Notes on "Love's Labour's Lost"

Author(s): H. B. Charlton

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Jan., 1917), pp. 76-78

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713153>

Accessed: 31-10-2015 13:43 UTC

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

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.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

perhaps the point may be more effectively illustrated from colloquial diction. In England (possibly not in America) one may often hear such expressions as these: 'I did not arrive until after closing-time,' 'The vacation extends from before Midsummer to after Michaelmas,' 'I have not seen him since before last Christmas but one.' There are here no compound prepositions; and assuredly there are no such compound substantives as *after-closing-time*, *before-Midsummer*, *after-Michaelmas* and *before-last-Christmas-but-one*. It was probably from constructions more or less analogous to these that compound prepositions were evolved such as *at-after*, *an-under*, and Old English *on-būtan* and *a-bufan*. We can sometimes see the development in progress. Milton's 'from under ashes' (*S.A.* 1691) is clearly to be analysed as preposition + phrase; but in modern use *from under* often comes very near to being a compound preposition.

It seems to me that Professor Emerson has entirely failed in his attempt to carry back the record of the compounds *after-dinner* and *after-supper* to the fourteenth century, and to prove that *aftermete* and *after-Easter* ever were English words.

HENRY BRADLEY.

OXFORD.

NOTES ON 'LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST.'

Act I, sc. 2, 183.

'The first and second cause.' Halliwell's note on this is as follows: 'The "cause" of quarrel was a technical term in the then noble science of defence. In the second book of *Honor and Honorable Quarrels*, 1594 [i.e. Vincentio Saviolo, *His Practise, in two booke: the first intreating of the use of the Rapier and Dagger, the second of Honour and Honourable Quarrels*, 1594-5], the causes in which "combats ought to bee graunted" are reduced to two:—"I will onely treat of that which I shall judge meetest by a generall rule to bee observed, and include all combats under two heads. First, then, I judge it not meet that a man should hazard himselfe in the perill of death, but for such a cause as deserveth it, so as if a man be accused of such a defect as deserve to bee punished with death, in this case combate might bee graunted. Againe, because that in an honourable person, his honor ought to be preferred before his life, if it happen him to have such a defect laid against him, as in respect thereof he were by lawe to be accounted dishonorable, and should therefore be disgraced before the tribunall

seate, upon such a quarrell my opinion is that hee be not able by lawe to clere himselfe thereof; and except a quarrell be comprehended under one of these sortes, I doe not see how any man can, by reason or with his honor, either graunt or accompanye another to the fight.” On Halliwell’s note and extract, Furness comments thus: ‘This quotation seems hardly apposite. Unquestionably, two causes of quarrels are here given, but they have not the conciseness that we expect, and are not laid down explicitly as “the first” and “second cause.” I doubt that these are the causes in Armado’s mind. It is possible that there is a book where Shakespeare found the various causes of quarrels clearly defined, but this book has not yet been discovered, or, at least, no quotation that is exactly appropriate has yet been furnished by any commentator’ (*New Variorum Ed.*). Hart (*The Arden Shakespeare*, Methuen, 1906) agrees that Halliwell’s quotation ‘is not satisfactory,’ and that Furness is certainly right in his supposition that ‘there may be a book not yet discovered, where these causes of quarrel are clearly defined’: he hazards the guess that it may be the apparently non-extant *Grammar of Quarrels*, by Carranza, probably an English translation of this same Carranza’s *De la Filosofia de las Armas*, etc., 1569, 1592.

The difficulty is, of course, that Halliwell’s quotation from Saviolo is not ‘exactly appropriate,’ since it does not concisely limit the causes of quarrel to two explicit ones—an explicit limitation which the phrase in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* and the identical one in *Romeo and Juliet*, ii, 4. 26, obviously require. I believe, however, I have found the ‘appropriate’ quotation, without invoking the hypothetical translation of Carranza. Shakespeare’s source was nearer at hand; indeed Halliwell was very near it, for it is to be found in a book which Saviolo had under his nose when he wrote his *Practise*, as may be seen by comparing Halliwell’s extract from him with the extract quoted below. In *The Booke of Honor and Armes*, attributed to Sir Wm Segar, and published in 1590, we find (p. 22): ‘I say then that the causes of al quarrell wherevpon it behoueth to vse the triall of Armes, may be reduced into two: for it seemeth to me not reasonable, that any man should expose himselfe to the perill of death, save onelie for such occasions as doo deserue death. Wherefore whensoever one man doth accuse another of such a crime as meriteth death, in that case the Combat ought bee graunted. The second cause of Combat is Honor, because among persons of reputation, Honor is preferred before life.’

This limits the ‘causes’ definitely to two, concisely enunciates

both, and expressly calls the one of them the 'second' cause; it seems to have the requisite qualities which Hart and Furness find wanting in Halliwell's quotation. There can be little doubt that it supplies the 'first and second cause' to *Love's Labour's Lost* and to *Romeo and Juliet*: moreover, it puts these 'causes' in a different category from the 'seventh cause' of *As You Like It*, v, 4. 69, which is due, not to Segar, but to Saviolo.

A further, and much more important, consideration is that if *The Booke of Honor and Armes* is accepted as the source of the phrase in question, the date of *Love's Labour's Lost* is definitely not before 1590.

Act v, sc. 2, 650 etc.

Commentators, and notably the best of them, Hart, have pointed out that 'A gilt nutmeg' and 'A lemon stuck with cloves,' both of them here mentioned humorously as gifts from 'armipotent Mars' to Hector, are frequently referred to in contemporary letters as drinking perquisites. But apparently no commentator has explained why such things are dragged in here as part of Mars' gift to Hector. An examination of the multitude of puns, quibbles, word-plays and sound-plays, and the shifts to which Shakespeare will resort to obtain them in *Love's Labour's Lost*, has convinced me that the cause of their insertion is an implied quibbling on 'armipotent,' based on its sound-similarity to a number of the Elizabethan words connected with *potation*, of which many were in current use as tipping terms: cf. *pottle* (*Merry Wives* ii, 1. 222, *Othello* ii, 3. 88), *pottle-pot* (2 *Henry IV* ii, 2. 86), *pottle-deep* (*Othello* ii, 3. 57, 'hath...carous'd Potations pottle-deep'). Hence the quibble would be easily suggested: and indeed a similar one occurs more explicitly in *Othello* ii, 3. 80, 'potent in potting' (*i.e.* in tipping).

H. B. CHARLTON.

MANCHESTER.

TWO NOTES ON THE FIRST FOLIO OF SHAKESPEARE.

[Shortly before his sudden and lamented death Mr Guthkelch had sketched these two Notes. I have prepared them for publication, making some changes in places where I was sure of the writer's intention, and adding the notes enclosed in square brackets. I was asked to do this because he had spoken to me about the facts concerning *King Lear* to which attention is drawn in Note II., and I had supplied him