

Johnson's "Shakespeare": The Man in the Edition

Author(s): Arthur Sherbo

Source: *College Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Winter, 1990), pp. 53-65

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25111843>

Accessed: 24-07-2019 16:42 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 <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*The Johns Hopkins University Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *College Literature*

# JOHNSON'S *SHAKESPEARE*: THE MAN IN THE EDITION

by *Arthur Sherbo*

---

Many eighteenth-century editions of Shakespeare make pleasant reading even when the text is ignored and attention is concentrated solely on the commentary. So often the personality of the editor is clearly discernible from the rambling, digressive notes of these eighteenth-century men of letters, some of them devoted amateurs not too much concerned with the profits to be derived from publication. But editorial practices change with the passage of time, and what was once acceptable is now frowned upon. Modern editors are usually cold, efficient, and above all else economical of words. We learn more about Shakespeare's plays from modern editions, but the editors are for all intents impersonal beings. Anyone who has worked closely with Lewis Theobald, William Warburton, and Samuel Johnson as editors of Shakespeare will be able to spot the notes of the respective editors, and each wrote thousands. One hesitates to predict the same success with the notes of twentieth-century Shakespeareans. Dr. Johnson was not entrusted with an edition of Shakespeare because he was adjudged peculiarly equipped for the task; rather the booksellers thought, quite naturally and shrewdly, that the public would be attracted by his name. The public was expected to ask: What does the Rambler have to say about Shakespeare? not: What advances will this edition of Shakespeare make over its predecessors? And when people bought their copy of the edition they looked as much for the "beauties of Johnson" as they did for the "beauties of Shakespeare." There exists a *Beauties of Johnson*; in it one will find many notes from the edition of Shakespeare, culled exactly because they can be exhibited in isolation as "beauties."

Johnson's personality can be seen in a small group of notes which allow glimpses, or half-glimpses, into his life. The notes are few, and their application must necessarily be accompanied by extreme caution. Although, for example, the extent of Johnson's knowledge of works on the supernatural as revealed in the notes in the edition is important and may even make more understandable his interest in the Cock-Lane Ghost affair, this knowledge is not in the form of a direct statement of personal belief or disbelief; our conclusions are based on the implicit statement. Yet William Kenrick, in his vicious *Review of Dr. Johnson's New Edition of Shakespeare* (1765), seizes upon this very question as the basis for one of his sneers. Johnson had written a long note on *The Tempest* in which he showed some knowledge of spirits and the "System of Enchantment" (I, 17, 3).<sup>1</sup> Kenrick says that he would have passed over the note "But as the world hath been pleased very publickly to impute sentiments to him, which seem incongruous with those he here professes, I cannot pass it over without some little animadversion. The incongruity I mean lies here: the Doctor, I have been frequently informed, very religiously believes in the existence of ghosts and apparitions; although he here strongly insinuates that there *never* was any such thing practised as witchcraft" (4). And he ends his comment, after further "animadversions," with a reference to the Cock-Lane Ghost: "Hence, though I should be brought to believe, that our editor did go from Cock-lane to Clerkenwell, to fulfill an appointment with the ghost of Fanny, I cannot possibly suspect him of ever going there purposely to meet the devil" (5). Kenrick is, of course, distorting Johnson's words to fit his purposes and to give him opportunity for another display of wit.

There are, however, many explicit statements in the notes, not often couched in the first-person singular, it is true, but unmistakably the expression of Johnson's personal views, of his conclusions from first-hand experience, and of his prejudices. When he is prompted to a moral utterance by something in the text it is obviously permissible to assume that the observation is not made solely for the occasion, and hence relatively insignificant, but that it represents the commentator's serious conviction. Again the wealth of biographical material that we possess is of great value, allowing us to compare bare editorial statements with the facts of Johnson's life. Sometimes the notes make it possible to reconstruct an incident in Johnson's life and, by way of conjecture that borders on certainty, to supplement the still meagre accounts of some events.

Many of the observations on Johnson's character made by Boswell, to start with certainties, are corroborated by Johnson's own works. That is to say, Johnson's moral nature, his melancholy, and his detestation of dishonesty—to choose a few examples at random—might be deduced from *The Rambler*, *Rasselas*, and the *Letter to the Reverend Mr. Douglas, Occasioned by his Vindication of Milton*. When these same facets of his nature are reflected again and again in other works they are almost as good biographical evidence as Boswell's statements. The presence of notes in the edition of Shakespeare illustrating these and other aspects of Johnson's character make our total picture of him stand out more boldly and clearly.

Johnson's melancholy manifested itself in frequent attacks of hypochondria—the words are actually synonymous in his *Dictionary*—when, for no reason at all, he would fall into a “gloomy, pensive, discontented temper.”<sup>2</sup> One suspects, then, that he was impelled, by psychological necessity, to comment on certain passages that touch upon the subject. Thus his note on the Queen's lines in *Richard II* (II, ii, 30-32),<sup>3</sup> “I cannot but be sad; so heavy-sad,/As, though, on thinking, on no thought I think,/Makes me with heavy nothing faint and shrink,” comes from personal experience of the very feeling expressed by Shakespeare's character. He writes that “the involuntary and unaccountable depression of the mind, which everyone has sometimes felt, is here very forcibly described,” remembering his own state of mind during his attacks of “vile melancholy.”

A regard for truth which sometimes was carried so far as to border on the ridiculous is claimed for Johnson by Boswell. For example, Johnson would retire to his garret without telling his servant so that the latter would not be guilty of falsehood when he told visitors his master was not at home. Johnson's objection, critically justifiable or not, to Hamlet's invoking his madness as excuse for wronging Laertes, is prompted by this consideration: “I wish Hamlet had made some other defence; it is unsuitable to the character of a good or a brave man, to shelter himself in falsehood” (VIII, 303, 1). When Prince John breaks his promise to the rebellious lords (2 *Henry IV*, IV, ii, 112-123), Johnson is shocked into violent objection: “It cannot but raise indignation to find this horrible violation of faith passed over thus slightly by the poet, without any note of censure or detestation” (IV, 317, 6). And when the King exclaims to the conspirators in *Henry V*: “Oh, how hast thou with jealousy infected/The sweetness of affiance!” (*Henry V*, II, ii, 126-127),

Johnson is moved to compliment Shakespeare's judgment: "one of the worst consequences of breach of trust is the diminution of that confidence which makes the happiness of life, and dissemination of suspicion, which is the poison of society" (IV, 392, 1). Equally pertinent are these sentences from a note on the temptation scene in *Othello* (VIII, 397, 1): "Deceit and falsehood, whatever conveniences they may for a time promise or produce, are, in the sum of life, obstacles to happiness. Those who profit by the cheat, distrust the deceiver, and the act by which kindness was sought, puts an end to confidence." Twice (II, 117, 9 and VI, 11, 3) he deprecates the lightness with which vows are made, and it will be recalled that in his conversation he often inveighed against the practice.<sup>4</sup>

Although these notes, and many more like them, do not afford new insights into Johnson's life they are as revealing as anything in *Rasselas* or *The Rambler*. But the few that follow are even more revealing.

During the period Johnson was working on his *Shakespeare* he was arrested for debt. The publisher Jacob Tonson "extricated" him. This occurred in February 1758; two years earlier (March 1756) he had been arrested for a small debt, and Samuel Richardson, responding to his letter for help, secured his release by lending him the money.<sup>5</sup> If Boswell knew of these two arrests, he chose to be silent about them. It is more likely that Johnson told him nothing. There is no note of poignant distress, no hint of personal shame, in the letters Johnson wrote on these two occasions. Are we then to assume that he was indifferent, that his pride suffered no hurt? A debtor's prison was an extremely unpleasant place; the progress of the prisoner to the "spunging house" was not kept secret; considerations of delicacy seem rarely to have occurred to eighteenth-century London bailiffs. There is no evidence that Johnson was in a debtor's prison or even in a "spunging house" either in 1756 or 1758,<sup>6</sup> but a note in his *Shakespeare* leads to the conjecture that he felt keenly the disgrace of being arrested. He may even have been exposed to public view. The note is a remark on the concluding line of Act II of 2 *Henry VI*, Eleanor's words upon her arrest, "Go, lead the way, I long to see my prison." Johnson writes: "This impatience of a high spirit is very natural. It is not so dreadful to be imprisoned, but it is desirable in a state of disgrace to be sheltered from the scorn of gazers" (V, 44, \*). Incidentally, one will find no note on this in the *Arden 2 Henry VI* (1957). Is there, perhaps, some connection between these arrests and

*Idler* No. 22, "Imprisonment of Debtors," which was substituted for the original, satirical essay upon the republication of the periodical in 1761?

In a sense, what I have done with the note quoted above and what I intend to do with succeeding ones is to interfere between the reader and Johnson's commentary, an ungrateful task which others have perhaps wisely shunned. Walter Raleigh's introduction to *Johnson on Shakespeare* concludes with remarks reminiscent of the closing paragraphs of Johnson's *Preface*. Johnson had advocated that the reader "yet unacquainted with the powers of *Shakespeare* . . . read every play from the first scene to the last, with utter negligence of all his commentators." Raleigh, speaking of those notes in the edition which record Johnson's "own tastes and habits," rightly considers it "a privilege to be able to hear him talking without the intervention of Boswell; we can in some ways come closer to him when that eager presence is removed" (xxxix). Raleigh comments on a few of these notes in his introduction, but there is no commentary in the book proper. When he cites a note (VII, 279, 4) on *Cymbeline* in which Johnson voices an eloquent protest against experiments on live animals he justly observes that we cannot find Johnson's views on this matter in Boswell's *Life*. But he forgets *Idler* No. 17 on vivisection and certain passages in the Soame Jenyns review. It is very difficult to say something new about Johnson's life and personality.

One fact for which novelty can be claimed is based upon Johnson's changing attitude toward two earlier editors of Shakespeare. When Johnson published his *Miscellaneous Observations on The Tragedy of Macbeth* in April 1745, Lewis Theobald had been dead less than a year (he died Sept. 18, 1744), and in all probability Johnson's work was started while Theobald was still alive. The third note in the *Miscellaneous Observations* concludes with a compliment to Theobald: "For some of his amendments are so excellent, that, even when he has failed, he ought to be treated with indulgence and respect." The note, minus the concluding compliment, is included in the edition of 1765. And there Theobald suffers more than any other critic in Johnson's commentary, on many occasions being patronizingly addressed as "Poor" Theobald. In the 1756 *Proposals* Johnson had so far disturbed "the manes of Theobald" (his own words)<sup>7</sup> as if to say of him that "if fame be just to his memory" he "considered learning only as an instrument of gain, and made no further inquiry after his author's meaning, when once he had

notes sufficient to embellish his page with the expected decorations.” In Johnson’s *Preface* Theobald is described as “weak and ignorant,” “mean and faithless,” and “petulant and ostentatious.” Theobald had been fair game for others, of course, but Johnson’s *volte face* between 1745 and 1756 is hard to explain without impugning his character. And one is not troubled because Johnson failed to realize, as most others had, that Theobald’s edition was superior to any up to 1765, but rather because he ill-naturedly berated a man, dead for almost ten years, who deserved better treatment at his hands.

Johnson’s reversal of position in regard to Theobald should be compared with his changing attitude to another Shakespearean editor, Sir Thomas Hanmer. After Johnson had finished his notes on *Macbeth* in 1745, Hanmer’s edition “fell into” his hands. His opinion of Hanmer’s performance, based on his reading of *Macbeth* alone, is low indeed. He concludes the *Miscellaneous Observations* by suggesting that Hanmer would have done better to devote himself to the “arts of policy” in which he excelled rather than to meddle in pursuits of which he knew so little. Hanmer died in 1746, and a highly laudatory *Translation of the Latin Epitaph on Sir Thomas Hanmer Written by Doctor Friend* that appeared in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* for May, 1747, has been accepted as Johnson’s by the most recent editors of his poetry.<sup>8</sup> Boswell (*Life*, I, 178) doubts Johnson’s authorship of this *Epitaph*, citing the unfavorable remarks in the *Miscellaneous Observations* as evidence. By 1765, when the *Preface* was written, Johnson, whether he wrote the “Translation” or not, had so far changed his earlier opinion of Hanmer that he praised him highly for his work on Shakespeare. If Johnson was sincere in his praise of Hanmer’s editorial performance, he was guilty of incredibly poor judgment, for Hanmer’s was, and is, one of the worst editions ever to be published. If this praise was dictated by other considerations, Johnson is again placed in an unfavorable light. He turns on “poor,” untitled, unpopular Theobald, after stating that he should be treated with indulgence and respect, and he is suddenly impressed by the abilities of the highly placed and prominent Sir Thomas Hanmer (also recently dead) not too long after refusing to blunt “the weapons of criticism” on him. Possibly these shifts of opinion represent honest reconsideration of the merits of the two men; if so, one is faced with the alternative of an almost inexplicable lapse of critical judgment. What is more, it has been argued that Johnson used the text of the 1757 *Theobald* for much of his

own edition. This smacks too much of unpardonable ingratitude. Joseph Ritson, in his *Remarks, Critical and Illustrative* . . . 1783 (vii), fastened on this: "It were to be wished that Dr. Johnson had shewn somewhat less partiality to *pride of place*; for, though he professes to have treated his predecessors with candour, Theobald, the best of Shakespeares editors, experiences as much scurrility and injustice at his hands, as Hanmer and Warburton, the worst of them, do deference and respect. For this, however, the learned critic might have his private reasons, which, as they could scarcely have justified his conduct, he did right to conceal." Johnson has been too much praised for his expressed intention to forbear the acrimony, invective, and turbulence displayed by earlier editors and critics. His statement to this effect occurs in the Preface, but it seems never properly to have been recognized that the Preface has little to do with the edition, that it was written practically *in vacuo*. The notes in the edition represent what Johnson could do as an editor; the Preface is merely a comprehensive statement, almost nowhere original, of what an editor should do. Judged by the standards of Johnson's Preface, Johnson's edition is a failure.

Does Johnson, to pass on to other matters, ever have anything to say about his physical ailments, those conditions which caused him to present such an awkward spectacle as he made his progress along the streets of London? Are there indications that he felt in himself "the pain of deformity?" There are many references in the *Life* to his convulsive starts, his rolling, his shaking his head and body, as well as to his blowing out his breath, his mutterings and inarticulate sounds, and his talking to himself. He suffered from a compulsion to perform certain almost ritualistic acts such as touching posts and entering or leaving a room in a certain way. He cannot have been unaware of the strangeness of his actions and appearance, and on the one occasion when they were remarked on in his presence he endured their mention with "great gentleness." But it must be remembered that the offender was "a very young girl" (*Life*, IV, 183, n.2). A man as proud and sensitive as Johnson must, however, have felt some distress as a result of his eccentricities. These eccentricities were, nevertheless, forgotten by those who were close to him, since they were more than amply compensated for by his intellectual powers. Johnson was aware that the "deformed" must divert attention away from their deformity, a fact made evident by two notes in his commentary. The expression "pain of deformity" occurs



in one of these (IV, 188, 3) as a part of a comment of Falstaff: "Every man who feels in himself the pain of deformity, however, like this merry Knight, he may affect to make sport with it among those whom it is his interest to please, is ready to revenge any hint of contempt upon one whom he can use with freedom." The second note (V, 173, 4) is on the hunchbacked Richard, Duke of Gloucester's, resolution "to o'er-bear such/As are of better person than myself" (3 *Henry VI*, III, ii, 166-167): "Richard here speaks the language of nature. Whoever is stigmatised with deformity has a constant source of envy in his mind, and would counterbalance by some other superiority these advantages which they feel themselves to want. *Bacon* remarks that the deformed are commonly daring, and it is almost proverbially observed that they are ill-natured. The truth is, that the deformed, like all other men, are displeased with inferiority, and endeavour to gain ground by good or bad means, as they are virtuous or corrupt." And since Richard III, because of his deformity, "cannot prove a lover," he determines "to prove a villain." Johnson comments: "Shakespeare very diligently inculcates, that the wickedness of Richard proceeded from his deformity, from the envy that rose at the comparison of his own person with others, and which incited him to disturb the pleasures that he could not partake." (V, 230, 4). If it be objected that Johnson would not apply the word "deformed" to himself, it must be noted that he thinks of Falstaff's girth as a deformity. Johnson, a virtuous man, endeavoured to gain ground by good means, and if we apply the words of the note to him, we must acquit him of ill-nature. Joseph Wood Krutch, *Samuel Johnson* (New York, 1944) 139, remarks, "Perhaps it has never been sufficiently remarked that one reason for his domineering manner, for his insistence upon winning almost every argument by fair means or foul, is to be sought in his realization that he must dominate any group of which he did not expect to become quickly the butt. In many respects he was made to be laughed at."

Johnson was a proud man throughout his life. A strong feeling of independence made him look with suspicion upon unsolicited favors. James Northcote, Sir Joshua Reynolds' biographer, remembers hearing Reynolds observe "that if any drew Johnson into a state of obligation without his own consent, that man was the first he would affront, by way of clearing off the account."<sup>9</sup> A passage in *I Henry IV* which elicits a remark from Johnson is so like this description of Johnson's pride that it merits full quotation. Worcester speaks:

For, bear ourselves as even as we can,  
 The King will always think him in our debt;  
 And think, we deem ourselves unsatisfy'd,  
 Till he hath found a time to pay us home. (I, iii, 285-8)

Johnson's note (IV, 137, 9), "This is a natural description of the state of mind between those who have conferred, and those that have received, obligations too great to be satisfied," emerges as a personal confession when compared with Reynolds' comment. Possibly the best-remembered anecdote illustrative of Johnson's pride is that of the boots some well-meaning person left outside his door at Oxford. Johnson, only twenty-one then—and who are more proud than the young?—"threw them away with indignation." Possibly this pride of the young, commented on in his edition, "Shame operates most strongly in the earlier years, and when can disgrace be less welcome than when a man is going to his bride?" (III, 461, 1), offers a clue to an unexplained incident of Johnson's marriage. It is not known why the marriage was performed at Derby rather than at Birmingham. Mr. Aley Lyell Reade's explanation is as plausible as any, and is strengthened, I believe, by the note just quoted. Mr. Reade says "Johnson was a young man of twenty-five: Mrs. Porter was a middle-aged woman of forty-six—not the modest forty to which she confessed when the license was applied for. He was practically penniless: she was possessed of a substantial sum of money. We can be extremely tolerant of such events when they have passed into the calms of historic fact, but most of us if alive at the time would have condemned him for cupidity and her for folly. The marriage was probably every whit as distasteful to his relatives as to hers, and both of them would be anxious to have it celebrated on neutral territory."<sup>10</sup> Did the proud young Johnson feel some shame and disgrace when "going to his bride" and therefore resolve that the marriage should take place where he and his bride were not known? In another note in the edition Johnson speaks of the "imprudent generosity of disproportionate marriages" (VIII, 397, 1). Compare also *Rambler* 167, where Johnson has his recently married correspondents say, "Our fortune was equally suitable, so that we meet without any of those obligations, which always produce reproach or suspicion of reproach, which, though they may be forgotten in the gaieties of the first month, no delicacy will always suppress, or of which the suppression must be considered as a new

favour, to be repaid by tameness and submission, till gratitude takes the place of love, and the desire of pleasing degenerates by degrees into the fear of offending.’’

Admittedly, such conjecture about Johnson’s marriage can be regarded only as conjecture; other notes in the edition, however, parallel Johnson’s known sentiments so clearly that there can be little doubt as to their pertinence for this supplementary account of him as a man. Who can refrain from a feeling of pity for Johnson when he reads this note on Henry V’s soliloquy (IV, i, 247 ff.), “There is something very striking and solemn in this soliloquy into which the king breaks immediately as soon as he is left alone; something like this, on less occasions, every breast has felt. Reflection and seriousness rush upon the mind upon the separation of a gay company, and especially after forced and unwilling merriment’’ (IV, 441, 4)? The reluctance with which Johnson allowed company to take their departure is also too well-known to require documentation. His concern for the feelings of servants or dependents, manifested in many acts of consideration towards the members of his household, is also well known. One remembers Frank Barber, blind Mrs. Williams, and Dr. Levett, among those who were the object of Johnson’s regard despite their position of dependency. In *Rambler* 68 he stated that “The highest panegyrick . . . that private virtue can receive, is the praise of servants.’’ And it was precisely this regard for the feelings of his servants that Johnson singled out for praise in the character of Timon. “Nothing contributes more to the exaltation of Timon’s character than the zeal and fidelity of his servants. Nothing but real virtue can be honoured by domesticks; nothing but impartial kindness can gain affection from dependants’’ (VI, 231, \*). “Real virtue’’ and “impartial kindness,’’ these Johnson possessed.

Johnson often remarks that friendship depends on pleasures or interests held in common. The idea finds frequent expression in the *Rambler* (nos. 99 and 160, for example) and is repeated in a note on Falstaff’s soliloquy on the virtue of sack (2 *Henry IV*, IV, iii, 86-125). Falstaff says of Prince John, Hal’s brother, who has just left him, “Good faith, this same young sober-blooded Boy doth not love me; nor a man cannot make him laugh’’ (87-89). Johnson reflects that “Men only become friends by *community of pleasures* (my italics). He who cannot be softened into gayety cannot easily be melted into kindness’’ (IV, 320, 9). Here is one of the essential differences, succinctly expressed, between

Hal and his brother. Boswell reports Johnson as saying that “Many friendships are formed by a *community of sensual pleasures* (my italics) . . . We form many friendships with bad men, because they have agreeable qualities” (*Life*, II, 162) and “Most friendships are formed by caprice or by chance, mere confederacies in vice or leagues in folly” (*Life*, IV, 280). One of the first friends Johnson made in London was Richard Savage. Much has been written about this friendship, and Johnson’s biographers have exercised their ingenuity to account for the great moralist’s sincere attachment for a man who “was marked,” says Boswell, “by profligacy, insolence, and ingratitude” (*Life*, I, 161). Boswell feared that this association “imperceptibly led Johnson into some indulgencies which occasioned much distress to his virtuous mind” (*Life*, I, 163).<sup>11</sup> The number of times that Johnson remarks on pleasures shared in common and agreeable qualities in a man as basis for friendship prompts the belief that these, among others, were the reasons for his association with Savage. They lead further to the conjecture that the dark hints of sexual irregularity in Johnson’s earliest years in London may have some foundation in fact.

Obviously, there can be no suggestion that Johnson’s life is laid bare in the notes to Shakespeare, but, almost as obviously, one cannot dismiss the evidence of his commentary. The temptation to quote more of Johnson’s notes is not easy to resist, but too much of a good thing may cloy the appetite. The danger of making capital of notes that seem to illuminate certain shadowy events in his life is so manifest that it should not be necessary to warn against its indiscriminate practice. Documentation of Johnson’s opinions, moral utterances, predilections, and the like, has for a long time, however, included quotation of pertinent passages from his work—only sometimes from the commentary to Shakespeare’s text. Most scholars, however, have been content to document without reference to the edition of Shakespeare, and it has been my purpose to redirect attention to a fund of information that is, at the very least, highly suggestive.<sup>12</sup>

One last note: Walter Raleigh points to Johnson’s remark on the tailor in *King John* who confused his left and right slippers. “But *Shakespeare*,” Johnson protests, “seems to have confounded a man’s shoes with his gloves. He that is frightened or hurried may put his hand into the wrong glove, but either shoe will equally admit either foot” (III, 475, 2). Raleigh then remarks, “This is a topic which demands, and would

well repay, the expert labours of academic research. Very little is known about Johnson's boots" (*Johnson on Shakespeare*, xxxix). Raleigh had his little joke, but it was not long before Johnson's boots became not only matter for research but for controversy.<sup>13</sup> While the whole matter is sufficiently amusing, it is not without its pertinence, for Johnson himself set store by such trifles in the writing of biography (see *Rambler* No. 60). The important and the trivial—Johnson's melancholy and Johnson's boots—are in the notes to his *Shakespeare*, and it is to them that we must go for revealing side-lights into his life.

### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Reference is to volume, page, and note number of the 1765 edition; the page reference is to the beginning of the note—sometimes a note spreads over three or four pages.

<sup>2</sup> This is the second definition of "melancholy" in the *Dictionary*.

<sup>3</sup> References throughout to Act, Scene, and Line are to the Riverside *Shakespeare* (Boston, 1974).

<sup>4</sup> See *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, ed. G. B. Hill, I, 299, where both notes from the edition are quoted and reference is made to the pertinent passages in the *Life*.

<sup>5</sup> *Letters*, ed. R. W. Chapman, I, 105, and *Life*, ed. Hill-Powell, I, 303, n. 1. "Extricated" is Johnson's.

<sup>6</sup> Boswell (*Life*, III, 195) uses the term "spunging-house," but comparison with his *Notebook* (ed. R. W. Chapman, 1925, 16), the source for the passage in the *Life*, shows that Johnson only told him he had been relieved "from an arrest."

<sup>7</sup> See Johnson's *Shakespeare* (VI, 244, 4).

<sup>8</sup> I have stated my reservations about the authorship of this poem in "Samuel Johnson and Certain Poems in the May 1747 *Gentleman's Magazine*," *RES*, 17 (1966). See also Herman W. Liebert, "Reflections on Samuel Johnson . . .," *JEGP*, XLVII (January 1948): 80-88, esp. 84-86.

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in Boswell's *Life*, III, 345, n. 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Johnsonian Gleanings: Part VI* (1933) 23.

<sup>11</sup> Sir John Hawkins, *Life of Johnson*, 2nd ed., 1787, 89, states that Johnson was temporarily separated from his wife because of this friendship with Savage. See also *Life*, IV, 395-396, and F. A. Pottle in *MLN*, LVI (May 1941): 325-329.

<sup>12</sup> I cannot dismiss this subject without inviting perusal of the following notes: III, 440, 5 and 460, 9; IV, 60, 7 (on sorrow and distress); VIII, 281, 2 (on revision); II, 280, 3 and III, 477, 4 (on guilt); III, 291, 9 (on the "mean" and the "great"); III, 186, \* (on the "unsocial mind"); and I, 456, 6 (on slavery).

<sup>13</sup> See *Notes and Queries* (March 5, 1910): 184-185; (March 26, 1910): 253; (July 18, 1936): 43.

## Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism

Editor: John Gronbeck-Tedesco

Associate Editors: Rosemarie Bank, Charles Berg, David M. Bergeron, John Countryman, Weldon Durham, Roger Gross, Richard Hornby, Felicia Londré, Charles Lyons, David McDonald, Bert States, Patrick White

The *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism* fills a long-time need for a publication which addresses the theoretical issues associated with performance and performance texts. The *Journal* publishes twice each year in the Fall and Spring. *JDTC* publishes a variety of scholarly works and commentary:

- new theories and methodologies pertinent to performance and performance texts
- commentary about such theories or methods
- performance criticism which attempts to yield new insights into theatrical works
- commentaries about criticism
- articles which explore dramatic terms as they are used in fields outside the theatre
- investigations into the history of the subjects enumerated above

Founded in 1986, *JDTC* has attracted essays by major scholars and artists: J. L. Styan, Thomas F. Van Laan, Marvin Carlson, Susan Hollis Merritt, William J. Free, Mary F. Cantanzaro, Hollis Huston, Natalie Crohn Schmitt, Stuart E. Baker, David M. Bergeron, Leonore Lieblein, Catherine Wiley, Joanne Klein, Edith Kern, John A. Degen, Jonathan Beck, Stuart E. Omans, Robert Findlay, Steve Vineberg, Charles Frey

Individuals: \$10.00 / Institutions: \$18.00 / Students: \$8.00  
Orders and inquiries to:

The *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism*  
Department of Theatre and Film  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66045