and a Camel, a huge beast: there is nothing therefore more ridiculous, than to strain in, wyne and water, least in swallowinge a gnat thou hurte thy Jawes, but carelessly to suppe vp a Camel . . .

This adds a further quotation to those given in O.E.D., and takes the idiom back to 1570.

Again, in the complete English translation of Calvin's *Harmonia* by Eusebius Paget in 1584, the Latin is independently rendered by 'straine at':

\[ \ldots \text{Therefore they doe as much, as if a man should straine at a crumbe or bread, and swallow downe a whole loaf. VVee know that a gnat is a small creature, and a camel a great beast: nothing therefore is more ridiculous then to straine wine or water, least thou shoulddest hurt the jaws with swallowing vp a gnat, but careless suppe vp a camel . . .} \]

Thus Tymme in 1570 and Paget in 1584 provide further evidence that 'strain at' was a usage in vogue before 1611. It is worth noting too that the English text which serves as lemma in Tymme has 'straye out' immediately followed by 'strain at' in Tymme's rendering of Calvin. The juxtaposition was thus not regarded as a discrepancy.

In translating the Latin *colare* or *excolare* by 'strain at', 'strain into', 'strain', the English translators think of the straining as done, not by pouring the liquid through a sieve-like strainer, but by making the lips and teeth serve as strainer, sucking in the liquid but rejecting the gnats. It is reasonable to suppose that the translators of 1611 knew and used Tymme's well-known translation of Marlotype.

CONSTANTIN HOPE

BORROWINGS FROM ROMEO AND JULIET IN THE ‘BAD’ QUARTO OF THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR:

In the introduction to the Griggs facsimile edition of the first quarto of the *Merry Wives* (1602), P. A. Daniel first pointed out that line 1188, "What is the reason that you use me thus?" comes from *Hamlet*, V. i. 312. So far as I can discover, however, no one has observed that the former text also contains three borrowings from *Romeo and Juliet*:

(1) *M.W.W.*, Q1, lines 511–512.

Ay, sir, and as they say, she is not the first
Hath been led in a fool's paradise


2 Owing to war-time delays the author has not been able to read proofs of his note.—Ed. R.E.S.

3 This and subsequent citations of the bad quarto of the *Merry Wives* are based on the line-numbering of W. W. Greg's edition: *Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1602, Oxford, 1910. Spelling and punctuation are modernized.
R. & J., II. iv. 175-176.
but first let me tell ye, if ye should lead
her into a fool's paradise, as they say;
(Q1, but if you should lead her into a fool's
paradise, as they say.)

(2) M.W.W., Q1, line 578.
Have you importuned her by any means?
(F1, Have you importuned her to such a purpose? II. ii. 221.)
Have you importuned him by any means?
(Omitted from Q1.)

(3) M.W.W., Q1, line 1108.
'faith, I know not what to say
(F1, Now good Mistress Anne—— III. iv. 57).
R. & J., IV. v. 140.
Faith, I know not what to say.
(Q1, I say nothing.)

Commenting on the Hamlet borrowing, Dr. Greg writes: 'The line must have been introduced into the Merry Wives either by the actor or the reporter, and in either case its appearance proves that in this particular at least the version of Hamlet which held the stage in 1601-2 agreed with the later and not the earlier text', i.e. with the good quarto of 1604, not the bad quarto of 1603, in which the reading is 'What is the reason, sir, that you wrong me thus?' On the other hand, Professor G. L. Kittredge finds 'the expression so natural and commonplace that it need not be regarded as a quotation'. Professor Kittredge is right to be cautious about drawing conclusions from one passage; however, the presence of three other passages from Romeo and Juliet can hardly be explained as an accidental similarity. The Romeo and Juliet borrowings, moreover, pretty well limit Greg's alternative that the actor or reporter introduced the lines; the passages are inserted in speeches by three different characters: Mistress Quickly, Falstaff (into whose part the Hamlet line is also placed), and Slender. Surely it is easier to suppose the insertions to be the work of one reporter than of three different actors. Thus the Romeo and Juliet borrowings give additional support to Greg's reporter-theory of the first quarto of the Merry Wives.

In connection with Greg's inference that the Q2 text was the stage-version of Hamlet in 1601-2, it is interesting to note that of the three Romeo and Juliet insertions only the first is reproduced with reasonable fidelity in the bad quarto of Romeo and Juliet; the second is entirely absent,

1 According to Bartlett's Concordance this is the only occurrence of the phrase 'fool's paradise' in Shakespeare. However, the important matter is not the reference to fool's paradise, which is of course proverbial, but the close similarity of wording in the two texts.

2 Greg, op. cit., p. 81.

and the third bears no verbal resemblance to the good text. Like the Ham.
line, these circumstances suggest that it was the Q2 rather than the B
(bad quarto) version of Romeo and Juliet which was on the boards in 1622,
and hence is further indication that Q2 is the authoritative text.  

HARRY R. HOPPE

LADY HONORIA HOWARD

Some years ago in the Review of English Studies Mr. Charles E. Ward
suggested a possible source for the name used by John Dryden in The
Rival Ladies for his chief female character, Honoria. The author takes
note of a statement made by Edmund Malone that Dryden, because of
somewhat romantic interest in his cousin Honor Dryden, had given the
name of Honoria to the important lady in his play. But this suggestion
says Mr. Ward, has always seemed very far-fetched, because the most
probable source for the name is Honoria, the wife of Sir Robert Howard,
his patron and brother-in-law after December 1663. Searching for jus-
tication of this idea, Mr. Ward indulges in considerable play of imagination.
Using as a spring-board a chancery suit dated 1665 concerning the Lady
Honoria, he jumps to the conclusion that she was married to Sir Robert
in 1664, and that Dryden ‘would have been privy to Howard’s courtship
even as early as 1663’ (the date of The Rival Ladies).

Two facts Mr. Ward is apparently unaware of—the first that Honoria
Englefield was a widow when she married Howard and hence would
probably not enjoy a long courtship; the second that she was a rich war-
of the King, who arranged the marriage to divert her fortune to the use
of one of his aspiring favourites, the son of the Earl of Berkshire, who
patrimony had been generously expended in the Stuart cause. The date
the marriage is not ‘uncertain’; her first husband having died in May 1662
she was married to Howard on the tenth of August of that same year. His
position quickly became unbearable because of Sir Robert’s increasing
interest in the actress Susanna Uphill. Her petition to the King in 1664
and her will in 1676 both testify to the fact that little affection had ever
existed between them. It is unlikely that Howard knew Honoria Englefe

1 Since Mr. Hoppe’s Note was accepted for publication in R.E.S., Mr. A. Hart
published his Stoile and Surr repentious Copies. In a chapter entitled ‘Inter-play Bor-
ings of the late Bad Quartos’ (p. 393) he has noted the first of Mr. Hoppe’s the
borrowings.—Ed. R.E.S.
2 Owing to war-time delays the author has been unable to read proofs.—Ed. R.E.S.
3 R.E.S., XIII (July 1937), p. 300.
5 C. 6/33/35. (P.R.O.).
6 S. P. Dom. 1667, f. 63, p. 495 (P.R.O.).
7 122 Bence, 1676 (Somerset House documents).