



**UNIVERSITY OF  
ILLINOIS PRESS**

---

Warburton and the 1745 "Shakespeare"

Author(s): Arthur Sherbo

Source: *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Jan., 1952), pp. 71-82

Published by: University of Illinois Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27713372>

Accessed: 21-08-2017 02:01 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*University of Illinois Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*

## WARBURTON AND THE 1745 *SHAKESPEARE*

WILLIAM WARBURTON'S Shakespearean endeavours have recently been the object of scholarly interest. The question of his quarrels with Lewis Theobald and Sir Thomas Hanmer has received its full share of critical attention, and it is not my present purpose to re-examine the facts of those quarrels with a view to indicating whether Warburton was right or wrong. All three men have had their champions,<sup>1</sup> and each of us is free to form his own opinion on the basis of the extant information. My primary concern in this article is to throw more light on Warburton's Shakespearean labors and to raise some questions which will serve to clarify—or, possibly, confuse—the question of the editorship of the 1745 *Shakespeare* which Dr. Giles Dawson has recently claimed for Warburton.<sup>2</sup> The 1745 *Shakespeare* was reprinted from Sir Thomas Hanmer's 1744 *Shakespeare* (the Oxford Edition); it represents Tonson's reprisal for the publication of the Oxford edition which he, owning the Shakespeare copyright, looked upon as a piracy. Incidentally, one of its chief purposes was to point out the many alterations that Hanmer had silently made in the text. It also purported to give Theobald, Warburton, and Dr. Thirlby proper credit for their many emendations. All emendations not otherwise attributed were Hanmer's.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Dawson has argued for Warburton's editorship of the 1745 edition, yet there are a number of puzzling questions touching upon this problem to which I shall call attention. A preliminary statement of the three divisions of my article may be helpful as a guide through the perplexed question under examination. These divisions are: first, a comparison of Warburton's early notes and emendations on Shakespeare with the attributions of those same notes and emendations in the 1745 edition; second, an examination of all the attributions in one play for each of the six volumes of the 1745 edition; and third, an investigation of accusations brought against Warburton in a contemporary pamphlet for stealing notes and emendations from the 1745 edition.

### I

It is matter of common knowledge that Warburton carried on an

<sup>1</sup> A. W. Evans, *Warburton and the Warburtonians* (London, 1932), Chapter IX; R. F. Jones, *Lewis Theobald . . .* (New York, 1919), Chapter V; Sir Henry Bunbury, *Correspondence of Sir Thomas Hanmer, Bart.* (London, 1838), pp. 90–91.

<sup>2</sup> "Warburton, Hanmer, and the 1745 Edition of Shakespeare," *Studies in Bibliography*, II (1949–50), 35–48.

<sup>3</sup> For a fuller description of the 1745 edition, see Dawson, *op. cit.*

extensive correspondence with Theobald about the latter's work on an edition of Shakespeare. Theobald's side of the correspondence for the years 1729 to 1733 is extant; Warburton's is not. But we have more than fifty emendations and notes sent by Warburton to Theobald, printed in John Nichols' *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, II (1817), 635–44. It is, however, less commonly known that a specimen of Warburton's Shakespearean emendations and criticism was printed as early as 1739 in the ninth volume of an English translation of Bayle's *General Dictionary*. Included in the article on Shakespeare is the information that Warburton was preparing an edition of Shakespeare, and a number of his comments and emendations are printed as footnotes to the text of the article. Since these notes have been slighted in the past it would be well to indicate the number and nature of them.

The first matter taken up in the *General Dictionary's* specimen of Warburton's notes is that of a glossary "of such words as Shakespeare has affixed peculiar significations of his own to, unauthorized by use, and unjustified by analogy; and these being chiefly mixed modes, as they are most susceptible of abuse, so they throw the most impenetrable obscurity over the discourse."<sup>4</sup> Warburton gives fifty-seven examples of such words, indicating unusual meanings and varying meanings for the same words, and, for certain words, explains what associations they had for Shakespeare. Warburton concludes with the confident statement that "this Glossary will remove the greatest obscurities in his [Shakespeare's] writings, and be a continued comment on his text." In his edition of Shakespeare (1747), Warburton does not include a glossary, explaining in his Preface that "I had it once, indeed, in my Design, to give a general alphabetical Glossary of these Terms; but as each of them is explained in its proper Place, there seemed the less Occasion for such an Index" (p. xvi). It will be remembered that Hanmer's edition had had a glossary and that Thomas Edwards, fastening on the absence of a glossary in Warburton's edition as one of the shortcomings of the book, had himself provided an essay towards such a glossary in his *Canons of Criticism, and a Glossary, being a Supplement to Mr. Warburton's Edition of Shakespeare . . .* [1748]. It is significant that Hanmer wrote to Warburton in January of 1736 asking for "a catalogue of such words as you think require explanation of which I think you once told me you had a number collected, the seeing of which may be of use towards

<sup>4</sup> *General Dictionary*, p. 190.

completing the Glossary for which I have already exhausted all that my own best attention led me to remark and inserted them in."<sup>6</sup> Comparison of Hanmer's glossary with the specimens of Warburton's glossary in the *General Dictionary* reveals only two words ("ostent" and "spleen") common to both. It is quite possible that Hanmer did not care to include Warburton's examples in his glossary, the two men being enemies in 1740.

The rest of Warburton's specimen notes in the *General Dictionary* are concerned with emendations, contemporary allusions in Shakespeare's plays, classical models for certain of his speeches, and a general praise of his excellences. There are thirty-eight notes in all exclusive of the long specimen of a glossary. Seventeen of these are emendations, one of which is the famous "God kissing carrion" for "good kissing carrion" in *Hamlet*. A comparison of these thirty-eight notes with Warburton's edition of Shakespeare in 1747 reveals something of Warburton's development—or lack of development—as a Shakespearean scholar.

Only part of the note on the proposed glossary that appears in the *General Dictionary* is used by Warburton in the *Preface* to his Shakespeare. In both places Warburton refers to critics who censure Shakespeare for the confusion of his ideas and the inaccuracy of his reason, and in both places he castigates Rymer's criticism as ignorant and brutal.<sup>6</sup> Most of Warburton's other notes in the *General Dictionary* reappear, with slight change, in his Shakespeare. For example, in the *General Dictionary* the last note (p. 199) reads: "The humour of this reply is incomparable: it insinuates not only the highest contempt of the flatterer in particular, but this useful lesson in general, that the images of things are clearest seen through a simplicity of phrase." In his edition, Warburton alters the note only in punctuation and by the addition of the following supplementary clause: "of which in the words of the precept, and in those which occasion'd it, he has given us examples" (vi, 231). Warburton, whose love of emendation is notorious, rejected only one of the seventeen he had proposed in the *General Dictionary*.<sup>7</sup> Although loath to reject, he was not unwilling to add emendations to two earlier notes. Thus, to the two emendations in the *General Dictionary* (p. 197) in Claudius' speech (*Hamlet*, III, iii,

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in Evans, *Warburton*, pp. 151–52.

<sup>6</sup> *General Dictionary*, p. 191; *Preface*, p. xv.

<sup>7</sup> Compare the note on *1 Henry IV*, II, vi on p. 194 of the *General Dictionary* with Warburton's edition iv, 129.

39 and 66)<sup>8</sup> he added a third in 1747 (1.56).<sup>9</sup> And in 1739 he had suggested a parallel between *The Tempest*, v, i, 41–47 and a passage in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The note was retained in 1747, but an emendation was added.<sup>10</sup> In four notes from the *General Dictionary* he adduced further examples from Shakespeare and other Elizabethan dramatists to substantiate his readings.<sup>11</sup> It is evident, therefore, that to some extent he continued to work on and elaborate his early notes.

Before proceeding to the more interesting and important question of the editorship of the 1745 *Shakespeare* I should like to indicate what use Warburton made of his specimen glossary previously printed in the *General Dictionary*. For each word that he defined in the glossary he cited the volume and page of Pope's duodecimo edition (1728). Reference to these passages in his own edition show that he kept—and used in his notes—only twenty-three of the fifty-seven definitions which had appeared in the *General Dictionary*. I have checked against Schmidt's *Shakespeare-Lexicon* the twenty-three words that appear in both the *General Dictionary* and the 1747 *Shakespeare* and find that Schmidt is in agreement with Warburton eight times. Schmidt concurs also in nine definitions which appear in the *General Dictionary* and are rejected in the 1747 edition. These facts have no startling significance, but they indicate that Warburton was not so taken with his own cleverness as to be blind to the necessity for constant re-examination of his notes—except his precious emendations.

The notes first printed in the *General Dictionary* are of no little importance in any effort to determine who edited the 1745 *Shakespeare*, and comparison of them with the emendations in the 1745 edition becomes obligatory. If Warburton is the editor of the 1745 *Shakespeare*, he would have full knowledge of the emendations in the *General Dictionary* and attribute them correctly to himself. It is, of course, quite obvious that any one else knowing of the notes in the *General Dictionary*, could make the correct attributions. That the editor of the 1745 *Shakespeare* knew Warburton's notes is immediately apparent, for on page 17 of the first volume appears, after an emendation, "This emendation Mr. Warburton propos'd in his speci-

<sup>8</sup> Where line references are given the modern edition used is Kittredge's (Boston, 1936).

<sup>9</sup> The early emendations are "th'ill" for "will" and "can but repent" for "cannot repent." The added emendation is "th' effects" for "th' offence."

<sup>10</sup> "Have open'd, and let forth their Sleepers, wak'd" for "Have waked their sleepers; op'd, and let them forth" (l. 49).

<sup>11</sup> Compare the *General Dictionary*, pp. 196, 196, 198–99, and 199 with, respectively, Warburton, I, 292, 342–43, VIII, 165–66, and 363–64.

men of an edition of this author, published in the *General Dictionary*." This statement might seem guarantee enough that all the emendations contained in the *Dictionary* would, upon their appearance in this edition, be correctly attributed to Warburton.

It has already been pointed out, however, that one of the chief reasons for the publication of the 1745 edition of Shakespeare seems to have been the desire on the part of somebody to expose Sir Thomas Hanmer's practice of silently including emendations which he had taken from Theobald, Thirlby, and Warburton. Comparison of the notes in the *General Dictionary* with those of the 1745 edition shows that for Warburton this has been done with almost complete consistency. There are thirty-eight notes in the *General Dictionary*; seventeen are emendations. Of the twenty-one notes other than emendations only three are printed in the 1745 edition, all attributed to Warburton.<sup>12</sup> It must be observed, however, that these three are the only notes of the twenty-one which Hanmer had included in his edition of the year before. The editor of the 1745 edition, it is obvious, was concerned to reprint only those notes which Hanmer had stolen from the *General Dictionary*.

The problem of the emendations which make up the rest of the notes in the *General Dictionary* becomes more complicated. Hanmer had printed seven of these seventeen emendations in his text as his own. The 1745 *Shakespeare* correctly attributed them to Warburton,<sup>13</sup> but it also incorrectly attributed three others to him. In the *General Dictionary* (p. 194) Warburton had emended "frontiers" to "rondeurs" (*1 Henry IV*, II, iii, 55); Hanmer prints "fortins" silently (III, 306); the 1745 edition prints "fortins" and attributes the emendation to Warburton (III, 305); and Warburton's edition also prints "fortins" but attributes it to Hanmer (IV, 129). In a second incorrect attribution the *General Dictionary* (p. 194) emends "allowed" to "hallowed" (*Timon*, V, i, 165); Hanmer prints "allowed" (V, 73); the 1745 edition gives "allowed" as the emendation, footnotes "hallowed" as the old reading, and attributes the emendation to Warburton (V, 74); and Warburton's edition again gives "hallow'd" (VI, 235). The third

<sup>12</sup> In the 1745 edition these occur in I, 90, 355; III, 69.

<sup>13</sup> 1745 edition (I, 17), *Tempest*, I, ii, 355, "could'st" for "did'st"; (I, 209), *Merry Wives*, V, v, 55, "rein" for "raise"; (II, 410), *All's Well*, IV, iv, 23, "fancy" for "saucy"; (III, 57-58), *Lear*, III, ii, transposition of lines 85-86 and 93-94 in the Fool's prophecy (the emendation, "or two" for "or ere," does not appear in the 1745 edition); (VI, 172), *Cymbeline*, III, v, 72 "winning" for "woman"; (VI, 355), *Hamlet*, II, ii, 182, "God, kissing carrion" for "good kissing carrion"; and (VI, 508), *Othello*, IV, i, 42, "induction" for "instruction."

incorrect attribution occurs in *Othello*, iv, i, 14. The *General Dictionary* (p. 197) emends "protectress" to "propertied"; Hanmer prints "proprietor" (vi, 508); the 1745 editor prints "proprietor" as an emendation and attributes it to Warburton (vi, 507); and Warburton, in his own edition of Shakespeare, prints the emendation as "propertied" (viii, 361). Of the remaining seven emendations, only one needs further comment. In *Hamlet*, iii, iii, 39 Hanmer prints "'twill" (vi, 387); the 1745 edition correctly attributes the emendation to Theobald (vi, 386).<sup>14</sup> The other six do not appear in the 1745 edition for the simple reason that Hanmer did not print them. Comparison of notes in the 1745 edition with the corresponding notes in the *General Dictionary* indicates that Warburton, or somebody friendly to him, was concerned to establish his priority in certain notes and emendations. Dr. Dawson has already made this quite clear and has nominated Warburton himself as the editor of the 1745 edition.<sup>15</sup> Why, however, should Warburton attribute an emendation to himself in 1745 and, two years later, attribute it to Hanmer (*1 Henry IV*, ii, iii, 55)? What is the reason for the confusion in the emendation in *Timon*, v, i, 65? Would Warburton attribute the emendation in *Othello*, iv, i, 14 to himself in the 1745 edition despite the fact that he had gone on record in the *General Dictionary*—which, it must be remembered, is referred to very early in the first volume of the 1745 edition—as favoring a different emendation, one which he was to use in his own edition two years later? I am of the opinion that the identity of the editor of the 1745 edition still remains an open question.

Two more examples of confusion in the attributions in the 1745 edition have been pointed out to me. These are in no way connected with Warburton's notes in the *General Dictionary*.<sup>16</sup> In *Cymbeline*, iii, i, 20 we find the 1745 edition (vi, 156) attributing an emendation ("rocks unscaleable" for "oaks unscaleable") to Warburton. Hanmer, in 1744, had printed "rocks," without acknowledging his source (vi, 156). Warburton, in 1747 (viii, 279), attributes the emendation to Hanmer. The *Variorum* edition assigns the emendation to Thomas Seward, one of the editors of the 1750 *Beaumont and Fletcher*, who states that he gave the emendation to Hanmer and found that War-

<sup>14</sup> See the *General Dictionary*, p. 197.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 44. Dr. Dawson admits the possibility that some "nameless hack" might have been employed as helper by Warburton, but suggests that "it is difficult to see how [the task] could have been accomplished without Warburton's active collaboration."

<sup>16</sup> These were pointed out to me by my friend Gwynne B. Evans with whom I have discussed this article on a number of occasions—always with great profit to myself.

burton concurred with him. This is all very confusing and becomes even more so when one finds Theobald writing to Warburton in 1731 and proposing the "oaks" to "rocks" emendation.<sup>17</sup> In 1731 Seward had just taken his B.A. (in 1730, actually) and was not, one imagines, concerned with matters emendatory. It is, of course, quite possible that Theobald, rejecting his emendation (for he does not print it in his edition of Shakespeare), gave it to Seward with whom he collaborated on the edition of Beaumont and Fletcher. What is most important for the present discussion is the fact that the 1745 editor attributes this emendation to Warburton, and Warburton attributes it to Hanmer two years later. Again, in *1 Henry VI*, I, i, 3, the 1745 editor (iv, 5) attributes an emendation to Warburton ("crisped" for "crystal") which does not appear in Warburton's own edition in 1747. Warburton emends "crystal" to "crested" or "cristed" which he explains as "standing on end" (iv, 433). Hanmer, in 1744, had printed "crisped" (iv, 5). There is no indication in the Theobald-Warburton correspondence that Warburton may have made the original emendation only to change his mind later. How does one reconcile these facts with the identification of Warburton as editor of the 1745 edition?

## II

The realization that there were more incorrect attributions in the 1745 edition than comparison with the *General Dictionary* brought to light prompted me to examine this interesting edition further. In *Othello* it correctly attributed eighty-four emendations and notes to Hanmer, seven to Theobald, and twelve to Warburton. A note on *Othello*, III, iii, 90, is attributed to Hanmer (vi, 488) but might have been derived from Theobald (1733, vii, 431). *The Tempest* also shows an extremely high percentage of accuracy. It is worth noting that one emendation attributed to Hanmer (1745, I, 29), "Troubles thee not" for "Trebbs thee o'er," might have been suggested by Pope (1728, I, 31), "Troubles thee o'er" for "Trebbs thee o'er"; that another—"sea-malls" for "scamels" or "shamois" (1745, I, 38)—although given to Hanmer, was possibly suggested by a note of Theobald's (1733, I, 29); and that a third, "all" for "so," attributed to Hanmer (1745, I, 21) had already appeared in Pope (1728, I, 23). Since *The Tempest* occurs in the first volume of the 1745 edition, and *Othello* in the last, four more plays, one from each of the remaining volumes, were chosen as a further check.<sup>18</sup> Only the incorrect attributions need be

<sup>17</sup> Nichols, *Illustrations*, II, 629.

<sup>18</sup> II, *Twelfth Night*; III, *Lear*; IV, *Henry VIII*; v, *Timon*.

listed. In *The Tempest*, I, ii, 81 one emendation attributed to Warburton cannot be verified by the evidence of the Theobald-Warburton correspondence, the first two editions of Theobald's *Shakespeare*, or Warburton's *Shakespeare*.<sup>19</sup> The emendation, "to plash" for "to trash," is attributed to Warburton (1745, I, 8). In 1747 Warburton (I, 9) prints "to trash" and states in a footnote that the emendation, "to plash," is Hanmer's.

The attributions to Warburton in the 1745 *Twelfth Night* require him to change his mind twice. In 1734 in a letter to Theobald (Nichols, *Illustrations*, II, 642), Warburton had offered one explanation for the reference to the "Lady of the Strachy" (II, v, 44-45), changed it, if it is correctly attributed to him, in 1745 (II, 463), and changed it still again in his edition (III, 156).<sup>20</sup> The 1745 edition attributes to Warburton the emendation (*Twelfth Night*, II, v, 72), "with thee the fortunate and happy" for "with thee. The fortunate and happy." Warburton, in 1747, punctuates differently: "with thee, the fortunate and happy." The 1745 editor (III, 65) credits the emendation "provoked" for "provoking" (*Lear*, III, v, 8) to Warburton. Warburton prints "provoking" and attributes the emendation, "provoked," to Hanmer (1747, VI, 86). In *Henry VIII*, I, iii, 2 Warburton is credited with the emendation, "mimick'ries" for "mysteries" (1745, IV, 418). In 1747 (v, 361) Warburton emends "mysteries" to "mockeries" and sneers at Hanmer's reading of "mimick'ries." In a letter from Theobald to Warburton we find this notation: "'Men into such strange MOCKERIES.' Doubtless, an excellent emendation." (Nichols, *Illustrations*, II, 460.) The inference, clearly, is that Warburton had offered this emendation to Theobald in a letter which we do not have. In this same play (II, iii, 14) Warburton is indicated as the emender of "quarrel" to "quar-

<sup>19</sup> Two other emendations in *The Tempest* attributed to Warburton in 1745 appear in his edition. These may be found in the 1745 edition, I, 23 (II, i, 11), "adviser" for "visitor," and I, 53 (IV, i, 68), "pale-clipt" for "pole-clipt." The fact that they appear in Warburton's edition in 1747 is not proof that they originated with Warburton, but I know no sure way to check. They could, of course, really be Hanmer's; one is faced with a Hobson's choice.

<sup>20</sup> In Nichols: "Satrape, i.e. governor, Probably, this Play is taken from an Italian play, or novel."

In the 1745 edition: "This is a word mistaken in the copying or printing, but it is not easy to conjecture what the word should be: perhaps *Stratarch*, which (as well as *Stateque*) signifies a General of an Army, a Commander in chief."

In the 1747 edition: "We should read Trachy, i.e. Thrace; for so the old English writers called it. Mandeville says, As Trachye and Macedoigne of the which Alisandre was Kyng. It was common to use the article *the* before names of places: And this was no improper instance, when the scene was in Illyria."

The first and third notes are Warburton's; the second note may be his—it bears his name.

r'ler" (1745, iv, 436) yet he prints "quarrel" in his own 1747 text without any comment (v, 381). Similar confusion exists in two attributions in *Timon of Athens*. In v, i, 47 the emendation, "black-corneted" for "black-corner'd" is given to Warburton (1745, v, 70). In 1747 Warburton emends "black-corner'd" to "black-cornette" and explains his emendation in such a fashion as to leave no doubt that "black-cornette" is the reading he thinks right (vi, 230). There is the possibility—I think quite remote—that Warburton changed his mind between 1745 and 1747. In *Timon*, iii, ii, 25, the emendation "o'erlook'd" for "mistook" is attributed to Warburton (1745, v, 34) and the 1745 editor in his note adds the word "mislook'd" in explanation of "o'erlook'd." Warburton's emendation in 1747 is "mislook'd" which he explains as "overlooked" (vi, 184). In *Othello*, ii, i, 165, the emendation "illiberal" for "liberal" is attributed to Warburton (1745, vi, 466), and Warburton, in 1747, prints "liberal," explaining in a note Shakespeare's use of the word (viii, 310). In *Othello*, iii, iii, 92, Warburton is given credit for the emendation, "and" for "or" (1745, vi, 491), but we find him printing "or" in his text without comment (1747, viii, 339). Finally, the 1745 editor (vi, 459, a) attributes a note (on *Othello*, i, iii, 346) to Warburton which is taken verbatim from Pope (1728, viii, 344). Warburton, in his own edition, rejects Pope's explanation by emending the passage.

### III

Interestingly enough, there is at least one contemporary writer who makes extensive use of the 1745 edition. The author of *Remarks upon a late Edition of Shakespeare: . . . Addressed to the Reverend Mr. Warburton . . .*, London: Printed for C. Norris, sen. behind the Chapter-house, near St. Paul's. [n.d.] prints "A list of Emendations upon Shakespeare, borrowed by Mr. Warburton from Sir Thomas Hanmer's Edition, without Acknowledgment" (pp. 31–36). The author of the *Remarks*, thought to be Zachary Grey, compares a number of notes and emendations in Warburton's 1747 edition with the same notes and emendations in "Hanmer 8vo, 1745." "Hanmer 8vo, 1745" is, of course, the 1745 edition which Dr. Dawson has claimed for Warburton. The author of the *Remarks* is no doubt speaking of the 1745 edition as "Hanmer 8vo, 1745" only because textually it is clearly a reprint of Hanmer's edition. Here is an example of what the author of the *Remarks* does in the list of emendations on pp. 31–36 of his pamphlet—the note is on *The Tempest*:

Act 4. Sc. 4. This is *strange, vulg. most strange, Hanm.*, p. 56 *Warb.* p. 67

Reference to the 1745 edition (I, 56) shows the emendation "This is most strange" for "This is strange" attributed to Hanmer, and comparison with Warburton's edition reveals Warburton's taking the emendation silently into his text. The emendation does not appear in Pope or Theobald. If Warburton was the editor of the 1745 edition, one must explain why he would attribute these emendations—the example quoted is only one of many such—to Hanmer in that edition, only to print the same emendations in his own text two years later without comment.

There are forty-three other notes and emendations which the author of the *Remarks* accuses Warburton of stealing from Hanmer. In none of these does Warburton acknowledge indebtedness to any previous editor.<sup>21</sup> In another nine notes, the author of the *Remarks* proves over-zealous in his efforts to expose Warburton's thefts from Hanmer. One example will have to suffice. In a note on *Midsummer Night's Dream*, II, I, 48, Hanmer's champion gives a reference to Theobald, as well as to the 1745 edition and to Warburton. Theobald had printed "roasted crab" without bothering to explain "crab" (1733, I, 91), the 1745 edition prints "roasted crab" and explains "crab" as "crab apple" (I, 87), and Warburton prints "roasted crab" (I, 108). This, surely, is not theft.<sup>22</sup> There are three emendations which Warburton incorporates into his edition, offering, in each case, the explanation that Hanmer has agreed with the emendations. The author of the *Remarks* would have us believe that these, too, were stolen from Hanmer and that Warburton is trying to give the impression, in his notes to these emendations, that they were originally his.<sup>23</sup>

There are six more notes in the list of stolen emendations and notes appended by the author of the *Remarks*.<sup>24</sup> All of them deserve comment. Warburton is accused of stealing a note from Hanmer (1745, I, 30)

<sup>21</sup> Compare 1745, I, 43 with 1747, I, 53; 1745, I, 347 with 1747, I, 414; 1745, II, 7 with 1747, II, 100; and 1745, II, 412 with 1747, III, 92. There is no need to list the others; they can easily be checked.

<sup>22</sup> The other eight notes are on the following passages (these references are from the *Remarks*, pp. 31–36): *Midsummer Night's Dream*, V, I; *Much Ado*, II, IX; *Troilus and Cressida*, I, VI and III, VII; *Cymbeline*, IV, V; *Hamlet*, III, II and IV, II; and *Othello*, III, VIII.

<sup>23</sup> See the notes on *Twelfth Night*, IV, III; *1 Henry IV*, I, I; and *Timon*, V, I in the *Remarks*.

<sup>24</sup> It is to be understood that the whole list of stolen emendations is at the back of the *Remarks*; the text of the pamphlet is an attack on Warburton with passages adduced to prove Warburton's guilt. Some of the passages in the text are referred to in the list at the end with the request that the reader go back to the text of the *Remarks*.

which is actually Pope's (1728, I, 32) and so attributed by Warburton in 1747 (I, 38) (*Tempest*, II, I, 248, in *Remarks*—the subsequent references will be to the list in the *Remarks*). Why should Warburton, if he was the 1745 editor, attribute the note to Hanmer in 1745 and then correctly attribute it to Pope in 1747? The 1745 editor (II, 18) prints as Hanmer's a note which mentions Theobald as the originator of the note. Warburton (II, 112) prints the note as his own in 1747 (*Merchant of Venice*, I, III, 135). I can find no evidence that Theobald got this note from Warburton. In Pope (1728, II, 128), the second line of *Richard II*, II, IV, reads "And hardly kept your countrymen together." In 1733 (III, 293) Theobald silently restores "our," the reading of the First Folio. The 1745 edition (III, 229) gives "our" as Hanmer's emendation, and Warburton (1747, IV, 45) prints "our" with no comment. Would Warburton, as editor of the 1745 edition, attribute an "emendation" to Hanmer which was actually Theobald's restoration, and which he, Warburton, was to print silently in his own text? There is an emendation in the 1733 Theobald (VI, 28) which that editor acknowledges, in a note, was suggested to him by Warburton's conjectures (*Coriolanus*, I, IX, 44). The 1745 editor attributes the emendation to Hanmer (V, 106). Warburton prints the emendation as his own in 1747 (VI, 458). Is this not strangely generous of Warburton, if he was the 1745 editor? In *Coriolanus*, IV, V, 78, Theobald (1733, VI, 88) prints "should'st" in his text as an original reading—at least there is no notice taken of the word in any note. The 1745 editor credits Hanmer with the emendation "should'st" for "could'st" (V, 163), and Warburton also prints it in his text, offering no comment (VI, 523). Why should Warburton, Hanmer's enemy, give Hanmer credit for an emendation which is not an emendation at all? The 1745 editor credits Hanmer with another emendation which is, again, not an emendation. The second edition of Pope's *Shakespeare* (1728) includes an emendation on *Othello*, II, I, 315, "right" for "rank." Pope put "rank" in a note as the reading of the first edition (VIII, 356). The 1745 editor attributes the emendation "rank" for "right" to Hanmer (VI, 470), and Warburton prints "ranke" without comment in 1747 (VIII, 315). There is, of course, the possibility that the 1745 editor was unaware that Hanmer was merely restoring the original reading to the text and not making an emendation. We have seen, however, that Warburton correctly attributes a note to Pope in 1747 which had been incorrectly attributed to Hanmer in 1745.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> See above, on *The Tempest*, II, I.

## IV

The evidence of the notes in the *General Dictionary*, the examination of six plays in the 1745 edition, and the comparison of the accusations of the author of the *Remarks* with Warburton's edition of 1747 are of such weight that the theory of Warburton's close connection with the 1745 edition must be discarded. That Warburton *edited* the 1745 edition has, one trusts, been shown to be, at the very least highly questionable. Dr. Dawson has suggested, and one is inclined to agree with him, that the 1745 edition was published as a kind of reprisal for the publication of the 1744 *Shakespeare* which Tonson, owner of the Shakespeare copyright, looked upon as a piracy.<sup>26</sup> It is extremely doubtful, however, that Warburton suggested the addition of the textual apparatus, as Dr. Dawson conjectures,<sup>27</sup> for he would be laying himself open to the kind of attack that was prompt to appear in the *Remarks*. The editor of the 1745 edition evidently knew the fifty emendations that Warburton had sent Theobald in a letter. Dr. Dawson has pointed this out.<sup>28</sup> It is worth remarking that the 1745 editor did not, seemingly, have access to the Warburton-Theobald correspondence, for he gives Theobald credit for a note (I, 562, b) which is based on Warburton's explanation of the words in question years earlier (cf. Nichols, *Illustrations*, II, 242). Warburton did not readily give up his priority in a note or emendation. The only solution consistent with my study of the evidence is that Warburton, whose forthcoming edition of Shakespeare is mentioned in the "Advertisement" in the 1745 edition, allowed himself to be quoted in that "Advertisement," gave the editor or editors notice of some emendations which he wished to claim for himself, and then had nothing else to do with the edition. Who the editor or editors of the 1745 edition are is a question that must continue to remain a mystery until new, conclusive evidence is found.

ARTHUR SHERBO

*University of Illinois*

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 47-48.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45. It must be noted, however, that the *Othello* emendation, "induction" for "instruction," occurs in the *General Dictionary*, to which the 1745 editor refers. I might add that I have come upon one other emendation which the 1745 editor could have known only from the letter in question (compare 1745, VI, 507, n. 7 with Nichols, *Illustrations*, II, 644).