THE "Απαξ Λεγόμενα IN SHAKSPERE.

Omnia rara praetura; ipsa raritate rariora.

By James Davie Butler, LL. D.

When we examine the vocabulary of Shakspere what first strikes us is its copiousness. His characters are countless, and each one speaks his own dialect. His little fishes never talk like whales, nor do his whales talk like little fishes. This impression of mine grows stronger when I read in the Encyclopaedia Britannica; "the language assigned to each character is made suitable to it, and to no other, and this with a truth and naturalness which the readers and spectators of every following age have recognized." Those curious in such matters have espied in his works quotations from seven foreign tongues, and those from Latin alone amount to one hundred and thirty-two.

Our first impression that the Shaksperean variety of words is multitudinous is confirmed by statistics. The titles in Mrs. Cowden Clarke's Shaksperean Concordance, counted one by one by a friend have been ascertained to be more than twenty-four thousand. The total vocabulary of Milton's poetical remains is more nearly seventeen than eighteen thousand (17,377); and that of Homer including the hymns as well as both Iliad and Odyssey is scarcely nine thousand. Five thousand eight hundred and sixty words exhaust the vocabulary of Dante's Divina Commedia. In the English Bible the different words are reckoned by Mr. G. P. Marsh in his lectures on the English language, at rather fewer than six thousand. Renan's estimate is 5,642. The number of titles, however, in Cruden's Concordance has been found to be greater by more than a thousand, namely 7,209. Those in Robinson's lexicon of the Greek Testament I have learned by actual count to be about five thousand five hundred.

Some German writers on Greek grammar believe they could teach Plato and Demosthenes useful lessons concerning Greek moods and tenses, even as the ancient Athenians, according to the fable of Phaedrus, undertook to prove that a pig did not
know how to squeal so well as they did. However this may be, any one of us to-day, thanks to the Concordance of Mrs. Clarke, and the Lexicon of Alexander Schmidt, may know much concerning Shakspere's use of language which Shakspere himself could not have known. One particular as to which he must have been ignorant, while we may have knowledge, is regarding his employment of "Απαξ λεγόμενα.

The phrase "Απαξ λεγόμενα, literally "once spoken," may be traced back to the Alexandrine glossographers centuries before our era, who invented it to describe those words which they observed to occur once, and only once, in any author or literature. It is so convenient an expression for statistical commentators on the Bible, and on the classics as well, that they will not willingly let it die. The synonymous phrase "Απαξ εἰρημένα is also a favorite with some Germans, but if we accent it according to its Greek accents, it is hard to pronounce, and I accordingly eschew it. So does Antenrieth in his Homeric dictionary.

Style is modified by the presence of such words — a moment bright, then gone forever. Greek critics were early sensitive to this subtle influence on style and therefore catalogued those words which produced it.

The list of "Απαξ λεγόμενα,— or words used once, and only once, in Shakspere, is surprisingly large. Those words are more than any man can easily number. Nevertheless I have counted those beginning with two letters. The result is that the "Απαξ λεγόμενα with initial Α are 864, and those with initial Μ are 310.

I have no reason to suppose the census with these initials to be proportionally greater than that with other letters. If it is not, then the Shaksperian words occurring only once cannot be fewer than 5,000, and they are probably a still greater legion.

The number I have culled from 146 pages of Schmidt is 674. At this rate the total on the 1,409 pages of the entire lexicon would foot up 6,504. It is possible then that Shakspere discarded, after once trying them, more different words than fill and enrich the whole English Bible. The old grammarians said their term supine was so named because it was very seldom employed, and therefore was almost always lying on its back. The supines of Shakspere outnumbered the employes of most authors.
No notices of Shaksperean "Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα had come to my knowledge when my attention was first called to that theme. In the midst of my investigation, however, I observed a statement in the London Academy (No. 402, p. 48) that some English scholar had counted no less than 549 words in the single play of Henry V. that are nowhere else discoverable in the Shaksperean dramas. It may also be worth noting that the first line which Shakspere ever wrote, or at least published, namely:

"Even as the sun with purple-colored face,"

contains a compound which he thenceforth and forever refrained from repeating.

The multitude of Shaksperean "Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα appears still more surprising if we compare it with expressions of the same class in the Scriptures and in Homer.

In the English Bible the "Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα with the initials Λ 69 and Μ 63 are in all one hundred and thirty-two, to 674 under the same initials in Shakspere. These Biblical terms would be more than twice as many as we find them if as numerous in proportion to their total vocabulary as his are.

The Homeric "Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα with initial Μ are 73. But if as numerous in proportion to Homer's whole world of words as Shakspere's are, they would run up to 186; that is, to more than twice as many as their actual number.

In the Greek New Testament I have counted sixty-three "Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα commencing with the letter Μ, a larger number than you would expect, for it is as large as that in the whole English Bible commencing with the same letter, which is also exactly sixty-three. This fact indicates in Paul and others who wrote the Greek Testament a wider range of expression than their English translators could boast.

The Shaksperean "Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα with initial Μ.—which amount to over three hundred (810), I have also compared with the whole verbal inventory of the English language so far as it begins with that letter. To my surprise they make up almost one-fifth of that stock, which on the authority of the Nation (vol. XX, p. 345.) can muster only 1,641 words, with initial Μ.

You will at once inquire: "What is the nature of these re-
jected Shaksperian vocables, which he seems to have viewed either as milk that would bear no more than one skimming’ or rather as “beauty too rich for use for earth too dear?” The percentage of classical words among them is great, greater indeed than in the body of Shakspere’s writings. According to the analysis of Weisse, in an average hundred of Shaksperian words one third are classical and two thirds Saxon. But then, he adds, all the classical elements have inherent meaning, while half of the Saxon have none. The result is that of the significant words in Shaksper one half are of classical derivation.

Now of the “Ἀποζ ἱστομαι with initial Α, I call 262 words out of 364 classical, and 152 out of 310 with initial Μ, that is 414 out of 674, or about four-sevenths of the whole host commencing with those two letters.

In doubtful cases I have classed those words only as classical, the first etymology of which in Webster is from a classical or Romance root. In the Biblical “Ἀποζ ἱστομαι the classical factor is enormous, namely not less than 69 per cent., while even in Shaksperian words of the same class it is no more than sixty-one.

Again, among the 674 Α. and Μ. “Ἀποζ ἱστομαι the proportion of words now obsolete is unexpectedly small. Of 310 with initial Μ, only one sixth or fifty-one at the utmost are now disused either in sense, or even in form. Of this half hundred a few were used in Shaksper, but are not at present as verbs, as to maculate, to miracle, to mud, to mist, to mischief, to moral. Also, merchandized and musicked.

Another class, now rarely written, are misproud, misdread, mappery, mansionry, marybuds, masterdom, mistership, mistressship.

Then there are slight variants from our orthography or meanings, as mained for maimed, markman for marksman, make for mate, makeless for mateless, mirable, mervaillys, mess for mass,—manakin, minikin, menny for many, momentary for momentary, misgrafiging, mountainer, moraler, misanthropos, mott for motto, to mutine, minutely every minute.

None seem wholly dead words except the following eighteen. To mammock tear, melt meddle, mose mourn, micher truant, mome fool, mallecho mischief, maund basket, marcantant merchant, mun
sound of the wind, mure wall, meacock henpecked, mop grin, militarist soldier, murrion affected with murrain, mammering hesitating,—mered only,—mountant raised up.

The "Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in Shakspere are often so beautiful and poetical that we wonder how they could fail to be his favorites again and again, for they are jewels that might hang twenty years before our eyes yet never lose their luster. Why were they never shown but once?

They remind me of the exquisite crystal bowl from which I saw a Jewess and her bridegroom drink in Prague and which was then dashed in pieces on the floor of the synagogue, or of the Chigi porcelain painted by Raphael which, as soon as it had been once removed from the table, was thrown into the Tiber. To what purpose was this waste? Why should they be used up with once using? Even the Greek drama that would never presume to let a God appear but for an action worthy of a God, was not so pervaded with horror of too much.

Some specimens of this class which all writers but Shakspere would have often paraded as pets, are such words as magical, mirthful, mightful, merriness, majestically, marbled, martyrred, mountainous, magnanimity, magnificence, marrowless, matin, masterpiece, masterdom, meander, mellifluous, menaces, mockable, monarchize, moon-beams, motto, mundane, mural, multipotent, mourningly, etc.

About one-tenth of the remaining "Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα with initial M, are descriptive compounds. Nearly all of them are among the following twenty-six adjectives: maiden-tongued, maiden-widowed, man-entered, many-headed, marble-breasted, marble-constant, marble-hearted, marrow-eating, mean-apparelled, merchant-marring, mercy-lacking, mirth-moving, moving-delicate, mock-water, more-having, mortal-breathing, mortal-living, mortal-staring, molley-minded, mouse-eaten, moss-grown, mouth-filling, mouth-made, muddy-mettled, maid-pale, momentary-swift.

From this list, which is nearly complete, it is evident that such compounds as may be multiplied at will by a word coiner form but a small proportion of the words that are used once only by Shakspere.
Again, a majority of Shaksperian "Aπαξ λεγόμενα being familiar to us as household words, and needful to us as daily food, it seems impossible that he who had cared to use them once should have need of them no more.

Some specimens, all with initial M, are the words, mechanics, machine, maxim, mission, monastic, mode, marsh, magnify, majority, malcontent, malignancy, manly (as an adverb), malleable, manna, maratime, manslaughter, market-day, folks, maid, price, masterly, mealy, meekly, miserably, mercifully, mindful, memorial, mention, merchant-like, mercenary, memorandums, mercurial, meridian, medal, metropolis, mimic, metaphysics, ministration, to moderate, misapply, misconstruction, misgovernment, misquote, monster-like, monstrously, monstrosity, moneyed, monopoly, mutable, mortised, mortise, muniments, mother-wit.

The letter M., which has been the staple of the present paper, is probably a fair representative of Shakspere's diction in regard to words which he would term "seld-shown." The subject, however, deserves to be treated more exhaustively. Every letter ought to be investigated as a single one has now been, and more abundantly. Nor would the labor be arduous, if the task were assumed by any Shaksperian club and divided among a score of its fellows, as the work of lexicography was among the forty members of the French academy. Such an examination would conclusively confirm, or confute, the conclusions to which the facts now set forth have led. It would also suggest others, and those of still greater interest.

In drawing up catalogues of once-used words, if such a set of co-laborers would append to each word the name of the play in which it occurs, the Shaksperian dramas could be easily compared in a manner which has never hitherto been possible. The "Aπαξ λεγόμενα in each particular play would be readily drawn out in a table. Then it would at once become manifest how far the number of such words varied in different works, and whether it was greatest in the early, or middle, or latest period of Shaksperian productivity.

In a casual reading of Cymbeline and Henry VIII., more than three score words in each that are elsewhere unfound have struck
my eye, but more hundreds must have been passed unnoticed. Aside from the 549 once-used words in Henry V., already mentioned, I know not that such verbal statistics have been gathered. But they would not be without manifold utilities. They would aid in judging by style concerning the genuineness of doubtful passages. They would show how far Shakspere's alms-basket of such words, which he calls "fire-new," continued to the last, like charity, which never faileth.

The array of once-used words which has been drawn up in the present writing must, as I think, surprise any one who passes them in review. The further one pushes research in the same line, the more his wonder will grow. Of compounds with the pre-fix re, like reiterate and resignation, he will discover one hundred and fifty lacking two, no one of which he will meet with again. To the same class of vocables undiscoverable a second time belongs every word in the line, "Unhouseled, disappointed, unaneled," as I have already stated, and the italicized words in the following phrases:

"Horns whelked and waved like the enridged sea"

"Massy staples
And corressonive and fulfilling bolts sperr up."

In the following nine lines, which are almost consecutive, the words in italics, numbering nine (or ten if we count lash which is no where else employed in the sense of the thong or cord of a whip), make their entrances and exits once for all.

"In shape no bigger than an agate-stone
Her wagon.spokes made of long spinners' legs,
The cover of the wings of grasshoppers,
The traces of the smallest spider's web.
Her wagoner a small grey-coated gnat
Her whip of cricket's bone, the lash a film.
Time out of mind the fairies' coachmakers
And sometimes comes she with a tithe-pig's tail,
Then dreams he of another benefice."

And yet Romeo and Juliet, the play from which this passage is extracted, was among Shakspeare's earliest efforts. Though a prolific writer for twenty years afterward, he had no occasion for any one of these words even once again,—and repeated the phrase "time out of mind" only on one occasion.
Nowhere perhaps will the student of Shaksperian diction be more astonished than in observing how uncommon is the repetition of the commonest words. Who would anticipate that such vocables as the following would never do duty but once? Fuller, shoemaker, straggler, playing, crazy, sisterly, scholarly, profoundly, prodigiously, wordless, comeliness, restful, fitful, forefoot, forecast, springhalt, rinsing, flannel, flock, sprout, leech, salamander, flail, flake, cater, corpulent, beverage, navigation, salary, omen, obscurity, cataract, cathedral, symbol, gospel, inwardness, Jesus, disciple, apostle, exhortation, homily, dirge, papist, institution, fragile,—or such word-clusters as, definite, definitive, definitively; or these five sprouts from one root, to elf, elvish, elvish-marked, elf-lock, elf-skin.

No one class of once-used words is more conspicuous in Shaksper than alliterative compounds. This fact will be clear from the following very partial register of such formations: all-abhorred, all-admiring, bow-back, burly-boned, bugbear, bull-bearing, bull-beaves, blood-bespotted, brow bound, bate-breeding, blood-boltered, bow-boy, baby-brow, care-crazed, cloud-capped, counter-caster, color-colored, canvas-climber, child-changed, custard-coffin, chamber-council, death-darting, dew-dropping, death-divining, deep-drawing, drug-damned, dove-drawn, dismal-dreaming, double-dealing, double-damned, deep-drenched, dumb-discoursive, ever-esteemed, fast-falling, folly-fallen, foot-fall, faultful, fitful, fiery-footed, fleet-foot, full-flowing, forceful, fraudulent, feast-finding, false-faced, foul faced, free-footed, jelly-foal, full-fed, find-fault, full-fraught, glass-gazing, gain-giving, grim-grinning, guts-gripping, great-grown, hard-hearted, hard-handed, heaven-hued, heavenly-harnessed, heavy-hanging, heart-hardening, hell-hated, highly-heaped, hoary-headed, hollow-hearted, hydra-headed, honey-heavy, honest-hearted, harvest-home, king-killer, love-lacking, low laid, lack lustier, love-letter, lack linen, lack love, lack-lean, lass-born, long-legged, lily-livered, lazar-like, long-lived, lean-looked, light-o'-love, peace parted periwig-pated, proud-pied, pity-pleading, plume-plucked, pistol-proof, plot-proof, ripe-red, riding-robe, riding-red, surfeit swelled, cinque-spotted, sweet suggesting, saint-seducing, sober sad, sad set, sea-salt, sea-sorrow, sea-swallowed, silver-sweet, sober-suited, still stand, ship-side, spirit stirring, super-subtle, superserviceable, sweet seasoned, summer swelling, summer steaming, sick-

These words, and four or five thousand more equally excellent, which have been the golden language of the English-speaking world for three centuries since Shakspere, and which, belonging to the immortal part of their vernacular, will be so forever, we are apt to think he should have worn in their newest gloss, not cast aside so soon. Why was he as shy of repeating them as Hudibras was of showing his wit,

"Who bore it not about
As if afraid to wear it out,
Except on holidays or so,
As men their best apparel do?"

This question, why a full fourth of Shakspere’s verbal riches was never brought to light more than once, is probably one which nobody can at present answer, even to his own satisfaction. Yet, the phenomenon is so remarkable that every one will try after his own fashion to account for it. My own attempt at a provisional explanation I will present in the latter part of this paper.

Let us first notice another question concerning the Ἀποξ λέγομενα, namely that which respects their origin. Where did they come from? How far did Shakspere make them, and how far were they ready to his hand? No approach to answering this inquiry can be made for some years. Yet as to this matter let us rejoice that the dictionary of the British Philological society is now near publication. This work, slowly elaborated by thousands of co-workers in many devious walks of study on both sides of the Atlantic, aims to exhibit the first appearance in a book of every English word. In regard to the great bulk of Shakspere’s diction, it will enable us ten years hence to see how much of it was known to literature before him, and how much of it he, himself a snapper up of unconsidered trifles, gathered or gleaned in highways and byways, or caused to ramify and effloresce from Saxon or classical roots and trunks, thus endowing his purposes with words to make them known.
Meantime, we are left to conjectures. As of his own coinage I should set down such words as mirth-moving, merriness, motley-minded, masterdom, mockable, marbled, martyred, marrowless, mighty, multipotent, monarchize, etc., etc.

Professor Skeat, the most painstaking investigator known to me of early English, has discovered the word “disappointed” in no author earlier than Shakspere. Nor has Shakspere made use of that word more than once, namely in the line:

“Unhouseled, disappointed, unaneled.”

In that line all the words without exception are ουσία λεγόμενα.

The word “disappointed” is not employed by Shakspere in its modern meaning, but as signifying unprepared, or better perhaps unshriven.

But however much of his linguistic treasury Shakspere shall be proved to have inherited ready-made, whatever scraps he may have stolen at the feast of languages, it is clear that he was an imperial creator of language. Having a mint of phrases in his own brain, well might he speak with the contempt he does of those “fools who for a tricksy word defy the matter,”—that is slight or disregard it. He never needed to do that. Words were “correspondent to his command and, Ariel-like, did his sprighting gently.” When has any verbal necessity compelled him to give his sense a turn that does not naturally belong to it?

It is very possible that Shakspere frequently shunned expressions he had once preferred and that because otherwise his style would become monotonous, and so cloy the hungry edge of appetite. According to his own authority, “when they seldom come they wished for come.” And again:

“Therefore are feasts so solemn and so rare,
Since seldom coming in the long year set,
Like stones of worth they thinly placed are,
Or captain jewels in the carcanet.”

In thousands of cases, however, Shakspere cannot have rejected words through fear lest he should repeat them. It has taken three centuries for the world to ferret out his ουσία λεγόμενα, can we believe that he himself knew them all? Unless he were the Providence which numbers all hairs of the head, he had not got
the start of the majestic world so far as that, however myriadminded we may consider him.

An instinct which would have rendered him aware of each and every individual of five thousand words that he had employed once only would be as inconceivable as that of Falstaff which made him discern at midnight the heir apparent in Prince Hal, when disguised as a highwayman. In short, Shakspere could not be conscious of all the words he had once used more than Brigham Young could recognize all the wives he had once wedded.

In the absence of other theories concerning the reasons for the Shaksperian "Δαφνίζ Λεγόμενα being so abundant, I throw out a suggestion of my own, which may stand till a better one shall supplant it.

Shakspere's forte lay in diversified characterization, and, in my judgment, when he had sketched each several character, he was never content till he had either found or fabricated the aptest words possible for painting its form and pressure even in all nuances most true to life. No two characters being identical in any particular, more than two faces are, no two descriptions as drawn by his genius could repeat many of the self-same words. Each of his vocables thus became like each one of the seven thousand pieces in a locomotive which fits the one niche it was ordained to fill, but is out of place everywhere else, yes even dislocated.

The more his ethical differentiations, the more his language was differentiated. His personages were as diversified as have been portrayed by the whole band of Italian painters, but being a wizard in words he resembled the magician in mosaic who can delineate in stone every feature of those portraits, thanks to his discriminating and imitating shades of color more numberless than even Shakspere's words.

It is hard to believe that Shakspere's characters were born like Athene from the brain of Jove in panoplied perfection. They grew. The play of Troilus was a dozen years in growth. According to the best commentators, "internal evidence favors the opinion that Romeo and Juliet was an early work, and that it was subsequently revised and enlarged. Shakspere after having sketched out a play on the fashion of his youthful taste and skill,
returned in after years to enlarge it, remodel it and enrich it with
the matured fruits of years of observation and reflection. Love's
Labor Lost first appeared in print with the announcement that it
was "newly revised and augmented." It is now very generally
regarded as a revision of a play which Shakspere had produced
ten years before and named Love's Labor Won. Cymbeline was
an entire rifacimento of an early dramatic attempt, showing not
only matured fulness of thought but laboring intensity of com-
pressed expression." This being the fact, it is clear that Shak-
spere treated his dramas as Guido did his Cleopatra which he
would not let leave his studio till ten years after the non-artistic
world had deemed that portrait finished.

Meantime the painter was penciling his canvas with curious
touches, each approximating some fraction nearer his ideal. So
the poet sought to find out acceptable words, or what he terms
"an army of good words." He poured his new wine into new
bottles, and never was at rest till he had arrayed his ideas in that
fitness of phrase which comes only by fits.

Had he survived fifty years longer I suppose he would to the
last have been, like Plato, perfecting his phrases. One couplet
which as he left it reads:

"Find tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything,"

he might possibly have corrected and improved, as some commen-
tator has done for him, so as to express more truth, if less poetry,
making the words to stand:

"Find leaves on trees, stones in the running brooks,
Sermons in books, and gain in everything."

To speak seriously, "His manner in diction was progressive, and
this progress has been deemed so clearly traceable in his plays
that it can enable us to determine their chronological order." This
view would have been accepted by Dryden, who treating of
Caliban remarks: "His language is as hobgoblin as his person.
In him Shakspere not only found out a new character, but devised
and adapted a new manner of language for that character."

On first thought it may seem beneath Shakspierian dignity to
be careful and troubled about verbal niceties. But no one will
continue so to think who has once perceived how much pains our dramatist takes in delineating every one of his fools, and that in showing forth their minutest follies he works by wit and not by witchcraft.

The result of Shakspere's curious verbal felicity, is that while other authors satiate and soon tire us, his speech forever breathes an indescribable freshness.

"Age cannot wither
Nor custom stale his infinite variety."

In the last line I have quoted there is a "Δαμαζ λεγόμενον, but it is a word which I think you would hardly guess. It is the last word,—namely, "variety." ¹

In order to make sure of the thing he refused to repeat the word. Indeed, he calls "iteration damnable."

On every average page of Shakspere you are greeted and gladened by at least five words that you never saw before in his writings and that you will never see again, speaking once and then forever holding their peace,—each not only rare but a none-such,—five gems just shown, then snatched away. Each page is studded with five stars, each as unique as the century flower, and like the night-blooming cereus,

"The perfume and suppliance of a minute."

The mind of Shakspere was bodied forth as Montezuma was appareled, whose costume, however gorgeous, was never twice the same, and so like Shakspere's own "robe pontifical, ne'er seen but wondered at."

Hence the Shakserian style is fresh as morning dews and changeful as evening clouds, so that we remain forever doubtful in relation to his manner and his matter, which of them owes the greater debt to the other.

¹Though this instance [Ant. and Cleop., 2, 2, 241] is the only occurrence of variety in the plays, we meet the word once more in Shakspere's poems, namely, in the twenty-first line of Venus and Adonis:

"Making them red and pale in endless variety."

Not a few other words which appear once only in the plays, are also repeated in the poems. But it was the Δαμαζ λεγόμενα in the plays, and not in other Shakserian writings, of which it was my aim to treat.
The Shaksperean plots are analogous to the grouping of Raphael, the characters to the drawing of Michael Angelo, but the word-painting exceeds the coloring of Titian. Accordingly, in view of Shakspere's diction, I would long ago have said, if I could, what I read in Arthur Helps concerning a perfect style, that "there is a sense of felicity about it, declaring it to be the product of a happy moment, so that you feel that it will not happen again to that man who writes the sentence, nor to any other of the sons of men, to say the like thing so choiceely, tersely, mellifluously and completely." In the central court of the Neapolitan museum I observed grape-clusters, volutes, moldings, fingers and antique fragments of all sorts wrought in the rarest marble, lying scattered on the pavement, exposed to sun and rain, cast down the wrong side up, and seemingly thrown away, as when the stones of the Jewish sanctuary were poured out in every street. Nothing reveals the sculptural opulence of Italy like that apparent wastefulness. It seems to proclaim that Italy can afford to make nothing of what would elsewhere be judged worthy of shrines. We say to ourselves, "If such be the things she throws away, what must be her jewels!" A similar feeling rises in me while exploring Shakspere's prodigality in "Ἀπεξ ἡγομένα. His exchequer must have been more exhaustless than the Bank of England, and he threw away more dies for coining words than the British mint ever possessed for coining money.

On the whole, in whatever aspect we survey the Bard of Avon I am reminded of the retired Boston merchant who, in his old age, reading Hamlet for the first time was enraptured. When asked how he liked Shakspere, his answer was, "How do I like him? Like is no word for my admiration. The truth is that not twenty men in modern Boston can write anything better than old Shakspere." I say ditto to the Boston man. Not more than forty men in Madison (the present company excepted) can produce plays superior to the old Shakspelian.