to contain as great and sublime a reflection as any the poet puts into his hero's mouth throughout the whole play. We shall first give the true reading which is this,

"For if the Sun breed maggots in a dead dog,
Being a God, kissing Carrion—

As to the sense we a may observe, that the illative particle (for) shews the speaker to be reasoning from something he had said before. What that was we learn in these words 'to be honest, as this world goes, is to be one picked out of ten thousand'. Having said this, the chain of ideas led him to reflect upon the argument which libertines bring against providence from the circumstance of abounding evil. In the next speech therefore he endeavours to answer that objection, and vindicate providence, even on a supposition of the fact that almost all men were wicked. His argument in

46 Ibid., p. 189, note.
the two lines in question is to this purpose, “But why need we wonder at this abounding of evil? for if Sun breed maggots ‘in a dead dog, which tho’ a God, yet shedding its heat and influence upon a Carrion—’. Here he stops short, lest talking too consequentially the hearer should suspect his madness to be feigned; and so turns him off from the subject by enquiring of his daughter. But the inference which he intended to make, was a very noble one, and to this purpose. If this (says he) be the case, that the effect follows the thing operated upon (carrion) and not the thing operating (a God); why need we wonder, that the supreme cause of all things diffusing its blessings on mankind, who is, as it were, a dead carrion, dead in original sin, man, instead of a proper return of duty, should breed only corruption and vices? This is the argument at length; and is as noble a one on behalf of Providence as could come from the schools of divinity. But this wonderful man had an art not only of acquainting the audience, with what his actors say, but with what they think. The sentiment too is altogether in character, for Hamlet is perpetually moralizing, and his circumstances make this reflection very natural. The same thought, something diversified as on a different occasion, he uses again in Measure for Measure, which will serve to confirm these observations:

The tempter or the tempted, who sins most?
Not she; not doth she tempt; but it is I
That lying by the violet in the Sun
Do as the carrion does, not as the flower,
Corrupt by virtuous Season—
And the same kind of expression in Cymbeline,
Common-kissing Titan.”"^[47]

This note is as noble an argument “on behalf of Providence as could come from the schools of divinity”. And “this wonderful man”, not content with explaining what Shakespeare actually wrote, attempts also an exposition of what lay in the hinterland of his mind! Given his premise that Hamlet was led to reflect upon the libertine objections against Providence as a natural consequence of his previous remarks, the whole note is quite a pretty piece of argument. Even accepting this argument how can “Being a God, etc.” come to mean “tho’ a God, etc.”? For the explanation is that though the Sun is a God, yet kissing carrion he breeds corruption, and not that by virtue of his Godhead he breeds corruption by kissing carrion. Apart from this, from the textual point of view, as Collier^[48] points out, “Good” could hardly have been a misprint for “God”, as in the latter case it would most likely have been written with a capital

letter. Dyce49 remarking that Johnson has “overpraised” the note, adopts Warburton’s emendation because it “at least has the merit of conveying something like a meaning”—surely an unsound reason from a textual point of view! Staunton50 accepts Warburton’s reading though he dissents “toto coelo” from Warburton’s reasoning. Hudson51 while thinking God “probably right” says that the “true explanation of the passage is that it is not meant to be understood”. Only Moberley52 and Clarendon53 among the later editors have “little doubt of the truth of Warburton’s explanation”. Furness54 in his Variorum Shakespeare, and the New Cambridge editors, follow Theobald, Caldecott,55 Corson,56 and Collier in retaining “good kissing carrion”. The 1866 Cambridge editors,57 as has been mentioned before, follow Dr. Johnson, though their notes are silent as to whether they accept Warburton’s reasoning.

Thus we see that the emendation, both from an examination of it on its own merits and from a reference to the judgments of later editors, is not such a brilliant one as we are led to expect by Johnson’s extravagant praise. Now that these lines of inquiry have resulted in the above conclusion, the statement may be made without any danger of prejudging the issue, that most probably it was Warburton’s kind notice of Johnson’s first venture in Shakespeare criticism, that was behind the exaggerated respect paid to Warburton by Johnson. When condemning most of the productions on Shakespeare as “absolutely below serious notice”, Warburton, in his preface excepted Johnson’s critical notes on “Macbeth” (“given as a specimen of a projected edition”) written, as “appears, by a man of parts of genius”.58 For this notice taken of him at a time when recognition was invaluable to him,59 Dr. Johnson was ever grateful. This fundamental bias in favour of Warburton is at the basis of much of his appreciation. This seems to be the only legitimate explanation of the extravagance of Johnson’s comment on this mostly irrelevant note. This might also account for his estimate of Warburton as equal to “two and fifty Theobalds cut into slices”.

50 Ibid.
51 Ibid., p. 149 (note).
52 Ibid. (note).
53 Ibid. (note).
54 Ibid., p. 146 (note).
55 Ibid., p. 148 (note).
56 Ibid., p. 149 (note).
57 Ibid., Vol. 8, p. 58.
There are two efforts at general criticism in Warburton’s notes on *Hamlet*. One of them is a characterization of Polonius and the other is a vindication of the “Aeneas and Dido” passages in Act II, sc. 2 (ll. 430-75) as genuine poetry worthy of the reader’s appreciation. The characterization of Polonius is not very remarkable for its insight. He makes out the character to be a caricature of a “weak, pedantic, minister of state”. As Dr. Johnson observed of it,

“the commentator makes the character of Polonius, a character only of manners discriminated by properties superficial, accidental, and acquired. The poet intended a nobler delineation of a mixed character of manners and of nature.”

And then follows Johnson’s own famous character sketch of Polonius. Warburton had not enough imagination to visualize the really capable Polonius who in the prime of his power was a worthy servant of the state. He does not grasp the pathos of the character which consisted in the decay of mental powers due to senility.

Coming now to the second instance of general criticism in *Hamlet*, we find Warburton commenting on the passages recited by the players to prove their powers of acting before *Hamlet*. The passages occur in scene 2 of the second Act (ll. 430-75). Warburton thinks them genuine and not intended as a burlesque, for three reasons. First, the character that Hamlet gives of the play is such that only a genuine play was intended to answer the description. Hamlet says that the play displeased the multitude because the play was written “on the ancient plan” according to the classical rules, which according to Hamlet’s taste was “caviare to the general”. Secondly, the description of Ilium and Priam falling together is equal to the best that Virgil ever wrote. Thirdly, the effect of the speech on the player was such that only a genuine play could produce such a result.

“Our author was too good a judge of nature to make Bombast and Unnatural sentiment produce such an effect.........And indeed had Hamlet esteemed this emotion anything unnatural, it had been a very improper circumstance to spur him to his purpose (of revenge).”

In addition to all these reasons, Warburton defends the alleged turgidity of some of the lines by asserting that “Shakespeare has used the very same thoughts in the same expressions in his best plays”. Not content with defending these passages as genuine, he goes further and asserts that the

“play in dispute was Shakespeare’s own and that this was the occasion of writing it. He was desirous, as soon as he had found his strength, of

---

61 *Shakespeare, ed. Warburton*, p. 175 (Vol. 8).
restoring the chasteness and regularity of the ancient stage, and therefore composed this tragedy on the model of the Greek drama, as may be seen by throwing so much action into relation. But his attempt proved fruitless, and the raw, unnatural taste, then prevalent, forced him back again into his old Gothic manner. For which he took this revenge upon his audience.”

This time Warburton has erred in good company. For we find Coleridge calling the descriptions “highly poetical; in truth, taken by itself, that is its fault that it is too poetical”! Steevens has a note on the passage which sums up the whole matter neatly. He says:

“The praise which Hamlet bestows on this piece is certainly dissembled, and agrees very well with the character of madness, which, before witnesses, he thought it necessary to support. The speeches before us have so little merit that nothing but an affectation of singularity could have influenced Warburton to undertake their defence. It is by no means proved that Shakespeare has employed the same thoughts clothed in the same expressions in his best plays. If he bids the false huswife. Fortune break her wheel, he does not desire her to break all its spokes; nay, even its periphery, and make use of the nave afterwards for such an immeasurable cast.”

In his acknowledgment in his notes Warburton has been neither fair nor scrupulous. His treatment of the previous editors is arrogant and unscholarly. Pope, of course, is an exception to this for obvious reasons. So overbearing indeed was his attitude that Dr. Johnson was provoked to a most dignified protest in his notes. In a note on a passage in Hamlet, Warburton speaks about the “Nonsensical blunder” of the “senseless editors” And referring to Hanmer he says, “And you could expect no less when such a critic had the dressing of him (Shakespeare).” To which Johnson appends the following note:

“I know not why our editors should, with such implacable anger, persecute our predecessors the dead it is true can make no resistance, they may be attacked with great security; but since they can neither feel nor mend, the safety of mauling them seems greater than the pleasure; nor perhaps would it much be seem us to remember, amidst our triumphs over the nonsensical and the senseless, that we likewise are men; that debemur morti, and as Swift observed to Burnet, shall soon be among the dead ourselves.”

---

65 *Ibid*.
In referring to Theobald he is always sneering, and “spelt right by Mr. Theobald” is a common phrase to be met with in the notes. The substantial reasons given by Theobald for the change of spelling are always omitted. Thus, for instance, in Act V, scene 1, Warburton has a note: “eisel, vinegar: spelt right by Theobald.” The correction is much more than merely spelling the word rightly. The word was written Esill as if it was a proper name. Theobald proves there is no such river in Denmark. He alters it to eisel, instancing its use in Chaucer, and lest Chaucer be thought too old, passages from “A Complaint” (alleged to be by Shakespeare), and from Sir Thomas More are given in support. He clinches the matter by giving the meaning from Somner, and the word “is acknowledged by Minshew, Skinner, Blount, etc.”.

The method of belittling Theobald’s alterations by partial quotation is to be met with very often. On a line (I. 130) in the third scene of the first Act in “Hamlet” Warburton has the following note:—

“Breathing like sanctified and pious bonds”
On which the editor Mr. Theobald remarks:—

‘Though all the editions have followed this reading implicitly, it is certainly corrupt; and I have been surprised how men of genius and learning could let it pass without some suspicion: What ideas can we frame to ourselves for a breathing bond or of its being sanctified and pious, etc.’

But he was too hasty in framing ideas before he understood those already framed by the poet, and expressed in very plain words. “Do not believe (says Polonius to his daughter) Hamlet’s amorous Vows made to you; which pretend religion in them, (the better to beguile) like those sanctified and pious Vows (or bonds) made to heaven. And why should not this pass without suspicion?”

It would seem from this note that the explanation given by Warburton of the line in question, had never struck Theobald. It would also appear that he suspected the passage of corruption without adequate reason. Whereas a continuation of Theobald’s note would make it clear that Theobald had already thought of Warburton’s explanation and rejected it because of its inadequacy. Here is the relevant extract from the rest of Theobald’s note which will speak for itself. It is continued from the point where Warburton ended it:—

---

69 Shakespeare, ed. Warburton, Vol. 8, p. 130, note 5.
"......The only tolerable way of reconciling it to a meaning without a change, is to suppose that the poet intends, by the words bonds, verbal obligations, protestations; and then indeed these bonds may, in some sense, be said to have breath. But this is to make him guilty of overstraining the word and allusion; and it will hardly bear that interpretation, at least not without much obscurity, etc."  

The rest of the note is occupied by a discussion of the emendation suggested by Theobald, with which we are, at present, not concerned. Association with Pope seems to have trained Warburton in all the tricks of damning people by truncated quotation.

Not only does he belittle Theobald's achievements by his sneering notes, he also fails to acknowledge the many alterations which he adopted from Theobald's edition. In his notes Theobald draws attention (both in "Shakespeare Restored" and in his edition) to the false pointing and obscure readings in the passage beginning "This heavy-headed revel east and west". (Act I, scene 4). He alters Pope's readings "clip", "His virtues", "fortune's star", etc., into the now accepted "clepe", "their virtues", "fortune's scar", etc. He also altered the pointing of the passage throughout. In his edition, Warburton adopts all these readings of Theobald as also his pointing (with only one exception) without any acknowledgment of the fact. Only the alteration of "ease" to "base" and "doubt" to "worth" is acknowledged. In Act II, sc. 2, l. 327, the reading "eyases" for the "yases" of the Folio is Theobald's emendation. There is no acknowledgment of that fact in Warburton though the reading is adopted. Whereas Dr. Johnson both accepts and acknowledges Theobald's reading.

In this connection it is interesting to hear what Dr. Nichol Smith has to say with regard to the editorial ethics of Warburton. In his introduction to his edition of "Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare" (p. lviii), he says:—

"The knowledge of Theobald's use of the quartos and Folios led Warburton to commit a detestable quibble on his title-page. There is said to be no evidence that Warburton himself had consulted them. Yet the statement that his text is 'collated with all the former editions' is not absolutely without the bounds of truth: Theobald had consulted them, and Warburton does not say that he consulted them himself'.

This criticism is true in every word of it. Warburton's edition is really founded on Theobald's. Even the arrangement of plays in the volumes

71 Ibid., p. 275, note.
follows Theobald's order and not Pope's. Only the scenic division and a few of those brief and inaccurate notes of Pope are there to remind the reader of the Poet's edition of Shakespeare.

As far as could be done by illustration from a single play, most of Warburton's qualities as an editor have been examined. Even a cursory examination of the notes to the other plays amply justifies the conclusions that have been arrived at. It is hoped that the foregoing analysis has amply demonstrated Warburton's inefficiency in almost every department of editing. How then, we may ask, can a man of this calibre be spoken of as repeatedly saving Theobald from himself? If Theobald is to be branded as one not having "taste enough to keep him right when he stepped beyond collation of the older editions", what suitable epithet can be found to characterize Warburton's equipment as an editor? How could a person, who, upon the least provocation, got himself into an inextricable tangle of irrelevance ever be capable of guiding another's efforts?