

Surrey); another daughter, Mary, married Sir Edward Selwyn (of Friston, co. Sussex), Knt. Both the pedigrees cited state that Hester Smith married R. Fleetwood, but as she mentions sisters Brand and Selwin (*sic*) in her will, they are evidently incorrect. 'Betham's Baronetage' is also in error, as it gives the husband's name as Robert. Incidentally, this answers the query in 9th S. ix. 513.

I now come to the will of Robert Fleetwood, citizen and glass-seller, of London, son of the regicide and Hester Fleetwood (Robert the first, of my first paper). In his will, dated 9 July, and proved 15 August, 1712 (P.C.C. Barnes, 153), he directs that he is to be interred in the parish church of St. Andrew Undershaft, in which parish he was living, or in the vault belonging to the said parish; the will likewise mentions that the house was in Lime Street Ward. He leaves to his honoured mother Hester Fleetwood 10*l.* per annum, "according to obligation I am under for that purpose," and requests that, should he predecease her, she would be pleased to name his son Robert as her executor. To his eldest son George he leaves two shillings and sixpence "and no more, he having already had a full Child's part and more," and been an expense to him. To his son and daughter Cleaver he leaves a guinea apiece for a ring, his daughter having already had her portion. After various bequests he leaves the residue of his estate, South Sea stock, goodwill of business, &c., to be divided into three equal parts, for his wife Anne and his sons Robert and John. He wishes Robert to have the management of the business, and that John should serve the full term of his apprenticeship with his brother. The executors are his wife and the sons Robert and John, with Benjamin Steward, glass-seller, as overseer and arbitrator if need be.

The following extracts from the parish registers relate to him and his family; a further search would probably disclose other entries:—

Christenings.

1720, April 6. John, the son of Robert Fleetwood and Jane his wife.

1721, April 25. Charles, y^r son of Robert Fleetwood and Jane his wife.

Burials.

1712, Aug. 10. Robert Fleetwood.

1721, April 28. Charles, y^r son of Robert and Jane Fleetwood.

1721, Oct. 6. Robert Fleetwood.

The children baptized must have been the grandchildren of Robert who died in 1712. Robert Fleetwood who died in 1721 was in all probability the father of the children.

Administration of the estate of Jane Fleetwood, late of West Moulsey, co. Surrey, widow, was granted to her son Robert Fleetwood, 17 March, 1752 (P.C.C. Bettesworth), but I cannot state positively that she was the widow of Robert and mother of the two children baptized in 1720 and 1721, though the connexion of the Brand family also with Moulsey can hardly be a coincidence.

With regard to Hester Fleetwood's connexion with the Quakers, I must express my obligation to Mr. Norman Penney (of the Friends' Library at Devonshire House, 12, Bishopsgate Street Without, where many interesting Quaker records are preserved), who has been at great pains to verify that she was a member of that body. R. W. B.

SHAKESPEARIANA.

"HORSE" (10th S. i. 342).—The suggestion of "horse" for "horses" in 'Macbeth,' II. iv. 13, would slightly improve the scansion of the line, and is so far desirable; but in face of Shakespeare's free use of extra syllables in his verse, it is not cogent on that ground. Is it, then, cogent on any other? Are we to understand that any emendation restoring "Anglo-Saxon" or "Middle English" forms to Shakespeare is desirable? Perhaps not. We are asked to strike out the *s* in the l.c. "because it contradicts Shakespeare's usage in many other passages." Now what is Shakespeare's usage? PROF. SKEAT admits that the form "horses" is found in Shakespeare. It is. Schmidt's 'Lexicon' gives eleven references, "&c.," for it. For "horse" as plural it gives eleven only (including PROF. SKEAT's ten). Admitted these latter, the poet's usage seems to *prefer* the dissyllabic plural. But I propose to examine the eleven more closely.

Let me premise that while Schmidt's 'Lexicon' as a work of reference is of the highest utility, the lexicographer's dicta on English meanings and usage are not to be swallowed uncritically; and few that read his inept note on "organ-pipe" ('Temp.,' III. iii. 98) will defer to his taste.

In Sonnet 91 there seems to me not the slightest presumption that "horse" is plural. A man keeps more than one hawk, more than one hound, but often not more than one horse.

In 'Tam. Shr.,' Induct., 61, the same applies.

'1 Henry VI.,' V. v. 54, proves nothing: in a category of things they need not be all in the same number (*e.g.*, "Verbera, carnifices, robur, pix, lammina, tædæ").

'2 Henry VI.,' V. i. 52 (if "horse" is the correct reading), proves nothing; to my mind *one* horse is here meant, as with the following word (one) armour. Cf. '2 Henry IV.,' IV. v. 30, and 'Two Noble Kinsmen,' III. vi. 3. N.B. Schmidt's second class of the word "armour" is a good sample of vacuous profundity.

'1 Henry VI.,' I. v. 31, though a strong instance, does not seem to me decisive. Categories may fluctuate between plural and singular, especially when "disjunctive."

'Ant.,' III. vii. 7, is enigmatical; but I see nothing in the context to show that horse is not singular. I suspect a play on words, with allusion to the fact that one horse may "serve" several mares.

In 'Macbeth,' IV. i. 140, "horse" is surely used in the "military" sense (implying the mounts), as in "The king to Oxford sent a troop of horse," "A cornet of horse," &c. Of this use Schmidt quotes sixteen instances from Shakespeare; I have not examined them.

This specialized use as a collective noun is natural enough (cf. ἡ ἵππος in Greek). It naturally, too, belongs to any collection of the animals that can be viewed as a unit—for example, "team of horse" in 'T. G. V.,' III. i. 265. In 'T. A.,' II. ii. 18, 'Ant.,' III. vi. 43, and '3 Henry VI.,' IV. v. 12, this "military" sense appears; the second, however, is rather bolder than the others.

To conclude, then, in only two instances at most, of the eleven, do I find even a *prima facie* case for considering "horse" as a plural.

If we are to purchase smoothness of scansion (by no means one of Shakespeare's fetiches) by reading "horse" in 'Macbeth,' II. iv. 13, I maintain that we should go further, and read "minion of his race.....his stall.....he would make.....he eat himself.....he did so." Or else we must take "horse" in the "military" sense, and retain the plurals. The omen will then be even more impressive. Of course I do not deny that a singular form (especially with numeral or quantitative adjective prefixed) is often used as a "collective," or that Shakespeare may have used it so in some of the passages; but I may not believe, short of an undoubted instance, that he ever consciously used "horse" as a plural form, to indicate several distinct units; still less can I assent to an emendation introducing such an instance. Rather would I hold it more reasonable to emend all the monosyllabic "plurals" into dissyllabic, where metre allowed.

H. K. St. J. S.

Shakespeare also uses the plural *horses*, as in the verse of Hotspur:—

Hath Butler brought these horses from the sheriff?
And in the line,

And Duncan's horses (a thing most strange and certain),

the third foot is an anapaest. An additional syllable, making one of the feet an anapaest or a dactyl, is common in the blank verse of Shakspeare and of other great poets:—

Thése vi | ðlènt | dèlghts | hæve vi | ðlènt ènda.

'Romeo and Juliet.'

Omfínous | cónjác | túre òn | thè wóhle | áuccéss

A pill | ár ðf státè | dèép òn | hís frónt | èngríven.

'Paradise Lost.'

Nów lies | thè éarth | áll Dán | æt to | thè stárs.

Tennyson's 'Princess.'

Hundreds of examples might be given. No alteration of Shakspeare's line in 'Macbeth' is, I think, necessary. E. YARDLEY.

"COMRADE," 'HAMLET,' I. iii. 65.—I forward a conjecture of my own, with which I have not elsewhere met, on 'Hamlet,' I. iii. 65, ed. Dowden, in "Arden" Series (I. iii. 64, 65, Globe ed.):—

Do not dull thy palm with entertainment
Of each new-hatch'd unfledg'd comrade,

where *comrade* (cf. for accentuation '1 Hen. IV.' IV. i.) is the reading of the First Folio. Now Q. 1 and others read *courage*, which is explained somewhat awkwardly as equivalent to *bravery* used in the concrete sense of "a gallant." *Bravery* itself is common enough in this sense, but with a slightly different connotation from that of *courage*, not necessarily implying any valorous or manly qualities, but referring in many cases solely to splendour of apparel. Moreover, the 'N.E.D.' gives only two examples of *courage* used in this concrete sense. I propose, therefore, to read in this line in the Quartos (I do not wish to alter the Folio, for reasons that will appear later) *comrdgue*. This word is usually accented on the second syllable, and is equivalent in meaning to *comrdde*, as the following passages show: Webster, 'Appius and Virginia,' IV. ii. :—

1st Soldier [addressing 2nd Sold.]. *Comrdgue*, I fear

Appius will doom us to Acteon's death.

Here Dyce notes the occurrence of the word in Heywood and Brome's 'Lancashire Witches' (1634, sig. K): "Nay, rest by me, Good Morglay, my *comrdgue* and bed-fellow." He mentions that he had noted other instances, which he had then mislaid. This *comrdgue*, being a comparatively unfamiliar word, was probably corrupted in the Quartos to *courage*; and even if we suppose the First Quarto to represent an imperfect copy, taken down by ear, the words *courage* and