



## Lewis Theobald

Edward B. Koster

To cite this article: Edward B. Koster (1922) Lewis Theobald, *English Studies*, 4:1-6, 20-60

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00138382208596434>



Published online: 13 Aug 2008.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1



View related articles [↗](#)

The question is naturally asked how it is that the nominative with infinitive is not used with verbs of wishing. The answer cannot be that the nominative with infinitive in English is only an apparent one, for the genuine construction has been shown to occur. But it seems to follow from the facts mentioned that the genuine nominative with infinitive is only used in the case of verbs that can take an apparent (i.e. analysable) accusative with infinitive. The construction, therefore, is one step behind the development of the corresponding active construction.

It is natural to consider, in this connection, the similar constructions with the present participle. Such a sentence as *I saw him looking at a dead flower* may be turned into the passive: *He was seen looking at a dead flower* (*Handbook*, 695). But it is clear that the nominative with present participle occurs only in the case of verbs that have an apparent accusative with participle, i.e. in cases when the accusative can be analysed as an object. At any rate I have not observed the construction with *to have*, *set*, *like*, *want*, etc. (*Handbook*, 694). As far as I know, therefore, the nominative with participle is one step behind the corresponding infinitive-construction: the genuine nominative never occurs at all.

A third construction that might be examined is what has been called the *accusative with gerund*, whether plain gerund (*Excuse me getting up*) or prepositional gerund (*Excuse me from getting up*)<sup>1</sup>. It is evident that a passive construction is possible here, so that an apparent nominative with gerund is certainly quite common. But I hardly think the genuine construction is found in English, although a construction like: *The Bill was prevented from becoming law by the factious opposition of irresponsible men*, might be passed as correct English. If this should be true, we could conclude that the nominative with gerund is as far advanced as the nominative with infinitive.

E. KRUISINGA.

## Lewis Theobald.

*Lewis Theobald*: His Contribution to English Scholarship with some Unpublished Letters by RICHARD FOSTER JONES, PH. D. New York, Columbia University Press, 1919. \$ 2.00.

This book, a volume of the Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, is the latest tribute<sup>2</sup>) to the work of the Porson of Shakespearean criticism, as Theobald was afterwards called, when his reputation as a scholar had recovered from the virulent and slanderous attacks of the "little crooked thing", Alexander Pope. It also sets up the thesis that the basic principles of critical editing in English were derived directly from the method employed by Bentley in the classics.

I could a tale unfold, an enormous, labyrinthine, extensive one, like the tail of a long lost saurian of palaeontologic fame, if I attempted to follow the subject of Dr. Foster Jones's study throughout all the vicissitudes and adventures of his busy life as they are depicted in the more than two hundred and fifty pages,

<sup>1</sup>) *Lessons in English Grammar* by E. Kruisinga and J. H. Schutt, p. 71.

<sup>2</sup>) For earlier works recognizing the merits of Theobald as a textual critic the reader is referred to Karl Elze, *Grundriss der englischen Philologie* (2e Aufl. 1889); Bülbring, *Wege und Ziele der englischen Philologie* (1893); Lounsbury, *First Editors of Shakespeare* (1906); Dennis, *Age of Pope* (1909), etc.

minus the four appendices which give a sum total of 355 pages, of the volume before us. Avoiding all irrelevant details I hope to give the main features of Theobald's labours and experiences.

To begin *ab ovo*, Lewis Theobald was born in the early part of 1688 in Sittingbourne, Kent, where according to a contemporary biography his father was an eminent attorney. He was named after a friend of the family, Lewis Watson, Earl of Rockingham, who made his namesake companion to his son, Viscount Sondres, at a school conducted by the Rev. Mr. Ellis at Isleworth in Middlesex. The apparently thorough instruction received here was improved by a sojourn passed under the roof of his kinsman, John Glanville of Broadhurst, Wiltshire, and in appreciation of this kindness Theobald dedicated to him his first attempt at poetry, a Cowleyan Pindaric in praise of the union of Scotland and England, as well as his translation of Aristophanes' *Clouds*.

At some date not later than 1708 Theobald removed to London, where he followed his father's profession. His practice, however, which was more profitable in the latter part of his life, was neither so interesting nor extensive as to prevent his engaging in various literary activities, the most noteworthy of which were translations. In 1713 Bernard Lintot paid him five guineas for a translation of Plato's *Phaedo*, and in the same year he entered into a contract with Lintot to translate all the tragedies of Aeschylus for the modest sum of ten guineas. Though none of the plays was published, evidence seems to show that the work was completed a year or two after the contract was made, the only results however of this enterprise that are left us are a few selections in *The Censor* and *The Grove*, contemporary periodicals, some emendations contributed to a magazine of the day, and those of his notes written in his edition of the dramatist by Stanley, which Bloomfield<sup>1)</sup> inserted in his edition of Aeschylus. In the spring of 1714 he entered into another contract with Lintot to translate the whole of the *Odyssey*, and the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Oedipus Coloneus*, *Trachiniae*, and *Philoctetes* of Sophocles, together with explanatory notes, into English blank verse. He also contracted to translate the satires and epistles of Horace into English rhyme. For the translations of Homer and Sophocles he was to receive fifty shillings for every 450 lines, while for Horace the price was one guinea for every 120 lines. While Theobald may have translated the four tragedies mentioned above, only one, the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, was published, (1715). The next year, however, Lintot published a translation by Theobald of Sophocles' *Electra*, a play not mentioned in the contract. This was dedicated to Addison, whose friendship the translator enjoyed. Then Theobald turned from tragedy to comedy, and in 1715 appeared his English versions of Aristophanes' *Clouds* and *Plutus*. Of the satires and epistles of Horace no translation appeared, and Theobald's only work in the Latin poets was a version of the first book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, a poet who was almost as popular as Horace. His next work in the classics is an historical romance garnered from Galen, Appian, Lucian, Julian, and Valerius Maximus, entitled *The History of the Loves of Antiochus and Stratonice*, London, 1719, the last translation of Theobald, the *Hero and Leander* of the mythical Musaeus, appearing in *The Grove*, 1721.

A modern critic, John Churton Collins, calls Theobald's translations meritorious, and speaks of the "free and spirited blank verse" of the version of Sophocles and the "vigorous and racy colloquial prose" of the rendering of the two plays of Aristophanes. But not long after his death there was an

<sup>1)</sup> I believe this should be Blomfield.

attempt to depreciate the worth of his work. The effect of *The Dunciad* grew with the years, and Pope's slanders were perpetuated by Warburton and Johnson. In 1753 Professor Thomas Franklin issued a long poem called *Translation*, in which amongst other things the following occurs:

The great translator bids each dunce translate,  
And ranks us all with Tibbald and with Tate.

The Genius of Greece is invoked against the ravages and misdeeds of "Tibbald", as Theobald was called by his persecutors:

Genius of Greece, do thou my breast inspire  
With some warm portion of the poet's fire,  
From hands profane defend his much-lov'd name,  
From Cruel Tibbald wrest his mangled frame.

In 1707 Theobald's first attempt at poetry appeared, a Pindaric ode on the union of Scotland and England. Six years later he published *The Mausoleum*, a poem written in heroic couplets and dedicated to Charles, Earl of Orrery. According to Dr. Jones this is a lugubrious effort, stilted and affected, and full of praise for Pope and Addison. In 1715 Theobald translated Le Clerc's observations on Addison's travels, prompted by his admiration for the subject of the treatise. In the same year he wrote a poem on the recovery of the Duke of Ormonde from a dangerous illness, and in this year likewise his most ambitious attempt in verse was published, *The Cave of Poverty*, in imitation of Shakespeare. Professor Lounsbury in his *Text of Shakespeare*, p. 184, comments as follows upon this poem: "The truth is that the production throughout adopts and reflects Shakespeare's phraseology. There is frequently in it a faint echo of his style, and of the peculiar melody of his versification. Such characteristics could have been manifested only by one who had become thoroughly steeped in his diction, and especially in that of his two principal poems. These were so far from being well known at that time that they were hardly known at all". More influences are apparent in the poem: Ovid and Spenser.

Early in 1715 Theobald began the publication of a triweekly periodical, *The Censor*, fashioned after the *Spectator*. This ran for thirty numbers, from April 11 to June 17. It then suspended publication until January 1, 1717, when it again appeared and continued to June 1, ending with the ninety-sixth number. Theobald attributed the failure of the undertaking to its following "too close upon the Heels of the inimitable *Spectator*". Although Theobald has fared badly enough at the hands of Pope and succeeding generations, yet another attempt has been made to find an attack on him in Parnell's *Life and Remarks of Zoilus* appended to a translation of the *Batrachomyomachia*, 1717. Goldsmith appears to be the original authority for the idea that the satire was written at the request of Parnell's friends to whom Pope belonged, and directed against Theobald and Dennis. But probably Zoilus stands for Bentley, as this nickname was most frequently applied to the great critic. There is nothing in the production satirically appropriate to Theobald at that time, and probably Pope had never heard of him. In 1719 Theobald wrote a life of Sir Walter Raleigh, which seems a rather bald production, and two years later he collected and published a volume of miscellanies, *The Grove; or a Collection of Original Poems, Translations, etc.*, containing his translations from Sophocles, Aeschylus, and Musaeus, and a few of his poems; two prologues, one spoken by Mr. Keene, the other occasioned by his death; and a poem, *To Cloe, upon her Retreat at Fulham*. The collection is remarkable in that it contains Dr. Bentley's only attempt at verse, a poem entitled *A Reply* and dealing with the hardships incurred by scholars.

From the very beginning of his career the future editor of Shakespeare was interested in the drama. As early as 1708 his *Persian Princess* was acted at Drury Lane, when he was only twenty years of age. In 1715 he published a tragedy, *The Perfidious Brother*, which does its author even less credit than his previous play. On December 10, 1719, Theobald's adaptation of Shakespeare's *Richard II* was performed at Lincoln's Inn Fields, and met with some success, being acted seven times. In his alterations he omitted Acts I and II, with the exception of some speeches which he transposed, and introduced a love story. Genest points out in his *History of the English Stage* one absurdity into which Theobald fell, and thinks his additions are flat and his alteration on the whole is a very bad one; but considerably more than half the play is Shakespeare's. Some of Theobald's lines seem to be very good; in fact, they form the best poetry he wrote, and show clearly how closely he had studied Shakespeare.

During Theobald's lifetime there arose a new species of entertainment known as the pantomime. The first to claim credit for introducing these performances into England was John Weaver, a dancing master, and in 1716 John Rich followed in his footsteps. In the constructing of these pantomimes Theobald was very closely associated with his friend, John Rich. Previously he had composed several trivial pieces, all presented at Lincoln's Inn Fields. One was a one-act opera, *Pan and Syrinx*, produced in 1717, but he began his pantomimes in 1725 with *Harlequin Sorcerer, with the Loves of Pluto and Proserpine*, which drew crowded houses even after its revival at Covent Garden in 1753. After the production of other works of this nature, amongst which *The Rape of Proserpine* which was extremely popular, Theobald's last pantomime *Orpheus and Eurydice, an Opera*, was produced at Covent Garden in 1740, but had been published the preceding year. It appears to have been very successful. On the whole it is in his translations that the Theobald of this first literary period is seen at his best. Most of his dramatic ventures were adaptations or reworkings. His best poem is an avowed imitation. His interest in the Greek drama was genuine and intelligent.

Theobald marks the beginning of a new era in Shakespearean textual criticism. Adequate recognition of his work on Shakespeare has been slow in coming, but now his reputation is fairly well established. In his method he plainly follows Richard Bentley, the greatest classical scholar of his age, famous for his amazingly clever and thorough *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris*, the *Epistle to Mill*, his edition of Horace etc. The pages of his *Epistle* and *Dissertation* are strewn with emendations, and he is *facile princeps* amongst his contemporaries in textual criticism. Bentley may well be considered the first modern scholar, for the elements underlying his scholarship are still operative. The spirit of modern scholarship is the desire to gain with minute accuracy all the information and evidence on the subject of the investigation, arranged and ordered in its proper relations. Imbued with this spirit Bentley, instead of losing himself in a maze of unorganized knowledge, learned to systematize his material in such a way that he could focus upon a point, however minute, almost all that could throw any light upon it. He had perfect command over the materials of his learning, and built up his proofs with all the sureness and accuracy of a master builder. There had been scholars of as great if not greater erudition, but none whose reasoning was so close and clear. Whether he is eradicating a textual error, controverting atheists, or establishing the spuriousness of the Phalaris letters, the same powerful analytical spirit is active. Moreover he insists on minute accuracy, and this insistence upon "trifles" was the ground of the

bitterest attacks on him as a pedant. His enemies believed that only the large things, such as sentiment and philosophy, were of importance. Another feature of this minute study that attracted the scorn of the wits was the establishment of chronology to which Bentley had paid considerable attention in his dissertation. Bentley used his extensive learning, not to express a general view of antiquity, but to establish some particular point. He was master of his knowledge, and wielded it with ruthless logic toward the correction of error and the establishment of truth. In comparing Bentley with Scaliger Jebb says: "While Scaliger had constantly before him the conception of antiquity as a whole to be mentally grasped, Bentley's criticism rested on a knowledge more complete in detail; it was also conducted with a closer and more powerful logic." Bentley began an epoch; he established a new school of criticism, to which the greatest scholars of later times have belonged. But like most men who have something to say, Bentley has *les défauts de ses qualités*. While his *Horace* shows his critical method on a large scale and in a most striking form, it illustrates his defects as conspicuously as his strength. The defect was a readiness, doubtless engendered by previous success in corrupt Greek texts, to correct, by strict logic and the normal usage of words, passages which made very good meaning as they stood — a readiness that proved disastrous to Bentley because he possessed a *iudicium logicum* rather than *iudicium poeticum*. I remember my former master of Greek, who was indeed a master of Greek, Professor Cobet, speaking of Bentley in the highest terms of praise and admiration, and holding up to us for emulation the three great R's of English classical scholarship, Richard Bentley, Richard Dawes, and Richard Porson. I also remember how he used to scoff at the exaggerated authority certain scholars would profess for the ancient manuscripts, fearing to alter anything *adversus fidem veterum membranarum*. But he also had his limitations. He had a supreme contempt for the comparative study of languages, which he nicknamed „taalvergelijkerij," and once I heard him say to a student: "If you don't know *that*, you had better go and study English." And to write this in a periodical called *English Studies*!

We should not profess a too great reverence for ancient texts and manuscripts, but approach them with some suspicion; on the other hand the distrust of accepted readings may become a sort of psychological prepossession. Men sought for faults, and because they read texts with this idea in mind, discovered many absurdities that were merely their own hallucinations. They were obsessed with an idea of faulty texts. It became a kind of mania.

There were several factors at work fostering this rage for emending. The success and convincing nature of Bentley's method inspired scholars with a sincere faith in the efficacy of conjectural criticism. Thirlby says in the dedication to his *Justin Martyr* that he would not place criticism lower than any art either in dignity of matter or utility of gift, and writing in *The Censor*, April 20, 1715, Theobald expresses his regard for antiquity and criticism. He is describing the volumes on the shelves of his study and *inter alia* he says: "In opposite Columns to these stand the Restorers of ancient Learning who are continually snatching delicious Morsels from the Mouth of Time, and forcing that general Robber to a Restitution of his ill-gotten Goods.... When upon stumbling over the first Shelves I have discovered an uncommon Beauty and Strength of Wit in an imperfect Paragraph, I grieve as much that I cannot recover the Whole, as a brave man would for the Amputation of a Limb, from a strong and vigorous Body that had done his country great Services, and seemed to promise it

yet greater. If upon these Occasions any of the learned happen to have supplied that Defect, by restoring a maimed Sentence to its original Life and Spirit, I pay him the same Regard as the ancient Romans did to one who has preserved the life of a fellow-citizen." Emending had also a great fascination, and presented all the attractions of a puzzle in seeing what can be substituted and still satisfy the requirements of the passage. Men engaged in it as a *tour de force*. This fascination grew so strong as to be almost irresistible, as is well testified to by Bentley's *Milton*, which proved as great a failure as his *Horace* had been a success.

Immediately after the publication of Bentley's *Horace* a small host of pamphlets was issued, directed against Bentley in particular and emendatory criticism in general. As long as Bentley had confined his labours to such writers as Malalos, Phalaris, Menander, and Philemon, he was beyond the ken of many of the wits, but when he laid hands upon Horace, he was desecrating the popular idol. Horace was immensely popular in that time, people quoted him freely, travelled with their Horace in their pocket or portmanteau, and one Dr. Douglas is described as regularly Horace-mad. Satires on Bentley's edition were forthcoming, one of them in poetic form containing the lines :

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  
Smil'd to survey a rival's doom,  
While they possessed the envied room . . . .

Le Clerc, at this time Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Amsterdam, who had reasons for disliking Bentley, issued a restrained pamphlet against him, which was straightway translated into English and published in London. Bentley's *Horace* awakened the slumbering resentment against conjectural criticism ; while attacks at first were generally levelled against him for his boldness, this feeling gradually extended against all performers in the field. And for successive years "the noise of battle roll'd" between the wits and the "pedants", both of them obstinately clinging to their own views, and often heaping personalities and abuse upon one another. But although the opposition to this peculiar study was energetic enough and indulged in by the foremost wits of the time, ultimately their attacks failed, Bentley's labours reaching their flower in Porson, and Theobald's in the later capable critics of Shakespeare.

In an age so obsessed with the idea of correcting and so prodigal of praise, as well as blame, for the corrector, it was only natural that sooner or later the critical spirit should break through classical bounds and seek unconquered worlds beyond. Shakespeare was the first to attract attention. Here was a rich field for the textual critic and the reward promised to be proportioned to the popularity of the poet, the progress of the originally poor text through four folios having left the plays in a worse condition than many manuscripts of the classics. Here then was an opportunity of reaping fame and distinction, and it was as if the spirit of the time urged the learned scholars to devote their energies to him who was for all time. Dr. George Sewell remarks after mentioning the critical care expended upon classical authors: "What then has been done by the really Learned

to the dead languages, by treading backward into the Paths of Antiquity and reviving and correcting good old Authors, we in Justice owe to our great Writers, both in Prose and Poetry. They are in some degree our Classics; on their foundations we must build, as the Formers and refiners of our Language." But if the similarity between the classics and Shakespeare's text was noticed, it was not until two editions had been printed that the classical method was applied. Rowe suggested comparing the text with earlier editions, but seems to have based his chiefly on the fourth folio. While some of his emendations have proved satisfying, and while he rendered real service in giving the lists of *dramatis personae* to the plays lacking them, as well as dividing some of the plays into acts and scenes, his edition was not a critical one. Pope's edition, 1725, represents a more critical treatment of the text. One portion of an editor's duty, the most important, he recognized and clearly stated, that of collating the text with the old copies. But this for the greater part he failed to do although possessing, according to his own word, the means. When it came to the removing of obscurity either by explanation or conjecture, he failed signally. For this task there is needed the most critical spirit and the broadest knowledge of Elizabethan and pre-Elizabethan literature. Pope lacked both. Emendations he did make, but the majority were adopted to reduce Shakespeare's metre to eighteenth-century regularity. He evidently felt nothing of the rugged grandeur of Shakespeare's rhythm. For the rest of his conjectures he was wholly dependent upon his judgment, and anything that did not appeal to his taste ran the risk of being relegated to the bottom of the page. Unwilling as he was to collate carefully, he must have been all the more unwilling to investigate, analyze, and study corrupt passages, or undertake to become familiar with the literature current in Shakespeare's time. Nor does he seem to have made any study of the peculiarities of Shakespeare's grammar or diction. The only supports of his critical method are collation, carelessly followed, metrical skill, and taste. A few of his emendations based upon taste have found their way into most modern editions, as well as a larger number of his metrical emendations; yet these are upheld by no evidence, and draw on no authorities. Elsewhere we find even his judgment unsafe, and we perceive no inclination to scrutinize carefully every doubt and draw out stores of knowledge to remove it. But of course there were found, as always, interested persons and flatterers, belonging to a special literary set or clique, willing to hail Pope's edition as a sort of master-stroke, and William Broome, who was employed by Pope in making extracts from Eustathius for the notes to his translation of the *Iliad*, broke forth into a rapturous, not to say hysterical panegyric,

Shakespere rejoice! his hand thy Page refines,  
Now every Scene with native Brightness shines.<sup>1)</sup>

Pope's edition however brought forth the first truly critical work on Shakespeare. This was Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored: or a Specimen of the Many Errors, as well committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope In his*

<sup>1)</sup> Pope however was not exceedingly grateful, as will happen in circumstances of this kind. All literatures may afford examples of the same behaviour. In his *Bathos* Pope describes Broome as one of those "parrots who repeat another's words in such a hoarse odd tone as makes them seem their own", and in *The Dunciad* he has the following reference to him "Hibernian politics, O Swift, thy doom  
And mine, translating ten whole years with Broome."



*Late Edition of this Poet Designed Not only to correct the said Edition, but to restore the True Reading of Shakespeare in all the Editions ever yet publish'd.* The book appeared in March 1726, and is a large quarto volume, dedicated to John Rich and containing 194 pages. The first 132 are in large print, and are devoted primarily to *Hamlet*. The rest, under the title of Appendix, is in smaller print, and contains remarks on nearly all the plays. *The Merchant of Venice* and *Troilus and Cressida* lead the list with five remarks each, while *Macbeth* and *Coriolanus* follow next with four each. A number of the plays are commented on only once. The first half of the Appendix is devoted to showing Pope's mistakes under these heads: emendation where there is no need of it; maiming the author by unadvised degradations; bad choice in various readings and degradation of the better word; and mistakes in giving the meaning of words. Besides this the critic shows Pope's mistakes in pointing and "transpositions", and the inaccuracies due to inattention to Shakespeare and history. The rest of the "Appendix" from page 165 to the end, is devoted entirely to emendations. The nature of each remark is designated in the margin, so that the reader may be apprised of the content, by such terms as "false printing", "false pointing", "various reading", "passage omitted", "conjectural emendation", "emendation", and the like. There are nearly a hundred corrections on *Hamlet* and a few over a hundred on the other plays. The only plays not mentioned by Theobald are *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *As You Like it*, and *Twelfth Night*.

Theobald was unusually well equipped for the office of a textual critic on Shakespeare. He was somewhat of a poet, he possessed a tireless industry, he was thoroughly conversant with the stage, he had an intimate knowledge of Shakespeare's thought and diction, and last of all he had a wide knowledge of the classics and the methods of classical scholarship. On one phase of classical scholarship, the most prevalent during this time, Theobald placed great value, viz. textual and verbal criticism, and furthermore he was intimately acquainted with the work of the great textual critic Bentley. He models his edition of Shakespeare upon Bentley's Amsterdam Horace. In upholding the value of literal criticism he appeals to Bentley's success. Having recognized the similarity between the state of the text of Shakespeare and that of the text of Greek and Latin authors, Theobald applied the classical method to it, which had been heralded by Bentley. A comparison of a few of Theobald's notes with some of Bentley's shows conclusively that the former was consciously imitating the method of the latter. In following Bentley's lead and example Theobald himself put up an example to others, and it would appear as if he said to himself:

Grow great by your example and put on  
The dauntless spirit of resolution.

The author gives several instances of the close coincidence and conformity of Bentley's and Theobald's remarks. Theobald's notes easily fall into the divisions made for classical textual criticism — the critical doubt, emendation, and conjectural criticism. He scrutinizes the text with critical care, and produces his proofs with learning and logic. There is no jumping at conclusions, neither is there any blind acceptance of unintelligible passages, but in their stead a careful weighing of evidence, a logical handling of facts towards the ascertaining of a corruption, just as Bentley's grammatical criticism contains the very same elements.

Like Bentley Theobald also uses historical criticism a great deal, and by his knowledge of history and mythology he is able to correct several blunders

of Pope's. Both Theobald and Bentley make bold to engage in aesthetic criticism, the most dangerous of the three: *periculosae plenum opus aleae*. Here it would not be rash to grant the Shakespearean critic precedence over the classical scholar. The logical nature of Bentley's mind, which was of so much assistance in establishing fact and restoring meaning to unintelligible passages, was more of a hindrance than a help in judging literature by artistic standards. He could not overcome the tendency to inject logical consistency into a poetical passage. The shining example in this respect is his edition of Milton, where his notes are logical enough, but with a logic that makes poetry prose. Aesthetic criticism requires more than knowledge, more than logic. It requires a certain innate perception, nourished by a close and sympathetic study of the best in literature. An aesthetic critic must be a potential artist. Here Theobald shows his superiority. He was a poet, poor indeed, but with judgment superior to his accomplishments. His criticisms are worth reading when he speaks of a passage as possessing energy or elegance, as being bald and mean, marred by tautology or indifferent English.

In the actual emendation the two critics both show almost uncanny sagacity. Though Bentley evinces in his notes more learning and sheer mental power, Theobald's emendations give just as clear proof that he was possessed of that peculiar indefinable gift necessary to any great corrector. Furthermore Theobald has more respect for manuscript authority than Bentley (the earlier editions of Shakespeare corresponding to the manuscripts of classical authors). However, as regards manuscript assistance, Bentley was far more fortunate than Theobald in his *apparatus criticus*. Many are the manuscripts and editions of Horace that figure in his notes. Theobald on the other hand, had to rely for his remarks on *Hamlet* on the second folio, the 1637 quarto, a 1703 quarto, and Hughes' quarto. For part of his work he had an opportunity of examining the fourth folio. For the rest of the plays he had to content himself with the folios just mentioned, the 1600 quarto of *Much Ado About Nothing*, the 1611 quarto of *Titus Andronicus*, and a 1655 quarto of *Lear*. He also, perhaps, derived some slight help from later alterations of the plays.

Theobald's lack of knowledge of the literature of Shakespeare's age was a serious defect in his method, but it was in overcoming this deficiency that his edition of Shakespeare makes a pronounced advance over his first critical effort.

The work is also unique for its time in that it is permeated by a sincere desire for truth rather than victory, a desire that makes the critic confess and correct a mistake made on an earlier page. There is a ring of sincerity in the statement, "Whenever I am mistaken, it will be a Pleasure to me to be corrected, since the Public will at the same Time be undeceived". Though he speaks of the "Applause of the Readers" and implies that he acted on a "View of Reputation", he did not let his desire for glory overcome his love for truth. Yet the very novelty of the undertaking made him regard the outcome with some trepidation. Knowing of the attacks that had been made upon the mighty Bentley and the Royal Society, it is no wonder he felt that he ran a risk. He was somewhat doubtful of the way Pope would receive his book, but was fatuous enough to rely upon the generosity of a man whose regard for Shakespeare and truth was considerable less than his vanity.

From all these statements and observations it may easily be concluded that Theobald's work was of great significance for the study of Shakespeare; he brought to the study of English letters the spirit and the method of

sound scholarship, and he showed by the favour with which his book was received that English writers were worthy of the same study given to the classics. Later we find him turning his attention to Greek and Latin writers, who from days immemorial had been the source and object of investigation. Yet during the first quarter of the eighteenth century the researches of Bentley had been subjected to the bitterest taunts of the wits. If such were the attitude toward Bentley, what would it be toward one who brought Bentley's method to bear on an English poet? Yet Theobald's effort met with wider and more complete favour than Bentley's *Dissertation on Phalaris*. Only the persistent virulence of Pope and the misrepresentation of his later admirers succeeded in belittling the critic's work. At the time, *Shakespeare Restored* met with great success, and this, together with the convincing nature of Theobald's remarks, influenced others to turn their attention to English writers. Theobald came to be known as "the author of *Shakespeare Restored*", and henceforth work on Shakespeare became his chief interest and delight. Among his friends were Matthew Concanen, a lawyer by profession and literary man by choice, Dennis, James Moore-Smythe, and Thomas Cooke, all of them more or less notable men in their time and members of the so-called "Concanen Club." It was at a meeting of this group that Theobald first met William Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester, who like himself was an admirer of Shakespeare, but by far not an equally disinterested one. This friendship with Warburton, although the divine proved to be absolutely faithless, was of considerable assistance to Theobald in rendering him sympathy, encouragement, and inspiration to pull through the dark years following *The Dunciad*. In December 1727 Theobald brought forth a drama purporting to come from the pen of Shakespeare, entitled *Double Falshood*; or, *The Distrest Lovers*, which was by various authorities attributed to different authors: Shirley, Massinger, Fletcher. Others assigned the play to Theobald, and there was a versified reference to it in *The Grubstreet Journal*, with which Pope may have had some connection. Taken all in all the whole affair is the most faint-hearted undertaking with which Theobald has favoured us, as it appears he himself did not really believe Shakespeare was the author.

The period between *Shakespeare Restored* and the edition of all the plays is marked by a tremendous expansion in Theobald's reading of literature which could assist in correcting or illustrating the text. But things did not continue so very smoothly for Theobald. Pope, feeling very keenly the exposure of the defects of his edition, had been nursing his wrath and preparing his counter stroke in silence. The first blow fell with the publication of the third or so-called "last" volume of Pope and Swift's *Miscellanies*, March, 1728. In his volume, devoted to verse, a prose treatise had been inserted, "Martinus Scriblerus ΠΕΡΙ ΒΑΘΟΥΣ; or of the Art of Sinking in Poetry. Written in the year MDCCXVII." It is generally thought now that the treatise was written with the set purpose of calling forth attacks upon Pope, so that he would seem justified in retaliating with *The Dunciad*; the delay in the publication of the "last" volume of the miscellanies is attributed to the desire to have *The Dunciad* ready for publication. The author has no doubt that such was the purpose of the *Bathos*, but he is inclined to attribute the delay in the publication of the "last" volume to the fact that the treatise itself was not ready. In a letter written to Swift sometime in January, 1728, Pope says that he has entirely methodized the *Bathos* and written all of it. Furthermore, it contains strictures on *Double Falshood* which was not published until 1728. The

*Bathos* gives selections from several poets in order to show how persons may sink in poetry. Under its various chapters there appear as examples three passages from *Double Falshood*. Chapter 6 treats "Of the several kinds of Genius's in the profound, and the marks and characters of each." Here Pope lists the different kinds of writers under various animals, adding the initials of living authors. Theobald appears under the eels and swallows. This example of literary mud-slinging, likewise well-known in our dearly beloved Dutch literature or what must pass as such, could have had but one purpose — to provoke the infuriated victims to retaliation.

But this was not the only attack on Theobald made in the volume. There appeared in the verse a poem entitled "A Fragment of a Satire." After thrusts at Gildon and Dennis, Pope turns to Theobald:

Should some more sober critics come abroad,  
If wrong I smile; if right, I kiss the rod.  
Pains, Reading, Study, are their just pretence  
And all they want is Spirit, Taste, and Sense.  
Commas and Points they set exactly right;  
And 't were a sin to rob them of their Mite.  
In future Ages how their Fame will spread,  
For routing Triplets and restoring *ed*.  
Yet ne'er one Sprig of Laurel graced these Ribbalds,  
From sanguine Sew—<sup>1)</sup> down to piddling T—s.  
Who thinks he reads but only scans and spells,  
A Word-catcher that lives on syllables.  
Yet even this Creature may some Notice claim,  
Wrapt round and sanctified with Shakespeare's name;  
Pretty in Amber to observe the forms  
Of Hairs, or Straws, or Dirt, or Grubs, or Worms;  
The Thing, we know, is neither rich nor rare,  
But wonder how the Devil it got there.

This "last" volume of miscellanies succeeded in drawing forth some attacks contained in verses, letters, and the like in the current newspapers, and Pope was evidently satisfied with the rather poor results of the provocative treatise on the *Bathos*, for on May 18, 1728, appeared *The Dunciad*. In 1729 a second and last edition appeared, containing about one hundred lines more, and several appendages.

From the various replies called forth by the poem two deductions are obvious: first, that Theobald was made the hero of the satire because of his work on Shakespeare; and second, that his was the clearest case against Pope in that his criticisms were universally recognized as far superior to his adversary's edition. Dennis came to the aid of Theobald and blamed Pope for abusing "several ingenuous men" in *The Dunciad*, "among whom I am obliged, in Justice, to name Mr. Theobald who by delivering Shakespeare from the Injuries of Time, and of lazy, or ignorant and stupid Editors, has obliged all who are concern'd for the Reputation of so great a Genius, or for the Honour of Great Britain." He claims that Pope libelled Theobald for no other reason than that he had been surpassed by him, and denounces the attack on Theobald's poverty and that of others "who have derserv'd a thousand times better both of the country and the Commonwealth of Learning". Concanen also upholds Theobald against Pope,

<sup>1)</sup> George Sewell, a friend of Theobald's, who had been dead some two years. He had been associated with Theobald in the preparation of *Shakespeare Restored*. Pope invariably spells Theobald's name Tibbald. Later, when the poem was incorporated in *An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* "slashing Bentley" was substituted for "sanguine Sew—" and other changes were made.

and likewise other "dunces" rushed to their king's assistance. Concanen said amongst other things that the only crime Theobald committed was in presuming Pope was not infallible like his namesake of Rome, and could be mistaken, and that Pope would have done well in following the method Theobald had laid down. Two poetic attacks on Pope that appeared the same year as *The Dunciad* were *Sawney, An Heroic Poem. Occasion'd by the Dunciad*, from the pen of James Ralph, and *Durgen or a Plain Satyr upon a Pompous Satyr*, by Edward Ward. Ralph calls *The Dunciad* "an execrable Lampoon". Ward in his preface calls Theobald a man of learning, probity, and distinguishing merits, while in the poem he styles *Shakespeare Restored*, a meritorious work that must meet with the approbation of all good judges. William Duncombe, a person entirely removed from the quarrel, shared the general attitude of the neutral public and competent judges of literary productions that Pope was supreme in poetry and Theobald just as surely the better critic. He expresses this feeling in an epigram entitled *The Judgment of Appollo, on The Controversy between Mr. Pope and Mr. Theobald*, 1729:

In Pope's melodious Verse the Graces smile,  
In Theobald is display'd sagacious Toil;  
The Critick's Ivy crowns his subtle brow,  
While in Pope's Numbers, Wit and Music flow.

These Bards, so Fortune will'd, were mortal Foes,  
And all Parnassus in their Quarrel rose;  
This the dire Cause of their contending Rage,  
Who best could blanch dark Shakespear's blotted Page.  
Apollo heard — and judg'd each Party's Plea,  
And thus pronounced th' irrevocable Decree;  
Theobald, 't is thine to share what Shakespeare writ,  
But Pope shall reign supreme in Poesy and Wit.

It is well to note that an unconcerned observed attributed the quarrel to *Shakespeare Restored*.

Theobald himself did not reply to the attack on him, but in a letter to *Mist's Journal*, June 22, took occasion to comment on *The Dunciad*. In a poetical war of this kind he held that attacks should only be made on the faults in poetry, and that none should be satirized except those who failed as poets. When a writer drew private character into the quarrel and satirized men whose activities lay outside the field of literature, he became a common enemy to mankind and should consider himself lucky if he was not hunted down as a beast of prey. Here Theobald is defending the other "dunces" rather than himself, but he does defend himself against one unjust attack. In a certain passage of the satire Pope accuses Theobald of taking up party writing on the side of the Tories, "cackling to the Tories", as Pope hath it. This representation Theobald characterized, indirectly, as a malevolent lie of angry wit, and he claimed, justly, that his communications to *Mist's Journal* were not concerned with politics but only with learning or entertainment, and he turned the charge of cackling to the Tories against Pope, who, he said, was shrewdly abused or else made a practise of cackling to more than one party.

(To be continued.)

EDWARD B. KOSTER.

# Lewis Theobald.

## II.

Whilst Theobald was contemplating the publication of critical and explanatory remarks upon Shakespeare in three octavo volumes at the price of one guinea, Pope's second edition of Shakespeare appeared in November 1728. Theobald's emendations had met with such a wide acceptance that Pope felt compelled to introduce some of them into the text. This he did with poor grace, failing to acknowledge some and cavilling at others. At the end of the eighth volume he made a general acknowledgment of the aid he had received from Theobald, estimating it at twenty-five words introduced into the text, and added several pages of his opponent's corrections, on the ground that if thought trivial or wrong, they could at worst spoil only half a sheet that happened to be vacant. He also brought the charge against Theobald that although he publicly advertised for the assistance of all lovers of Shakespeare, while his edition was preparing for the press, yet this critic would not communicate his notes. He ended with a slur at Theobald's ability to correct errors of the press.

The latter was not slow to reply to this misrepresentation. In a letter to the *Daily Journal*, November 26, 1728, he called to mind the assurance he gave in *Mist's Journal* that he would be able to give over five hundred emendations that Pope and all his assistants would miss. He claimed that instead of Pope's accepting twenty-five of his readings, he had really adopted about one hundred.<sup>1)</sup> He proceeded to name, negatively, five qualities of an editor of Shakespeare: industry in collating, knowledge of history, knowledge of modern tongues, judgment in digesting text, and judgment in restoring it. Pope's deficiency in all these made him absolutely unequal to the task of editing. He also proved his assertion by citing examples where Pope had failed in each of the stated qualities. As regards Pope's complaint of his not communicating his notes, he said he considered it rash to bestow the labour of twelve years' study upon a bookseller to whom he owed no obligations, or an editor who was likely to prove thankless.

Notwithstanding the emendations he contributed at various times to periodicals, Theobald found time in 1728 for two other undertakings. One was an edition of Wycherly's posthumous works; the other was in the form of notes contributed to Cooke's translation of Hesiod. This last represents Theobald's first attempt at textual criticism in the classics. It also shows the regard his friends had for his scholarship not only in English but also in Latin and Greek. Even his enemies admitted his scholarship. Pope objected to him because he was a scholar. Scholarship and scientific investigation, from the time of the controversy between the ancients and moderns until after Pope's death, were looked upon almost as crimes by the wits. Cooke is very grateful to Theobald for his aid, and carefully distinguishes all the remarks of Theobald and other friends from his own. (In a note on *The Dunciad* Pope speaks of these notes as having been carefully owned by Theobald. The latter however had nothing to do with the owning: Cooke, like Theobald and unlike Pope, was scrupulous in giving credit for all assistance. This is an instance, among the many others, of Pope's back-biting and scurrility.)

<sup>1)</sup> L'histoire se répète. Think of the contention between Prof. Is. van Dijk and Mr. W. Kloos about the *Imitatio Christi*.

Early in 1729 Theobald began his correspondence with Warburton. The exchange of letters was very frequent up to the end of 1731, and continued with diminishing frequency until the spring of 1736, when it was broken off under circumstances hardly creditable to Warburton. In these letters Theobald and his friend exchanged their remarks and conjectures on Shakespeare and gave their opinions of them. In April of the same year *The Dunciad Variorum* made its appearance. To quote the whole title would take too much space, but never had an English work been issued into the world with all the elaborate paraphernalia common to the much satirized editions of the classics.<sup>1)</sup> Indeed, Pope seems to be intending a satiric thrust at them; the fact that he first planned the notes to be in Latin gives evidence of some such intent. But the real purpose of all this heterogeneous matter was to justify *The Dunciad* and continue the satire on its victims. Several misrepresentations of Theobald are given. Here are a few of them. In the single note giving his life there are no less than five. Pope speaks of Theobald praising his own productions in anonymous letters to *Mist's Journal*, for which statement there is no foundation. He makes Theobald the author of a communication to the same journal, June 8, 1728, which claimed there was no flaw in *Shakespeare Restored*; but the "wit" has nothing upon which to base his assertion. He repeats the accusation made at the end of his second edition of Shakespeare that Theobald concealed his design on the dramatist until after Pope's edition. He adds, however, that satisfaction had been promised to those who would assist him. To make matters worse, according to his account, Theobald at that time was soliciting favours from him. Lastly, he insinuates that Theobald had a part in the cry that Pope had joined with the bookseller to raise an extravagant subscription. Theobald had formerly answered the charge about concealing his design, yet Pope quotes this same letter as admitting the indictment. Later on Theobald completely demolished the accusation of ingratitude. As for the last charge, the only basis Pope had was the *Essay on the Art of Sinking in Reputation*, concerning the authorship of which he himself was not certain. Yet with all the elaborate commentary under which *The Dunciad* laboured the very book that was in a large way responsible for the poem was mentioned but once, viz. in the Note on l. 106, Bk. I: "What is still in memory is a piece now almost two years old; it had the title of *Shakespeare Restored*". In the poem proper references to the work are conspicuous by their absence. One passage only contains an allusion, commencing as follows:

There, thy good Scholiasts with unweary'd pains  
Make Horace flat, and humble Maro's strains;  
Here studious I unlucky moderns save,  
Nor sleeps one error in its father's grave,  
Old puns restore, lost blunders nicely seek,  
And crucify poor Shakespeare once a week.

In the notes the allusions are more numerous but still infrequent.

Most of the satire in the poem hinges on Theobald's other works. The satirist is especially severe on pantomimes in general and Theobald's in particular, mentioning by name three or four of his most popular ones. Of his translations, the *Phaedo*, *Ajax*, and *Aeschylus* are honoured, though the second Theobald probably did not write, and the last he never published.

<sup>1)</sup> There is a curious Dutch booklet of about the same period, edited in the same way, entitled *De vermakelijke slatuintjes*.

His dramas are represented by *The Persian Princess*, *The Perfidious Brother*, and a line from *Double Falshood*. *The Care of Poverty* is the only one of his poems to find a place in the satire. Then there are accusations of dulness and stupidity, party writing and ingratitude, poverty, Theobald's method and verbal criticism. Mock emendations of Virgil are scattered through the notes and gathered together in the appendix under the title of *Virgil Restored*. These, written mainly by Arbuthnot, were taken from a production of the Scriblerus Club, which was originally directed against Bentley.

As regards the purpose of *The Dunciad* even that ardent admirer of Pope, Johnson, was sceptical, as he remarks: "That the design was moral, whatever the author might tell his readers or himself, I am not convinced. The first motive was the desire of revenging the contempt with which Theobald had treated his Shakespeare, and regaining the honour which he had lost by crushing his opponent". Revenge was the poet's motive, no matter what he might say about being moved by public spirit in killing off bad writers. Why such care in seeking out and publishing the titles of all productions written against him, except to justify him in hitting back? In "A letter to the Publisher" it is frankly stated that the satire is a reply to attacks, and the author himself says that he promised to remove from *The Dunciad* any who could give him assurance "of having never writ scurrilously against him". In Pope's mind a bad writer must have been one who wrote against him. The moral idea was an afterthought, for which his rising reputation for virtue secured wide belief.

It is this variorum edition of *The Dunciad* that was largely responsible for the character of Theobald that has come down to recent times. People were prone to accept the mass of incorrect quotations and statements found in the same volume with the satire, instead of going back to the original sources. In this way they spread broadcast Pope's unjust characterization of the critic, giving as historic fact what was half the invention of the poet's malice. In short, they accepted as truth Pope's own account of *The Dunciad* and the dunces. The effect produced by this procedure, together with the slanders propagated by Warburton and supported by Johnson, was to give such a permanent character to Pope's charges as to make them pass current even to-day.

Theobald replied in a letter to *The Daily Journal*, April 17, 1729, and worthily defended himself against all the unjust allegations. Nor did he stop there, but he carried on the war into his opponent's territory. Knowing wherein his strength lay, he again calmly pointed out errors in Pope's edition of Shakespeare, duly numbered and arranged in order.

Pope at first did not find many to take up his side of the quarrel. But in 1729 Savage came under his dominion and worked most assiduously as his tool and informer. The next year *The Grub-street Journal* took up the work upon the same lines. Pope was the moving spirit of the affair: his enemies are attacked, he and his friends are handsomely praised. The former are known as "Theobaldians", "Grubeans", "Knights of the Bathos", while the latter are termed "Popeans" and "Parnassians". Some others followed in the wake of these, but they are of less significance and interest.

By 1731 the feeling against textual criticism reached such a height as to cause one scholar to lift his voice in aid and defence. This was John Jortin, a man of high character and true scholarly instincts, and his remonstrations appeared in his *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors Ancient and Modern*, 2 vols, 1731.

The greatest injury to the science, however, came from within the ranks of the critics themselves, from the greatest of them. Early in 1732 Bentley's



remarkable edition of Milton appeared. To justify the many violent changes which he advocated, Bentley devised a theory. This theory was that Milton dictated his poem to a friend who saw it through the press. The friend was ignorant, malicious, careless, and everything else imaginable; he introduced words, lines, and passages into the text. The corruptions were then increased by the carelessness of the printers. Yet Bentley had hopes of restoring the original text by his sagacity. Fortunately he left the text as it was, putting his emendations and discussions in the margin or at the bottom of the page. The edition was, as has been formerly observed, a failure. The only evidences of the classical scholar to be found in the work are seen in the vigorous logic of some of the notes. Of poetic appreciation there is no sign anywhere. Besides some feeble praise Bentley's *Milton* gave rise to a host of objections and indignant, scoffing, and angry comments. Theobald, who before its appearance had deprecated the great scholar undertaking a work wherein the ladies and children were prepared to laugh at him, emphatically resented Bentley's new departure. So ridiculous appeared the notes to him that he feared lest they were written to ridicule the critical art. Furthermore this edition strengthened the growing tendency to associate Theobald with Bentley. Though there was some pleasure in being joined with so great a man, the *Milton* could not but cast a bad light on the coming edition of Shakespeare.

In the beginning of 1733 there appeared a poem entitled *Of Verbal Criticism*. While the title would suggest a general satire on the science, the attacks are made almost entirely against Bentley and Theobald. In Bentley the author, David Mallet, sees the creator of the school of verbal critics, though he implies that in his edition of Milton the critic was imitating Theobald:

Yet he, prime pattern of the captious art,  
Out-tibbalding poor Tibbald, tops his part.

On the whole the poem is a rather poor production, and there was nothing new in the attack.

In the midst of feeling engendered by attacks of this kind Theobald's edition appeared, *The Works of Shakespeare: in seven volumes. Collated with the Oldest Copies, and Corrected; with Notes explanatory and Critical: By Mr. Theobald.* London MDCCXXXIII. The edition did not appear until January, 1734, and it was successful in spite of all attacks, and this can point only to one conclusion, namely that in spite of sundry belated attacks and slanders by Pope and others the victory of Bentley and Theobald against the poets and wits had been won, so that at the end of the century Porson could claim for verbal criticism a high place in the activities of man.

Meanwhile Theobald had failed in his candidacy for the laureateship in December 1730, his purpose in seeking the position being to get a competence that would permit him to pursue his work on Shakespeare unhampered by financial cares. And although he enjoyed the favour of Walpole, and this nobleman remained his friend for some time after the appearance of his Shakespeare, he was never granted what he so much wished, — a pension.

Whilst preparing his edition of Shakespeare Theobald was also writing for the stage. From all these literary occupations it will be obvious that his legal profession was not very exacting; yet it required a certain amount of time. In the beginning of 1730 he was hard at work upon his *Orestes*. Though styled an opera, the production is really a drama, enlivened by a few songs and dances. Theobald confessed to Warburton that in the play he imitated Shakespeare, especially *Macbeth* and *Lear*; it might also be noted that some passages show the influence of Aeschylus. While not extraordinarily successful, the play was by no means a failure.

In spite of all his efforts, there is no doubt that at times Theobald keenly felt the pinch of poverty, and this period in particular marks the low ebb of his affairs. He more than once had the greatest difficulty to make both ends meet, and toward the end of 1731 he communicates his hardships to Warburton. Such was the condition of the man whom Pope was pursuing with a cold and relentless malice. As for the "one sincere and cordial friend", as Theobald had styled Warburton a short time before, who was at the time enjoying a comfortable living at Newark in Nottinghamshire, this same divine a few years later begrudged his friend the profits of his edition, and still later joined in the chorus of detraction and falsehood from which Theobald's reputation has so long suffered. Honest, confiding Theobald, to be thus ill-treated by an invidious poet and a jealous preacher of the Gospel!

But soon prospects began to look brighter, owing in some degree to the patronage of John Boyle, Earl of Orrery. The earl's father, who had nominally been Bentley's chief opponent in the famous Phalaris controversy, had been Theobald's patron in the past, and to him the scholar had dedicated several of his early productions. In March the earl placed his father's letters in Theobald's hands to be regulated. The late earl had been ambassador at Brussels during the latter part of Queen Anne's reign, so that the correspondence represented letters from many of the greatest men of that time. Especially was Theobald delighted with the correspondence of Bolingbroke, who did not confine himself to state affairs. The time required for this task detracted from Theobald's study but aided his finances. A month or two later he addressed *An Epistle* to Orrery devoted mainly to praise of the earl's father, which verses Theobald said his patron made golden for him. The epistle is to be found in Appendix C, p. 302 sqq.; it is the usual, conventional stuff. The dedication of all seven volumes of the edition of Shakespeare to the lord was the final form Theobald's gratitude took, and for this he was handsomely rewarded.

Theobald's edition of Shakespeare was slow in making its appearance. This was owing to several delays, the principal being that the publisher, Tonson, wished the remainder of Pope's edition being sold before he threw a new one upon the market. Also Theobald had several remonstrations with Warburton concerning the preface. When the latter had heard that an agreement had been reached with Tonson, he expressed anxiety as to the preface the editor might prefix to the production. There seems no reason to doubt that the egotistical clergyman had designs on that part of the work. From all that is known about the agreement between the editor and the publisher it may be safely inferred that Theobald profited to the extent of 1100 guineas by his edition. When to this sum there are added the 100 guineas he received from Lord Orrery for the dedication, and the twenty pounds from the Prince of Wales for his set, no one can complain that Theobald did not receive adequate compensation. At least he obtained more for his work than any editor of Shakespeare, with the barely possible exception of Johnson. (Pope had received £ 215 for his edition.)

As soon as Warburton saw the printed preface, he at once informed the editor that it contained passages which his friends knew to be his. It is not improbable that he was trying to force Theobald to make a public acknowledgment of his assistance, as indeed the editor might have done. If this was his intent, he was unsuccessful, for Theobald replied, with unnecessary modesty for himself and unwarrantable admiration for his friend, "Let those preacquainted Friends frankly know, I embraced them in a just preference to what I could myself produce on the subject." Then he adds, as if divining

Warburton's motive, "Nor would I have chose tacitly to usurp the Reputation of them, but as I formerly hinted, and you joined with me in sentiment, it would have looked too poor to have confessed Assistance towards so slight a Fabrick as my Preface".

Yet Warburton was not content to let his part in the performance go unrecorded. In his copy of Theobald's Shakespeare he marked all the passages which he considered his own. Upon this basis D. Nicol Smith in his *Eighteenth-century Essays on Shakespeare*, 1903, accuses Theobald of dulness and theft, the first because he called upon his friend for assistance, the second because he did not publicly acknowledge that assistance. But according to the author of the book under review it was only an habitual lack of self-confidence and a greatly exaggerated idea of his friend's ability that made Theobald quick to take advantage of the insinuated offer of help. As for "theft", if the accepting what is freely given, with the mutual understanding that no open acknowledgment can be made, comes under that head, he is guilty. And, adds Dr. Jones, from our point of view the editor should not have taken credit for what was not his, but some term other than the one given above must be used to express the fault. As for myself, I believe Theobald was too artless, too unsophisticated, and too unsuspecting to believe he was doing wrong in including observations of his friend in his edition. Theobald and Warburton had exchanged thoughts, remarks, and views upon Shakespeare, and I venture to say the gain and the instruction in this intercourse was greater on the side of the latter than of the former.

However this may be, after his break with his friend, it would appear that Theobald in his later editions omitted all the passages not his own. There is also sufficient reason for believing that Warburton claimed more than his share really had been. One instance, in another respect, of Warburton's mode of dealing with Theobald. Theobald had, *under Warburton's approval and encouragement*, inserted some Greek conjectures at the end of his preface. A little over a year after he broke with Theobald Warburton mentioned in a letter to the Rev. Thomas Birch "the foolish Greek conjectures" of the preface. Here all comment seems needless and superfluous. And then to know that actually the preface closes with an acknowledgment of assistance, in which Theobald is especially eulogistic of Warburton.

Theobald realized that it was incumbent upon an editor to be thorough in whatever he undertook. Not only was he the first to insist that the editor of an English classic had any duties at all; he was the first to analyze the work to be done. In his preface he divides an editor's province into three divisions: the emendations of corrupt passages; the explanation of obscure or difficult ones; and an inquiry into the beauties and defects of composition. This last, more strictly termed "literary criticism", he hinted, did not necessarily belong to an editor, and since it required no special qualifications of learning, was open to all who were willing. What Theobald was concerned with — what every editor is primarily pledged to — was to give the best text possible illuminated with all necessary explanations. By emendation he meant not only correcting by conjecture, but also the restoring, by collation, of a better variant reading. His notes prove him familiar with the works of Marlowe, Kyd, Jonson, Chapman, Heywood, Dekker, Marston, Webster, Ford, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Massinger, to say nothing of the number of anonymous plays he has occasion to mention. Particularly numerous are his references to the many plays of Jonson and Beaumont and Fletcher. Moreover, he was a diligent reader of a different species of literature. The antiquaries Stowe, Camden, and Dugdale he used to good advantage.

Besides the chronicles of Hall and Holinshed, he was familiar with such semi-historical works as Hakluyt's voyages. Lydgate and Caxton were known to him, though he seems to have been ignorant of Gower. With Chaucer and Spenser he was intimately acquainted, and, in a much less degree, with the sixteenth-century lyricists such as Wyatt, Surrey, Daniel, and Lodge. As Theobald widened his knowledge of the literature around Shakespeare his belief in the poet's learning was considerably shaken, and he became convinced that Shakespeare must have worked more from translations than from the original classic authors. The secret of his method was the insistence on proof for any conclusion. This is the method of the true scholar, one who loves "to go thorough-stitch" (an expression of Theobald himself) with whatever he takes in hand.

The similarity between the Boyle-Bentley and Pope-Theobald controversies was not merely superficial. Pope's edition of Shakespeare and Boyle's edition of Phalaris were both examples of careless scholarship and insufficient and inexact research. Furthermore Boyle's counter-attack on Bentley entitled *Examination of Dr. Bentley's Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris* (on which, properly speaking, several authors had been working), bears a close resemblance to *The Dunciad*, for though he attempts a serious defence, differing therein from Pope, it is plain to see that Boyle's main reliance is upon banter and satire, the last resort of careless study exposed to the relentless attacks of careful scholarship. Even the accusations remind one of Pope's satire — pedantry, insistence on trifles, out-of-the-way reading. Nor did satire suffice, for Boyle's malice went so far as to deal in misquotation and false statements, though hardly to the degree reached by Pope.

Theobald's edition and Bentley's second dissertation are, of course, works of different natures, but the spirit animating them and, in a general way, some of the methods employed are similar. They both represent the effort of true scholars, by reliance upon fact, proof, and authority, to silence forever the arguments of inaccurate investigation and malicious satire. The authors are vitally concerned, not so much in gaining the victory, as in ascertaining the truth.

The manner of producing evidence and the amount and widely diverse sources of proof are seen in the handling of detached questions. One example will suffice. Boyle and Pope had fallen foul of certain expressions their opponents had used: Boyle objected to Bentley's "first inventor", and Pope to a line of the *Double Falshood* satirized in *The Dunciad*. Never did the ridicule of two wits receive such a severe jar from the cold array of evidence presented against them. The classical scholar proceeded to give passages from Terence, Lucretius, Pindar, Herodotus, Plato, and a Greek inscription, while Theobald was not far behind with quotations from Plautus, Ovid, Seneca, Terence, Shakespeare, and Beaumont and Fletcher.

Theobald is *facile princeps* of all emenders of the text. Slight corrections eliminated, there remain some four hundred and twenty nine emendations for which he had to rely upon his genius and learning alone. Of these one hundred and fifty have been accepted, so that a little less than thirty-seven per cent of his corrections have stood the test of time and the scrutiny of scholars.

When consideration is paid to the large number of corrections attempted and the almost total obscurity of many of the corrupt passages, this percentage is amazing. Certainly no other corrector, either in English or the classics, can boast such a high ratio of accepted readings. Bentley falls far short of the mark. Warburton, who, according to Johnson, supplied Theobald with

the best part of his emendations, was successful in only thirteen per cent of those substitutions which Theobald saw fit to introduce into his edition. Undoubtedly the percentage would be much lower, had not the bishop's notes passed through his friend's sifting hands, so that only the more probable corrections were given to the public. These numbered one hundred and thirty-five, thirty-six of which the editor refused to insert in the text. Theobald's judgment in rejecting, if not in selecting, his assistant's notes is vindicated by the fact that only one of the thirty-six has been accepted. Still there are some critics who look upon Warburton as Theobald's guardian angel, saving him from himself.

Besides his emendations, Theobald often restored the text and defended variant readings where Pope had either emended the text or chosen the inferior reading. This he did in some two hundred places; in a score of places he rescued whole lines and even passages from the old editions. In a large number of places he restored stage directions, gave lines to their proper speakers, and in four plays introduced new act divisions, half of which have been accepted. His changes in punctuation are innumerable, ranging from the most trifling alteration to corrections that restore meaning to unintelligible lines. Explanatory notes clearing up obscure and difficult passages amount to well over two hundred, nearly forty of which Warburton supplied. These notes reveal, perhaps even more than his emendations, Theobald's wide reading and diligent research in the literature of his author's age. But not only in those particulars that most closely concern an editor was Theobald interested; unlike previous editors, he showed a curiosity in that threefold field of research that has since engaged the activities of so many scholars — the chronology, authorship, and sources of the plays ascribed to Shakespeare. As regards the authorship of some of the doubtful plays, Theobald stated opinions that curiously enough coincide with many of the conclusions of modern scholarship. The grounds for this statement and the examples given the reader should peruse for himself, as I perceive this article is expanding to an alarming bulk. Further on the author recalls a saying of Kenrick to the following effect: "Though Dr. Johnson hath made very few discoveries of his own, he hath discovered the method of making more of Theobald's at second hand, than ever the author could do when they were spick and span new".<sup>1)</sup> And later on the author says, speaking of Theobald's search for songs of Lodge: "Fortunately for Johnson, Theobald did not succeed in his search for Lodge's *Rosalinde*, while the later critic, following the path so clearly pointed out by the man he slandered, met with success".

As no human work is quite perfect, so Theobald's edition also has its faults. These defects Professor Lounsbury has clearly stated in his *Text of Shakespeare*, Chapter XXIV. Some were due to personal whim, such as the failure to number scenes. Others were occasioned by the eccentricities of the times in which he lived. These are chiefly the tendency to emend too much and the proneness to show erudition. Bentley, guilty of both, had set the fashion for his age. When compared with many of the scholars of his time, Theobald appears conservative in his conjectures and modest in his citations. His willingness to emend, however, caused him in some cases to miss the obvious meaning of passages, and in others to make good his lack of knowledge by conjecture. What might be called another blemish of his work was his treatment of Pope, who however got his deserts and had

<sup>1)</sup> *A Review of Doctor Johnson's New Edition of Shakespeare by W. Kenrick, 1765.*

nothing to complain of as he had reviled and provoked Theobald in an unprecedented way. Furthermore, Theobald's accusations of incompetency and carelessness were almost as universally true as Pope's were false.

The most reprehensible defect in the edition was the tacit adoption of many of Pope's metrical emendations. The poet had sought to improve Shakespeare's versification by reducing the lines to eighteenth-century regularity. In the majority of cases Theobald followed him, although knowing, and indeed stating, some of the peculiarities of Shakespeare's verse and pronunciation, as well as reproving Pope for his ignorance of these peculiarities and his attempt to make the verse smooth.

The faults of Theobald's edition seem trivial when compared with the difficulties he encountered. His study was hampered by the misfortunes and hardships with which his life was beset. The aids to research were few and scattered. As there were no large libraries where material could be found, he had to rely upon his friends and the booksellers for the accumulation of an *apparatus criticus*. Dictionaries and books of reference were both few and unreliable, while there was little previous research from which to obtain aid. Though he had the advantage of being the first to enter an almost unexplored field, yet he had not the advantage of approaching the text with that wealth of sympathetic intelligence that centuries of study have given to modern scholars. The great difficulty, however, lay in finding a method. As scholarly methods had not been employed on England's literature, he was forced to adapt to an English text the method employed by Bentley in the classics. This duty he performed so effectively that he blazed the trail succeeding editors have always followed.

Thus far I have pursued the account of Dr. Jones' book to the end of the fifth chapter, which is the most interesting part. Two chapters are following entitled respectively "Theobald's Later Life" and "The Progress of the Method".

All in all, the years immediately following his edition were the brightest of his career, and this period also marks a renewal of his interest in the classics. He supplied notes to Cooke's *Hesiod*, and contributed three papers of classical observations to Jortin's *Miscellaneous Observations*. Furthermore he was working on editions of Aeschylus and Hesychius, which, however, never appeared. Dr. Jones cherishes the belief that, had his work on these classics been put before the public, the editor of Shakespeare would have occupied a creditable position among the classical scholars of the eighteenth century. This opinion is borne out by the fact that Middleton enlisted in Theobald's services, and it testifies to the high regard in which his scholarship was held by contemporaries.

In the midst of his ambitious projects there came what must have been a grievous disappointment and a real injury. Revealing at last his true nature Warburton broke off the friendship under circumstances by no means creditable to the divine. Theobald's failure to publish all of his assistant's notes was the chief irritant to Warburton's pride, and also it seems the latter expected some financial remuneration for his aid. But as Dr. Jones remarks, for the avaricious critic, who was fully cognizant of Theobald's financial straits, to begrudge his friend the profits of his edition while he himself was enjoying a comfortable living, was certainly not becoming a Christian, much less a clergyman. Theobald had made a most handsome acknowledgment of Warburton's services in his preface, while in the body of the work each note belonging to the other was acknowledged with high praise.

Furthermore, he was eager to repay his debt in kind. When he first heard

of the other critic's intention of editing *Paterculus*, he rejoiced in the undertaking and assured him that when Shakespeare was off his hands, he would repay the least parts of his debt by perusing the Latin author to find corruptions, a task he would embrace with great satisfaction. In his subsequent correspondence he frequently mentioned Warburton's design, at the same time sending him such notes and transcripts as he thought might be helpful.

Warburton's part in the disagreement was nothing short of contemptible. Two or three years later he was to be on intimate terms with the man who had abused his friend. Not only that, he himself was to slander that friend who had always dealt honourably by him, a friend who, though suffering grievous injuries at his hands and placed in a position to make things very unpleasant for Pope and his newly acquired champion, maintained a high-minded silence.

From this time on there is little to be found on Theobald's life. His reputation as a scholar did not decline; in 1740 appeared the second edition of his *Shakespeare* in eight volumes, from which those notes and parts of the preface which he owed to his former assistant were excluded. He also omitted the conclusion of the preface, in which he had acknowledged the assistance he had received, and had mentioned the works read in the preparation of the edition.

Probably the pressure of finances incited him to attempt his last critical work. In 1742 he entered into an agreement with the Tonsons to edit the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, upon which he had been working for fifteen years. In this undertaking he was aided by Thomas Seward and a Mr. Sympson, but neither of them was able to render very valuable assistance. Trouble having arisen as soon as the first volume had been printed owing to Theobald's unwillingness to admit notes that did not meet with his approval, the edition did not appear until 1750, six years after Theobald's death. He had edited the entire first volume, the second to p. 233, and the third to p. 69. There were ten volumes in all, and it soon appeared Messrs. Seward and Sympson were poor editors compared to Theobald.

Of Theobald's last days nothing is known except that they were embittered by a severe disease. After suffering from a jaundice for several months, he met a peaceful death on Sept. 18, 1744. Two days later he was buried in St. Pancras cemetery, attended by one friend.

Well might people have said "here cracks a noble heart", as there is little to blame and much to praise in Theobald's life. Continually battling against adversity, the disheartening demands of poverty, and the cruel attacks of Pope, he bravely struggled through the task he had set himself. Sensitive, modest, lacking in self-confidence, his nature was all the more open to the thrusts of satire and the falsehoods of malice. Though for the most part suffering in silence and passing over with manly dignity the libels and abuse of his adversary, at times he showed a seeming vindictiveness, which, after all, was but the natural reaction of an oversensitive and underconfident nature to almost unendurable taunts. Even then he took no mean advantage, he indulged in no falsehood; he attacked only what was manifestly reprehensible. He made by far the best figure in the *Dunciad* war. In the midst of all the dirt and filth thrown up by both sides, he alone was free from stooping. Sympathetic, liberal, true to his friends, it is not strange that they so anxiously defended him. Only one proved recreant. Possibly it would be hard to find in history a man who has suffered more injustice at the hands of posterity.

Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored* and his edition of the dramatist mark a beginning of an epoch in English scholarship just as plainly as the *Epistle to Mill* and the *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris* mark a new era in classical research. The importance of Theobald's work lies in the fact that it inspired scholars with an interest in their native literature, created a demand for critical editions of English poets, and made popular a method which, with amplifications and modifications, has come down to the present day.

Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the service Theobald did for research in English literature when he turned the attention of scholars to a new field of investigation, a field that had either been unnoticed or scorned before. As long as editing remained in the hands of poets who were not scholars, there was no hope for any critical work. It was Pope's fame and not the worth of his edition that increased the interest already felt in Shakespeare. The merits of the work attracted no scholar, created no interest in the text. Its defects aroused Theobald, but Pope can be given no more praise for that result than can be granted Boyle for Bentley's *Dissertation*. Had not the scholar reviewed the poet's edition, textual criticism in the great dramatist could hardly have been awakened. The attention of scholars was turned not only to the Shakespearean text but also to the text of other English poets. There gradually arose a demand for critical editions, and the incentive of praise, so powerful before in producing editions of the classics, prompted scholars to undertake English poets.

While the impulse to edit Shakespeare came from Theobald directly or indirectly, the editors immediately following him did not show much familiarity with his method. Hanmer followed Pope, but used some of Theobald's material. Warburton contented himself with his former friend's collation, and stole from him to add to his own frequently absurd notes. And Johnson, intent on his common sense remarks, did not advance collation or investigation very far. With the later editors of Shakespeare, however, the case is different: "So far as any later editor achieved success," says Prof. Lounsbury, "it was by following and improving upon the methods which Theobald had adopted."<sup>1</sup>) A few examples, of eighteenth century criticism, will suffice, the more as Theobald had a posthumous hand in one of them. The first critical edition of Ben Jonson appeared in 1756, twelve years after Theobald's death. The editor, Peter Whalley, makes several remarks on how to handle the text, which read so much like those given by Theobald that it is difficult not to suppose that his preface was largely modelled upon the preface to Shakespeare. He himself bears witness to the fact that his methods were Theobald's. He had obtained the latter's copy of Jonson with marginal notes, and the very notes bear out this statement. Many allusions are explained by references to the literature and customs of Jonson's time, while the meanings of many words are illustrated by quotations from Jonson and his contemporaries. Unlike Theobald, Whalley seldom supports his emendations, which are sometimes introduced without notice, but they are few and unimportant. Yet his own words, together with the fact that he frequently makes use of material furnished by Theobald's *Shakespeare*, show whom he was imitating.

The critic who approaches Theobald more closely than any other is Thomas Warton, author of *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser*,

<sup>1</sup>) The late Professor Lounsbury is the author of *The Text of Shakespeare*, in which work he gives Theobald fully his due. By minutely investigating *The Dunciad* and its surroundings, he has given a true and comprehensive account of its hero, laying to rest, once and for all, the evil spirit loosed by Pope.



1754. This is evident throughout the whole work, especially by the wide reading Warton had indulged in. No wonder he fell foul of Pope's line "All such reading as was never read," and he remarks upon it: "If Shakespeare is worth reading, he is worth explaining; and the researches used for so valuable and elegant a purpose, merit the thanks of genius and candour, not the satire of prejudice and ignorance."

Although Theobald's name was in high repute amongst several of the best scholars and editors of his time, later on it gradually waned. One reason why in the end his reputation was unable to overcome the misrepresentations of Pope lay in the fact that as his method became more general, its source was obscured. The generation who knew Theobald and his works realized his importance and patterned their own procedure after his. Their work became in turn new centres of influence, so that by the last quarter of the century the later tribe of critics considered the method anybody's. Not only was he deprived of the honour of formulating and practising a method by which results could be obtained, but his own results were continually pillaged by critics, to whom have been attributed discoveries made many years before. Theobald the editor disappeared; Theobald the dunce survived.

But Dr. Jones has rendered scholarship and Theobald the signal service of unduncing him and reinstating him in his hard won rights of a scholar and an editor. Since Theobald's days hundreds have profited by his example and followed the path he pointed out. Dr. Jones and his predecessors deserve the thanks of all who know how to value justice and truth. His book makes excellent reading, and he has treated his subject in a captivating manner.

I have tried to give an account of the contents of "Theobald Restored", as we might call this book, "to the selfsame tune and words" of its author, adding but little *de meo*, and it is devoutly to be wished that this attempt may be an incentive to lovers of English literature and Shakespeare to read the whole work for themselves. It is of the most vital importance for sound scholarship and thoroughness. <sup>1)</sup>

EDWARD B. KOSTER.

<sup>1)</sup> In case of a reprint Dr. Jones will do well to pay renewed attention to the proof-reading, there are several mistakes in the Greek and Latin quotations. In the English text proper there are very few misprints; on p. 232 we read Egnlish, and on p. 239 we notice a curious fault in a quotation — it may be the fault lies with the author quoted —: Johnson, where apparently Jonson is meant.

## War Words and Peace Pipings.

(Materials for a Study in Slang and Neologism.)

### II.

**anti-aircraft**, employed against hostile air-craft (of guns, troops, etc.); plural *anti-aircrafts* (*Punch*, Sept. 1915, p. 261.)

**anti-flash gear**, see quotation:

The guns are cleared away and we all don our anti-flash gear, which consists of a mask and a pair of gloves made of non-inflammable material and designed to protect us from cordite fires; our appearance when rigged up is somewhat reminiscent of the pictures of monks at a mediæval *auto-da-fé*. (*Daily Mail*, 16 July, 1918).