

emendations have at last been admitted which, notwithstanding their self-evident correctness, were previously to be seen only in appended foot-notes. Nevertheless, the obelus still appears by the side of a passage here and there where, as yet, in the opinion of the editors, no admissable improvement has been proposed, or where lacunæ occur too great to be filled up with any approach to certainty by conjecture. As a kind of contrast to the very enjoyable Globe edition, we may notice here an elaborate typographical curiosity, having relation also to the name of Shakspeare. This is Mr. Booth's reprint (1864), on paper of three several forms, of the folio of 1623. The announcement of the publisher in respect to this work, will be read with mingled feelings of pain and pleasure:—"This beautiful volume is the most perfect re-production that could be imagined or desired of the first and only authoritative edition of Shakspeare's Works. So great pains have been taken to secure accuracy that every head-piece, ornament and line has been carefully copied, and every broken or deformed letter preserved. Though the book has now been nearly two years before the public, not a single inaccuracy has been discovered." A production thus remarkable for its accurate inaccuracy appropriately finds a place in a catalogue of *errata recepta*. Another cognate, and in a scientific point of view, more interesting publication should also be noticed. Not only has the folio of 1623 been thus, with all its faults, minutely edited and carefully printed; it has also been brought out complete and in perfect fac-simile by the process of photozincography. The literary man may thus have upon his own private shelves a copy of Shakspeare in a manner identical with one of the original folios of Heminge and Condell—a copy actually struck off from the face of one of them by the all but miracle of solar typography.

All students of English are interested in the text of Shakspeare. Its perfect purity is a thing greatly longed after. Every rational contribution to this end meets with a welcome. I venture then upon a remark on three several passages which continue to be obelized as, after various treatment by the commentators, incurable. In regard to each respectively I offer a reading, which, as it has struck me, may be really the original one.

"Siquid novisti rectius istis

Candidus imperti; si non, his utere mecum."

In each case I have been more or less led to the suggestion made