

Title	Between particularity and generality : The significance of Samuel Johnson's abandoned edition of Shakespeare
Sub Title	個別性と一般性のはざま : サミュエル・ジョンソンの幻のシェイクスピア全集
Author	原田, 範行(Harada, Noriyuki)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	1990
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.57, (1990. 3) ,p.244(31)- 258(17)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00570001-0258

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

Between Particularity and Generality: The Significance of Samuel Johnson's Abandoned Edition of Shakespeare

Noriyuki Harada

"Shakespeare is...the poet of nature; the poet that holds up to his readers a faithful mirror of manners and of life". In this passage, Samuel Johnson (1709-84) uses "nature" as "the generic type, excluding the differentiate of species and individuals". He adds: "in the writings of other poets a character is too often an individual; in those of Shakespeare it is commonly a species".¹⁾ Johnson's thought in the "Preface" is similar to the description in *Rasselas* (1759): "the business of a poet...is to examine, not the individual, but the species; to remark general properties and large appearances....He is to exhibit in his portraits of nature such prominent and striking features, as recall the original to every mind".²⁾

However, the "manners" and "life" are mutable in themselves and dominated by particular occasions. If Shakespeare held a faithful mirror of them and showed any "general nature", he had to generalize the universality from particularity. It was a difficult and lifelong question for Johnson how Shakespeare adapted the particularity to generality. In his working on the edition of Shakespeare, one can trace his groping for the answer.³⁾

Johnson published his first edition of Shakespeare in 1765 and revised four times in his lifetime. Johnson's attitude toward the contradictory problem between particularity and generality has been discussed in so far as these five editions, especially the "Preface" to the 1765 edition, are concerned.⁴⁾ However, Johnson's working on Shakespeare was never confined in these ones. Actually, he made plans to edit Shakespeare for the first time in 1745 and published

the *Proposals* and *Miscellaneous Observations on the Tragedy of Macbeth*, as a pamphlet for the specimen of his text and notes.⁵⁾ But this edition was abandoned because of troubles over the copy-right and has been unjustly ignored.

In view of this, the obscurity surrounding the 1745 edition must be more lighted. It undoubtedly marks the first time that he expressed his intention to publish a Shakespeare edition even though he did not complete it. Moreover, this was just after he experienced the cataloging of the Harleian Library and just before undertaking his monumental *Dictionary* (1755), so it can be regarded as the accomplishment of Johnson's early career and as the prologue to his later achievements. Although he was only the anonymous author of *London* (1738), *Life of Savage* (1744) and some articles on parliamentary debates in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and far from becoming the "Great Cham of Literature", in this period, when he was trying to establish the foundation of his career as a man of letters, we seem to be able to find the roots of his later achievements—*Dictionary*, the complete editions of Shakespeare, *Rasselas*, *Lives of the English Poets* (1779–81) and numerous critical writings in *The Rambler* (1750–2) and *The Idler* (1758–60).

For the discussion of the significance of the 1745 edition, three points will be offered. The first concerns his historical sense; the second is his psychological approach to biography; and the third is his ardent enthusiasm to complete his own dramatic work, *Irene* (1749). These are all concerned with the contradictory problem—particularity and generality.

As regards Johnson's historical sense, it has characteristic origins. Throughout his life, he was sensitive to the antiquities in and around his birthplace, Lichfield, such as old structures, historic relics and traditional habits remaining there.⁶⁾ It is true that he was always critical of pedantic antiquarianism, but, undoubtedly, he was interested in tangible facts which told history vividly. He never disregarded particularity in history. And, in addition, his wide reading from his childhood extending to the classics, medie-

val romances and numerous books in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries might have evoked historical imagination to each scene described within. His attacks on easy “flights of imagination” into history are famous; however, abundant historical imagination acquired from books supported his historical sense.⁷⁾

These origins, however, had to be adapted for his literary career. He had an ambition to be a literary writer, and as such he thought that he needed to derive universal validity of history in order to appeal to the common reader. Universality could be found neither from mere enumeration of historical facts and scholarly knowledge, nor from any partial generality of history. Because he regarded his age as the destination of history, he thought that his contemporary readers expected him to deduce the essence of history from particular facts and individual imagination. Such attitude toward history had already appeared in the preface to *A Voyage to Abyssinia* (1735):

[The reader] will discover what will always be discover'd by a diligent and impartial enquirer, that wherever *human nature* is to be found, there is a mixture of vice and virtue, a contest of passion and reason.... (emphasis added)⁸⁾

Although *A Voyage to Abyssinia* is only English adaptation of French translation of Jeronimo Lobo's travel book, he recognized that what was important in historical accounts was human nature. His literary theme was how he would describe the universality in history. The aim was clarified; however, the practice for realizing the aim was not necessarily involved at this time. After he came to London in 1737, he had to suffer much in the difficulty of his ideal writing. In his political hack writings for the *Gentleman's Magazine* in the early 1740s, he often exploited imaginary events under the pretence of history to persuade the reader to take his side. But he could not accomplish his ideal description because such writings drew only partial generality. He could not afford neither to study history in detail, nor to express his own view of the universality

of human nature independently. The shift from such hack writing to the cataloging of the Harleian Library was an escape from the deceptive writing.

The experience of making the catalog cannot be ignored as regards the development of Johnson's historical sense, mainly because he had an opportunity to survey the content of numerous books in the collection and confirm them tactually.⁹⁾ He stored great literary knowledge including the source of Shakespeare's plays and it is needless to say that he was aware of the great tradition of literature. At this point, his motivation to edit the works of Shakespeare emerged. He might have a presentiment that he would be able to participate in the tradition by putting the experience effectively.

Johnson stopped the task halfway and moved on to editing the works of Shakespeare, presumably in 1744. It is perhaps true that no one could continue without being discouraged, faced with such a vast collection. But it is not enough to explain his shifting. It is because the cataloging was fundamentally different from what he was aiming at. Although he actually expected himself to access to history in the Harleian Library, after the brief encounter with the experience, he decided to concentrate on drawing universality from his knowledge of history in his own way. Cataloging of the Harleian Library was certainly a great task; however, it was a job for historians and far from popular. He did not have any ambition to be scholarly historian or antiquarian. His purpose was directed to his contemporary readers. For such purpose, to treat the works of Shakespeare—editing and criticizing—appeared to be a reasonable way to inquire into his literary theme; they treat historical subjects and are excellently unified as literary work. In addition, he would be able to make the most of the Harleian experience.

In the notes to *Macbeth* of the 1745 edition, Johnson exercised his historical sense and tried to explain the Elizabethan circumstances. It is because he thought that, if he would gave proper historical knowledge of Elizabethan age to the eighteenth-century readers, he could arrange the basis for reading the universality of

human nature in the play. For instance, in the long explanatory notes (I and XXXV), he earnestly shows the appropriateness of Shakespeare's using of supernatural witches, although they are uncommon for the eighteenth-century readers:

In order to make a true estimate of the abilities and merit of a writer, it is always necessary to examine the genius of his age, and the opinions of his contemporaries....[A] survey of the notions that prevailed at the time when this play was written, will prove that Shakespeare was in no danger of such censures, since he only turned the system that was then universally admitted to his advantage, and was far from overburthening the credulity of his audience.¹⁰⁾

He then comments on Shakespeare's historical validity in demonocracy, referring to Photius's *Extracts*, St. Chrysostom's *De Sacerdotio* and King James's *Daemonologie*. He mentions lastly:

Upon this general infatuation Shakespeare might be easily allowed to found a play, especially since he has followed with great exactness such histories as were then thought true; nor can it be doubted that the scenes of enchantment, however they may now be ridiculed, were both by himself and his audience thought awful and affecting.¹¹⁾

Note XXXV, provided for Act IV Scene i of *Macbeth*, is also expository in the infernal scene:

As this is chief scene of inchantment in the play, it is proper in this place to observe, with how much judgement Shakespeare has selected all the circumstances of his infernal ceremonies, and how exactly he has conformed to common opinions and traditions.¹²⁾

Johnson's interpretation that Shakespeare did not make a display of his eccentricity far from the real history can be found in the other notes as well. Shakespeare's play was, for him, not fiction but reconstruction of history validly for the description of human nature. It is true that Johnson himself did not necessarily describe

clearly what is the universality. Or rather, he might entrust the reading of universality to Johnson's contemporaries, instead he himself would directly point out it. But it is undoubtedly that Johnson vouched the validity of Shakespeare's historical sense and regarded the play as sufficient description for human nature.

Johnson's appreciation of Shakespeare's plays in historical sense is interwoven with his evaluation of Shakespeare's psychological description of the *dramatis personae*. Johnson thought that historical person should be described dynamic, not motionless. An author of character portraiture must treat the universality of human nature which has wide application to the readers. Similarly to his historical sense, Johnson required to give universality to historical person, and, therefore, he thought highly of psychology of characters.

This approach had been cultivated in his biographical writings and it is evident in his *Life of Savage*, which was presumably written while he was preparing the Shakespeare edition. Although the novelty of *Life of Savage* as psychological description resulted partly from the unique circumstances—he was an intimate friend of Savage and when Savage died, he was the only writer who was qualified to write a biography—he could apply his principle for the first time.¹³⁾ Accordingly, Johnson did not waste the opportunity on public records and chronological description of Savage, but instead described his personality. *Life of Savage* does not “begin with his pedigree and end with his funeral”; most of it is a study of psychology which affords more knowledge of a man's real character than “a formal and studied narrative”.¹⁴⁾ Once the method of biography was established, he could easily apply it to other historical persons or characters in play.

This principle of biographical writing is clearly mentioned in later years. He makes an assertion that a writer of biography should treat the truth of human nature and inherent probability in human life in such a way that enables the reader to have pleasure in understanding them. In *The Rambler*, Johnson states the significance of biography:

[N]o species of writing seems more worthy of cultivation than biography, since none can be more delightful or more useful, none can more certainly enchain the heart by irresistible interest, or more widely diffuse instruction to every diversity of condition.¹⁵⁾

And he refers to useless narratives:

The general and rapid narratives of history, which involves a thousand fortunes in the business of a day, and complicate innumerable incidents in one great transaction, afford few lessons applicable to private life[.]¹⁶⁾

Then he concludes the business of biographer:

[T]he business of the biographer is often to pass slightly over those performances and incidents, which produce vulgar greatness, to lead the thoughts into domestick privacies, and display the minute details of daily life, where exterior appendages are cast aside, and men excel each other only by prudence and by virtue.¹⁷⁾

What Johnson gives significance in biographical writing is, firstly, to take notice of the “minute details” of individual life and, secondly, to describe the prudence and virtue from which the details of life resulted. “Complicate innumerable incidents in one great transaction” do not give any significance to private life of the readers. An author of biography had to exercise his appropriate imagination into the psychology of the man who is described and enable the reader to “recognize [the pains or pleasures] as once our own, or considering them as naturally incidents to our state of life”.¹⁸⁾

This approach is seen in Johnson’s notes to *Macbeth*. In note XVI, which discusses the scene in which Lady Macbeth persuades her husband to murder Duncan and take the throne for himself, Johnson penetrates into both characters’s psychology and, from it, draws what common readers can apply to their own life:

She urges the excellence and dignity of courage, a glittering idea which has dazzled mankind from age to age, and animated sometimes the housebreaker, and sometimes the conqueror; but this sophism Macbeth has forever destroyed by distinguishing true from false fortitude, in a line and a half[.]

I dare do all that may become a man,
Who dares do more is none.

This topic...is used in this scene with peculiar propriety to a soldier by a woman. Courage is the distinguishing virtue of a soldier, and the reproach of cowardice cannot be borne by any man from a woman, without great impatience. She then urges the oaths by which he had bound himself to murder Duncan, another art of sophistry by which men have sometimes deluded their consciences, and persuaded themselves that which would be criminal in others is virtuous in them[.]¹⁹⁾

Johnson likens his reading to Shakespeare's own observation of human nature and mentions at the beginning of the note: "the arguments [of Lady Macbeth and Macbeth] ...afford a proof of Shakespeare's knowledge of human nature". Similarly, in note XX, which refers to Macbeth's soliloquy just before murdering Duncan, Johnson comments:

Macbeth has...disturbed his imagination by enumerating all the terrors of the night[.] As he is going to say of what, he discovers the absurdity of his suspicion and pauses, but is again overwhelmed by his guilt, and concludes, that such are the horrors of the present night, that the stones may be expected to cry out against him. ...He observes...that on such occasions "stones have been known to move". It is now a very just and strong picture of a man about to commit a deliberate murder under the strongest convictions of the wickedness of his design.²⁰⁾

Instead of mere annotation, Johnson intended to show the universality of Macbeth's speech and action by penetrating into the psychology of Macbeth.

This attitude toward the characters is sometimes excessive and seems to forget the stream of time from the characters or Shake-

speare to Johnson. But he did not forget the distance. What he would explain is the universality of human nature beyond the distance. Indeed, his approach to the characters has a similarity to his historical sense because he did not aim at a generality without observing particularity. It is through particularity that Johnson generalized the universality. Both Johnson's historical sense and view of biographical description in the notes to *Macbth* clarify his aiming at universality with swaying between particularity and generality.

Johnson's ardent enthusiasm for completion of *Irene*—his only dramatic work—also can be discussed in this point. If he would create a dramatic work, he could make the audience most effectively aware of the universality without tedious explanation. From eight years before the 1745 edition, he cherished the desire to put *Irene* on the stage and rewrote it intermittently. For Johnson, Shakespeare's play might be a model of his *Irene*. In addition, David Garrick, a famous actor in the eighteenth century and once Johnson's pupil in Lichfield, played an important role of combining Johnson's theatrical interest with Shakespeare's *Macbeth*.

Irene was borrowed from a Turkish story set at the court of Mahomet II in the early fifteenth century which treats the fate of two heroines—Aspasia and Irene. In a political disturbance of the court, the former survived because of her belief in virtue, while the latter is killed as a result of her overconfidence in power regardless of virtue. It is certain that the plot is loose; the characterization is ambiguous, other motifs are confused and the conclusion such as "heav'n supports the virtuous mind" seems too abstract and extravagant.²¹⁾ He could not expertly describe the universality of human nature in the "real state of sublunary nature". However, Johnson's attitude toward dramatic work is obvious: he tried to draw universality from particular speech and action of characters and tell the audience what is universal human nature. He approached Shakespeare's play with the same principle.

Garrick had the most sympathy to Johnson's *Irene* from early days and he was also an important person who kindled Johnson's

intention to publish the 1745 edition. He had already made a start as a famous actor of Shakespeare's play; he played *Richard III* firstly in 1741 and established his reputation by playing *King Lear* and *Hamlet* the next year. In January 1744, he also successfully appeared in *Macbeth*, possibly seen by Johnson. It was two months before Thomas Hanmer's edition of Shakespeare was published. Johnson refers to this edition in his own 1745 edition: "after the foregoing pages were printed, the late edition of Shakespeare, ascribed to Sir T. H. fell into my hands".²²⁾ It is certain that Johnson undertook the 1745 edition before the success of Garrick's *Macbeth*; however, it encouraged him to publish it.

Johnson had, in fact, been involved with Garrick's *Macbeth* earlier. When Garrick planned to stage *Macbeth*, he tried to improve the version of William Davenant, asking Johnson and William Warburton for their advice on textual problems. Bored with Davenant's text, Garrick intended to restore Shakespeare's original *Macbeth*. The exchange between Garrick and Johnson must have occurred during 1743. Although Garrick seems not to have followed Johnson completely, several of the older man's suggestions were adopted in Garrick's text.²³⁾ At this point, Johnson peered into the emendation of Shakespeare's play and inferred the successful method for contemporary audience from Garrick's practice. In the exchange with Garrick, Johnson faced what he should do for his contemporary audience's understanding and the question how he would finish his *Irene*. What Johnson acquired in this experience was not only his development of scholarly knowledge of Shakespeare, but also the dramaturgy which brings universality from particular speech and action of characters effectively to the audience. Both of them are employed in the 1745 edition and in completing *Irene*. Or rather, Johnson might regard the 1745 edition as a step toward *Irene*'s theatrical success.

Indeed, Garrick's dramatic and theatrical sense might have influenced Johnson's notes in the 1745 edition. In note XXIV, Johnson doubts whether Shakespeare's audience could understand the allusion

to Anthony:

I cannot but propose the rejection of this passage...that his [Shakespeare's] audience should be less knowing than himself, and has therefore weakened the author's sense by intrusion of a remote and useless image into a speech bursting from a man possess'd with his own present condition[.]²⁴⁾

And Johnson criticizes for the excess of personages in note XXXIV:

As this tragedy like the rest of Shakespeare's is perhaps overstocked with personages, it is not easy to assign a reason, why a nameless character should be introduced here, since nothing is said that might not with equal propriety have been put into the mouth of any other disaffected man.²⁵⁾

Johnson's numerous comments on metrical regulation also hint at future production in which Johnson aimed at theatrical success, although they were entirely omitted in the 1765 edition.²⁶⁾ The notes to *Macbeth* reflect not merely his editorial proficiency and scholarly knowledge, but his dramatic mind.

However, it was evident that Johnson's *Irene* would not succeed in a stage, because his purpose was too far ahead of his practice. Actually, the play staged only to fail in 1749. It is certain that Johnson might learn Shakespeare's dramaturgy and partly accept Garrick's practical advice on *Irene*. Nevertheless, he could not finish *Irene* as that which would be superior to boring morality. The hope which Johnson tried to describe universal human nature successfully in his own dramatic work was gone. It is perhaps that Johnson himself might notice his talent. His self-scornful attitude in the "Plan" for the *Dictionary* which was published in 1747, symbolizes his travail for establishing his ideal writing:

[A] task that requires neither the light of learning, nor the activity of genius, but may be successfully performed without any higher quality than that of bearing burdens with dull patience, and beating the track of the alphabet with sluggish resolution.²⁷⁾

The overall tone of resignation is undeniable: "that requires neither the light of learning" might be a confession of inadequacy in his scholarly activities while "nor the activity of genius" might be a prediction of his failure in the theater. He never grasped the mind of the theater audience. Although he conceived his theatrical success at the time of the 1745 edition, it seems to be natural that the task of lexicographer would be prepared for him after the 1745 edition was abandoned.

There were other possible reasons why Johnson undertook the 1745 edition. The publication of Shakespeare editions was in fashion and thus profitable for the publishers. Cave, the able editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, would no doubt have been keen to publish an original edition of Shakespeare by a rising writer. Johnson conferred with Cave and mapped out the plan. Although the plan was not carried out completely and some scholarly errors were exposed, numerous interpretations of the passages in *Macbeth* found their way into the *Dictionary* and his later editions of Shakespeare.²⁸⁾ It is certain that he partly achieved the content of the proposa for the 1745 edition: "notes critical and explanatory, in which the text will be corrected: the various readings remarked: the conjectures of former editors examin'd, and their omissions supply'd".²⁹⁾

However, it is more significant that the 1745 edition involves the embryos in Johnson's literary theme: the treatment of history in his writing, psychological description of biography, and creation of his own dramatic world. These are all concerned with the contradictory concpts—particularity and generality—and Johnson desired to draw universal human nature between them. It is certain that he denied false material, but he also denied such particular observation and description as that which could not tell universality. To draw universality through generalization of particularity was his only ideal description. It would be lifelong theme how he describes history and biography in this principle. In addition, the dramaturgy which he learned in the process of making the 1745

edition also influenced his later achievements, although his desire to create his own dramatic work failed. In this sense, the 1745 edition epitomizes the essence of his literary career.

Acknowledgments

This essay is based on chapter 4 of my MA thesis, which was presented to Keio University in 1990. I would like to express my deep gratitude to Professor Toshiyuki Takamiya and Associate Professor Andrew Armour for their kind advice and careful reading of my manuscript.

Notes

- 1) See Johnson's "Preface" to the 1765 edition in *Johnson on Shakespeare*, The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson, VII, ed. Arthur Sherbo (New Haven: Yale UP, 1968), p. 62. For the definition of "nature", see Arthur O. Lovejoy, "'Nature' as Aesthetic Norm", *MLN*, XLIII (1927), pp. 444-50.
- 2) "The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia", *The Works of Samuel Johnson*, LL. D. (1825; New York: AMS, 1970), I, p. 222.
- 3) In the "Preface" to the 1765 edition, Johnson often uses "general nature" in contradiction to "particular nature" or "sublunary nature".
- 4) See, for example, Scott Elledge, "The Background and Development in English Criticism of the Theories of Generality and Particularity", *PMLA*, LXII (1947), pp. 176-82 and Murray Krieger, "Fiction, Nature, and Literary Kinds in Johnson's Criticism of Shakespeare", *Eighteenth-Century Studies* IV (1970-1), pp. 184-98.
- 5) When Johnson published the *Proposals* and *Miscellaneous Observations on the Tragedy of Macbeth* together in April 1745, Jacob Tonson quickly claimed that Tonson and his associates controlled the copyright of Shakespeare and they would bring a suit against Cave and Johnson. Tonson had already prepared Warburton's edition of Shakespeare. *Miscellaneous Observations* consists of forty-six notes to *Macbeth* and it is substantially complete, although the title is modest. For the change of the notes to *Macbeth* from the 1745 to 1765 edition, see Arthur Sherbo, "Dr. Johnson on *Macbeth*: 1745-1765", *RES* New Series II (1951), pp. 40-7 and *Samuel Johnson, Editor of Shakespeare* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956), esp. pp. 1-14.

- 6) See James L. Clifford, *Young Samuel Johnson* (Melbourne: Heinemann, 1955), pp.25-41 and John A. Vance, *Samuel Johnson and the Sense of History* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984), pp. 24-6,
- 7) For Johnson's reading in childhood, see James Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, I, ed. George Birkbeck Hill, rev. L. F. Powell (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934), p.57. The phrase "flights of imagination" were originally used in Johnson's criticism on the poetry of William Collins and it has been regarded as a typical expression of his attitude toward romantic and fanciful imagination. See Johnson, "Collins", *Lives of the English Poets*, III, ed. George Birkbeck Hill (1905; New York: Octagon, 1967), p. 337.
- 8) Johnson, "The Preface", *A Voyage to Abyssinia*, The Yale Edition, XV, ed. Joel J. Gold (New Haven: Yale UP, 1985), p.3.
- 9) As regards the Harleian Library, he published miscellaneous writings: "Proposals for a Catalogue of the Library" (1742), "Advertisement for Osborne Concerning the Harleian Catalogue" (1743) and "Preface to the Harleian Miscellany" (1744).
- 10) Johnson, "Miscellaneous Observations on the Tragedy of Macbeth", *Johnson on Shakespeare*, p.3.
- 11) *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- 12) *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- 13) Psychological description of biography here means that it results from the author's insight to internal motivation of a man's speech and action. This approach to biography made a turning point of English biography. For the novelty of Johnson's biographical description; see Robert Folkenflik, *Samuel Johnson, Biographer* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978), esp. pp.214-9 and G. F. Parker, *Johnson's Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), esp. pp.28-42. And it is in *Life of Savage* that he established his own principle, contrary to his previous writings: *The Life of Father Paul Sarpi* (1738) and *The Life of Dr Herman Boerhaave* (1739); see also Harold Nicolson, *The Development of English Biography* (London: Hogarth, 1927), pp.79-86.
- 14) See Johnson, "The Rambler 60", *The Rambler*, The Yale Edition, III, ed. W. J. Bate and Albrecht B. Strauss (New Haven: Yale UP, 1969), pp. 318-23.
- 15) *Ibid.*, p. 319.
- 16) *Ibid.*, p. 319.
- 17) *Ibid.*, p. 321.
- 18) *Ibid.*, p. 319.
- 19) *Johnson on Shakespeare*, pp.17-8.
- 20) *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- 21) See Johnson, "Prologue" to *Irene*, *The Works of Samuel Johnson*, LL. D., I, p. 29.

- 22) *Johnson on Shakespeare*, p. 43.
- 23) Johnson's advice may be inferred from several passages in Garrick's text, for example in Act V Scene iii and v, because these passages are not seen in the other texts of Shakespeare except Johnson's 1745 edition (note XLII and XLV). See George Winchester Stone, Jr., "Garrick's Handling of Macbeth", *Studies in Philology* XXXVIII (1941), pp. 609-28 and Harry William Pedicord and Frederick Lois Bergmann, eds., *The Plays of David Garrick*, III (Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1981), esp. pp. 397-406.
- 24) *Johnson on Shakespeare*, pp. 24-5.
- 25) *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- 26) See note XXII and XXXVII in the 1745 edition.
- 27) Johnson, "The Plan of an English Dictionary", *The Works of Samuel Johnson*, V, p. 1.
- 28) At the 1745 edition, Johnson did not know the Elizabethan meanings of "owe" and "seat" (note IX, XXXII and XV), while note XXXIX and XLII are strengthened in his *Dictionary*, which gives, in both cases, Johnson's definition in the 1745 edition with one more example from Shakespeare. See Sherbo, "Dr. Johnson on *Macbeth*: 1745 and 1765", p. 45 and *Samuel Johnson, Editor of Shakespeare*, pp. 15-27.
- 29) See the photocopy of the "Proposals" in *Johnson on Shakespeare*, pp. 46-7.