The rational reader, following all Bacon's pronouncements on dramatic and theatrical matters, can see that they consist with each other, and tell of a general dissatisfaction with what is being done. Dramatic *Poesy* he commended as a vehicle for moral instruction; and perhaps FERREX AND PORREX might have satisfied him as a duly didactic performance. The plays he wanted to be performed in the schools could not conceivably be those which the Baconians declare him to have written. In the matter of the watermen's petition he took up his usual protectionist attitude. The watermen were losing much of the custom by which they lived, and he was perfectly willing to meet their wishes; on the professed principle of putting "profit before pastime," when in point of fact the profit in question depended solely on the continuance of the pastime in a particular place. If Bacon disapproved of the change, his "tool" Shakespeare and the rest of the company were flouting the wishes of their own playwright; and he in turn, by seeking to thwart them, was, on the Baconian hypothesis, provoking them to reveal his secret. The rational and natural reading of the facts yields a perfectly intelligible situation: the Baconian theory reduces it, as usual, to nightmare. Yet I doubt not that some Baconians will promptly accuse their idol of gross hypocrisy in order to maintain their theory of his authorship.

But perhaps the wildest inconsequence of all in the Baconian case is its utter disregard of the fact, witnessed-to alike by the precept and the practice of Bacon, that he was latterly either so convinced of the coming "bankruptcy" of the modern languages as to be moved to put forth all his serious didactic matter in Latin, or anxious enough for foreign appreciation to forego much of the audience he might have secured at home by writing in his mother tongue. The Baconians would have us believe that the Bacon who composed even the WISDOM OF THE ANCIENTS in Latin, rather than spend less time in putting

it forth in English, determinedly gave himself to the writing of thousands of pages of plays in English, mostly in verse, with a great deal of "comic relief" in prose, much of it to be spoken by stage clowns. And, as if this were not enough in mass, they would have him be author of a play (RICHARD II) the reproduction of which[1] in 1601 at the request of the fellow conspirators of Essex, on the day before his rising, brought upon the theatre the sharp displeasure of the Government, and a veto on further performance—this at a time when Bacon was compelled by his official position to repudiate all share in his former patron's proceedings (as he had long done), and was on the eve of being called upon to prosecute the rebels, as law officer of the crown. Do the Baconians, one wonders, suppose that Bacon was playing fast and loose, running with the hare and hunting with the hounds? If so, they outgo his enemies in imputation against him.

It is all of a piece with the perversity that, without blenching, ascribes to Bacon the authorship of the Sonnets, wherein the poet avows his "rude ignorance," as in the dedication of the LUCRECE he had spoken of his "untutored lines"; avows that he is one whose "name receives a brand," so that

> Almost thence my nature is subdued
> To what it works in, like the dyer's hand;[2]

making the actor's confession:

> It is most true, I have gone here and there,
> And made myself a motley to the view,
> Gored mine own thoughts, sold cheap what is most dear,
> Made old offences of affections new;[3]

[1] Messrs. Clark and Wright in their Clarendon Press ed. of *Richard II* say "it is certain that this was not Shakespeare's play." I know not whence they derived their certainty. Few other scholars share it. Had Shakespeare's company *two* plays on Richard II?

[2] Sonnet 111.

[3] Sonnet 110.

and telling of an unhappy love-affair of which there is no faintest trace or hint in Bacon's biography.

At every turn in the investigation, the monstrosity of the whole theorem becomes more amazing, the incredibility more mountainous. The form which it has finally taken—the proposition that Bacon, writing the Plays during a period of twenty years, chose as his literary representative a "clown" who could not even sign his name (for to this complexion the argument has come), contriving that a secret thus alleged to be necessarily known to a whole theatrical company, and inferrible by all Shakespeare's fellow dramatists, should be absolutely withheld from public or official knowledge; and yet all the while planning endless crazy "ciphers" which would reveal not only that "secret" but a hundred others to a remote posterity in the event of that cipher being guessed at—the total allegation is a critical chimera which staggers judgment and beggars comment.

Yet it will go on being propounded, by men who make no attempt to rebut confutations, heaping farce on fallacy, facing no difficulty, ignoring mountains of disproof. Again we can foresee the form of answer which such partisans will make to the argument of this chapter. They will revert for the nonce to one of the terms of Mr. William Theobald's self-contradiction. After claiming that Bacon "reveals" himself in the plays by duplications of phrase, idea, and word, they will now argue that on the contrary he could not put his ideas in the plays because he would thereby "reveal" his identity. Returning to the "coincidences," they will again claim to stand on these as revelations. Heads, the Baconian wins; tails, the Stratfordian loses. Two mutually exclusive principles are alternately employed to defend one proposition; and a semblance of reasoning serves to accredit two theses which contrarily flout reason. If Bacon had reason to fear being known to be a playwright; why in the name of common sense, should he have put

himself in jeopardy by adapting or writing or collaborating in thirty-seven plays in collusion with a fraudulent actor, whose secret is *alleged* to have been actually divined by his literary contemporaries, must, and in the terms of the case, have been known to his colleagues? If Bacon desired to keep secret his authorship, why, in the name of sanity, should he sow the bulk of the plays with law phrases which, according to the Baconians, reveal the deepest legal knowledge, when, all the while, he puts no such legal seasoning in his signed works of a non-legal character? If Bacon dared not turn his plays to any of the purposes of his life, why, in the name of Baconism, did he write them? And if, finally, he dared not reveal himself, why *did* he supererogatorily reveal himself to contemporaries as the Baconians, most of the time, allege that he did? To these questions there is no answer. *Stat pro ratione voluntas.*

To convince such reasoners, be it plainly said, is not even desirable. But to prevent the recruiting of the army of the deluded by minds yet capable of rational enlightenment may be possible; and to that charitable end it may be well to indicate one more set of facts, singly sufficient to satisfy any reasonable reader, not only that the Plays were the work of a man of the theatre, an "insider" and not an outsider; but that whatever may have been the measure of occasional collaboration in the Plays from outside, and whatever the amount of adaptation of other men's work in them, the general authorship and the source of adaptation can be vested in no other man than the actor-partner, Shakespeare.

CHAPTER XIV

EXTERNAL AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE: LIVES AND PERSONALITIES

§ 1

THE Baconian hypothesis, it is obvious, arises in a certain tendency to an *a priori* view of what was *likely* to have been the preparation, and what was *likely* to have been the way of life, of the supreme dramatist. All worship presupposes worshipful characteristics; and in regard to literary genius, more than to any other form of human faculty, men are prone to associate other forms of excellence with those put in evidence by the writer's work. One result of this propensity, as I have elsewhere remarked, is that nearly every full biography of a great man of letters sets up disappointment. A Southey may gain from biography; a Shakespeare cannot, simply because literary admiration has given him every possible advance on credit. We know that Boswell's Life of Johnson, delightful as it was to be to later generations, for whom Dr. Johnson was not a dictator in letters and morals, was a shock to many of his admirers in that which received it; and that Lockhart's perfectly loyal Life of Scott, in respect of its revelations of the great man's financial and other weaknesses, actually set up speculation as to whether the son-in-law wrote with a hostile animus. Milton and Shelley and Keats and Coleridge are similarly disadvantaged for adoring readers of their verse by the publication of their lives and letters. And so it has been; for men of our idealising age, with the short and simple annals of the greatest of English dramatic poets. Men

not given to the study of the psychology of genius frame for themselves an unreal conception of its conditions and bases. It is only after a cool comparative study of the lives of the masters of speech and portraiture and song—as Catullus and Poe, Tourguénief and Dostoyevsky, Villon and Burns, Goethe and Heine, Carlyle and Ruskin—that we are qualified to check our instinctive expectation by a real knowledge of probabilities.

Emerson had not done so when he wrote concerning Shakespeare that he "could not marry this man's life to his verse." He had formed an ideal of a supreme intellect, identifying genius for utterance with genius for universal judgment, a commanding power of speech with command over all environment. And Emerson's lead has been followed by those—university men and others—unable to conceive how the greatest English poet can have been a man of short schooling, who gathered what knowledge he had outside of libraries and colleges. They first grossly exaggerate his knowledge under the spell of his art, ascribing to him scholarship and legal and other acquirements which he did not possess: then they call for a man who shall square with their ideal. And so we have the "Baconian" theory and the "anti-Stratfordian" argument. I propose now to examine the *a priori* side of these positions, testing it by the relevant considerations, as we have tested all the attempts to reinforce it by literary evidence, beginning with the more concrete.

§ 2

One of the surprises of the controversy is the readiness with which a number of men avowedly incline to accept any hypothesis of the non-Shakespearean authorship of the plays on the score of the strangeness of the actor's apparent indifference to their preservation. The assumption is that none of the quartos printed in Shakespeare's lifetime was authorised; and that the actor's abstention

from issuing a collected edition implies an indifference which in his case would be unintelligible. On the other hand, the issue of the Folio in 1623 can by such reasoners be without misgiving set down to Bacon, though the actor-partners who caused it to be published ascribe the plays to Shakespeare in the most unqualified terms, as does Ben Jonson in his prefixed poem. This ascription, declared to be deliberately false, is regarded as a trifle that puts no difficulty in the way of the Baconian theory; while the actor's mere delay in publishing his plays, to which he had been adding up to and even after the time of his retirement (presumably in broken health), is regarded as an inexplicable phenomenon, on the assumption of his authorship.

A hundred and fifty years ago, Farmer put the rational explanation that the plays were not Shakespeare's to publish; that they belonged to the theatre-partnership; and that it was not to its interest to print plays which continued to draw audiences. This reasonable suggestion might very well serve to allay any reasonable wonder. But even in the eighteenth century it was urged that *all* the quarto issues could not plausibly be held to have been piratical; and in the latest and most competent discussion of the problem, Mr. A. W. Pollard's SHAKESPEARE FOLIOS AND QUARTOS (1909), this contention is pressed to good purpose. The common-sense view of the case is that, seeing the piratical publication of plays—whether from stenographers' notes or from stolen manuscripts—was clearly a source of profit, the actors who owned plays would naturally publish them when they ceased to "draw," or when for any reason the theatres were closed. This is the reasonable explanation of the uncommonly abundant publication of plays in 1593–94, when the theatres were closed for a spell of eight months on account of the plague; and again in 1600, when the number of the licensed theatres was reduced to two, and their performances to two per week, with a close time for Lent.

In each of the two short periods specified, the number of plays entered in the Stationers' Register rises to twenty-eight; whereas in the eight years 1585–92 only nine plays were entered, and in the years 1596–99 (after January 1596) only nine more.[1]

Further, we find that with the single exception of LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST, all the quartos which are found to have "good" texts, or to have been used in preparing the Folio, were duly entered in the Register before being printed; whereas all the quartos with "bad" texts were either not entered prior to publication or entered in a suspicious fashion, and printed by a dubious printer. There thus arises the inference that the "good" quartos had been printed by authority. To this exposition Mr. Pollard adds a convincing demonstration that certain of the "1600" and other quartos were really reprints of 1619, and may conceivably have formed part of an intended complete issue of the plays in separate quartos. With this very interesting matter, however, we are not here concerned. It suffices for us that—whether it was he or the partnership that suggested the genuine issues of the quartos—Shakespeare is shown not to have been so indifferent to the preservation of his plays as has commonly been supposed, and was thus no such prodigy of literary unconcern as to justify any resort to a desperate search for another author, who, moreover, in the terms of the case, showed no more anxiety than he did.

Still, there can be no pretence that Shakespeare did show anxiety to have his plays properly printed. Some of the authorised quartos seem to have been printed either to suppress piracies or to prevent them. They were not supervised by Shakespeare. It is clear that he did not properly—if at all—read the proofs even of the "good" quartos; and if one might hazard a speculation on that head, it would be that he, who so constantly outran the clock in his plot construction, and wrote with

[1] Pollard, as cited, pp. 9–10.

an ease of composition which it annoyed Ben Jonson to hear of, was not likely to be a good proof reader if he tried. Further, it is well that we should make the effort to conceive that the supreme master of dramatic objectivity, whose highest gift lay precisely in his power of projecting himself into other personalities, may not have been much exercised to see his plays in print. Signally spontaneous in his first composition, he was as ready as other men to see need for revision later ; better than any one, he knew the weakness of the alien work he had taken over ; and he may well have felt that a mere printing of all the plays as they had left his hand would give him more vexation than pleasure. He could hardly have foreseen that an adoring posterity would come to read with reverence, as his, all the bombast and platitude and bad versification by other men, which he had left in the stage versions ; and if he could have foreseen it, he might fitly be credited with disrelish for such uncritical worship. On the other hand, it is surely not inconceivable that he may have scrupled to claim, in the perpetuity of print, over his name, the credit for a quantity of *invention* by other men to which he may have been modest enough to attach some importance. On the one hand, he had the choice of the toil of rewriting all that inferior work at a time of failing health ; on the other hand he had the choice of publishing all that composite work, of so much of which he of all men best knew the poverty, with elaborate explanations of its literary history, telling how this scene was mainly Greene's or Marlowe's ; and that other mainly his own rewriting of their or Peele's verse : how in this case he had elected to rewrite an entire play (as LEAR) and how in another (as HAMLET) he had continuously recast, yet retained some little of, the old material. What should move him to either of these burdensome courses ? We are here facing a problem never glimpsed by the Baconians ; but one which Mr. Greenwood is both able and bound to face, though he has

not considered it in his book, which runs so much to the uncritical and unprofitable endorsation of Lord Campbell and the classicists.

And it is a problem constantly ignored by those who dilate on the "strangeness" of Shakespeare's unconcern. If any one accustomed to stand at that point of view will reflect that certainly in much, and probably in most, of Shakespeare's ostensible work there is old matter either worked over or simply retained, or matter actually supplied by collaborators, he will realise that for Shakespeare to publish all his Plays as his works would have been a very different thing from the undertaking to that effect by Ben Jonson. Shakespeare had in his youth been railed at by Greene, the dying playwright, for eking out his and others' handiwork; and a friend of Greene's had later asserted openly that men who had eclipsed Greene's fame in comedy had stolen his plumes, challenging them to deny it. Supposing—as we so well may—that several of Shakespeare's comedies were recasts of Greene's originals, and recognising as we must that a number of the history-plays and tragedies were undoubtedly either revisions or recasts of other men's work, we must surely realise that for a man of moderately sensitive literary conscience—such as the great master presumably was—it was not possible to issue the plays as his own work in the fashion in which the partners did it after his death. To buy and adapt and revise and recast for the theatre was both permissible and customary; and as a play had to have a responsible author for all purposes, he had no need to scruple over being named as the author of the acting plays in which his own work was incomparably the best, where he had done any recasting. Assuredly he wrote "for gain, not glory," in the first instance; though genius irresistibly had the casting vote. After the two "first-fruit" poems he prepared nothing for the press, definitely electing to be a writer for the stage. To leave his composite plays to the chances of the

stage and the guardianship of his partners was really as congruous a course on his part as some have thought it incongruous.

And if we make a further effort in the way of comparative criticism we may realise that, even apart from the fact that the fathering of the plays in print would have made him permanently responsible for a quantity of matter which not only was not his but was in every way inferior to his, there is a further consideration which should at least appeal to those theorists whom I am now answering. To publish one's own plays in that day was in a manner to acknowledge that they had no very sure future on the stage.[1] A feeling of this kind might fairly have been credited, in the name of modesty, to Ben Jonson, who in 1616 published his collected plays and poems, in folio, as his "Works," and thereby incurred much derision for his vanity. No playwright had ever done it before, as indeed no other playwright well could. Jonson had doubtless to receive many owners' permissions, which he would get the more easily because so many of his plays had no abiding attraction on the boards. After all, if Shakespeare in his latter years—when the competition of new men like Beaumont and Fletcher moved him to compare with them in the matter of elaborate plot-construction, as in CYMBELINE and THE WINTER'S TALE[2]—were concerned rather to hope for continued vogue in the theatre than to fall back on the solace of sales among the reading public, it would really have been a disposition on his part sufficiently human to appeal to those who profess to find it incredible that such an author should have "left his works to chance." Publication would have meant for him not so much success as withdrawal; and we are really not entitled to

[1] Or else to cheat the theatre, as Heywood implies that some playwrights did.

[2] Compare on this, Mr. Barrett Wendell's *William Shakespeare*, 1894.

suppose that when he retired to Stratford he thought himself played out as a dramatist.

But now, supposing this line of reasoning to be still resisted by the "anti-Stratfordians," what is to be said of the Baconian theory in the same connection? It simply disappears. The proposition that Bacon *did* cause the Plays to be published collectively in 1623, without any supervision of the press, with all their imperfections and their alloy on their heads, in order to preserve *his* work for posterity, breaks down instantly on confrontation with the typographical facts. The Folio text, though printed from authorised quartos and from theatre manuscripts, abounds in the most baffling misprints and confusions, which no author could have passed, and which are not to be paralleled in any book of Bacon's. And, having regard to the fortuitous late inclusion of TROILUS, and the omission of PERICLES, it is inconceivable that the responsible author had any hand in the business. All the while, upon the very argument with which we are dealing, *Bacon* must be held to have shown just such disregard for *his* literary progeny as Shakespeare is said to have done; for Bacon, in the terms of the theory, allowed his plays to lie uncollected or unpublished till 1623, and set himself to issue them only after his fall had given him new and utterly unexpected leisure. If it be argued that up till then he had delayed the matter for lack of leisure, it follows that but for his ruin he might never have issued them at all. Thus the argument from "strange indifference" recoils upon and destroys the Baconian case.

§ 3

But this is only the beginning of the circumstantial exposure of the insanity of the Baconian theory.

It has evidently never occurred to the Baconians to wonder why the philosopher-playwright of their fantasy so strictly bent himself, not to any philosophic plan or any

exposition of his own intellectual aims, but to the simple commercial needs of a going theatre, on lines dictated by the theatrical circumstances. Even on the most conservative view, the Plays are, as we have said, largely adaptations or reconstructions of previous plays. KING JOHN and HENRY V and the HENRY VI group and RICHARD III are certainly based on previous plays; as are HAMLET, LEAR, ROMEO AND JULIET, MEASURE FOR MEASURE, THE TAMING OF THE SHREW, and probably OTHELLO and THE MERCHANT OF VENICE. MACBETH, TROILUS, PERICLES, TIMON, and HENRY VIII, are all admittedly either reconstructions of previous plays or works of collaboration;[1] and a similar thesis might be put as to the COMEDY OF ERRORS, LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST, THE TWO GENTLEMEN, and ALL'S WELL. RICHARD II and JULIUS CÆSAR both raise problems of derivation. As to TITUS ANDRONICUS, apart from the Germans and a few English critics, even those who suppose Shakespeare to have had *some* hand in the play limit his share narrowly, recognising that there was certainly a previous play on the subject. All these critical data, at which the Baconians hardly ever glance, are part of the problem for real students.

Now, the facts in question go as naturally with Shakespeare's authorship as they are irreconcilable with Bacon's. The actor-partner dealt with old plays as an actor-partner would. He supplied his company on business-like lines, revising and recasting plays which had actually been found to attract the public, and making new experiments from time to time. But the Baconian theory invites us to contemplate Bacon as habitually arranging with the theatre people, during a period of twenty years, for adaptations, adjustments, revisions, expansions, and reconstructions of plays previously on the boards—nay, as collaborating from time to time with other dramatists

[1] In *Macbeth*, the non-Shakespearean element is small, but it is unmistakable.

—and all the while counting on having his secret kept by all concerned. I believe that any one who simply takes a little pains to realise what a state of things is thus posited will need no further persuasion to dismiss the Baconian theory—though a sufficiency of confutation on other lines has, I hope, been supplied in the foregoing chapters. And to the unknown lawyer of Mr. Greenwood's nugatory hypothesis, the "busy man" writing plays and poems during a lifetime under the name of an actor, never disclosing his identity, the concrete recognition of the situation involved is no less fatal.

Incongruities of detail as between the literary facts and their theory are acknowledged by some Baconians. Even Dr. Theobald admits that the contrast between the handling of love in the Plays and that in the Essay OF LOVE has staggered many of the faith. He proceeds to resolve it by arguing that Bacon in the different cases had different objects in view; that the Essay is a deliberately objective and as-it-were scientific study; whereas in the Plays love is naturally handled as the great force it is in human life; though even there, Dr. Theobald contends, love is always "subordinate." I leave it to the reader to pronounce for himself on this precious philosopheme. Thus far I have been careful to meet every concrete Baconian argument with a concrete rebuttal; but when it comes to the æsthetic appraisement of the total literary and psychic content of the Plays and the Works, one may, in passing, fitly meet Baconian asseveration with flat counter-claim. And I submit to the reader who has an æsthetic sense, that the kind of feeling or temperament and the kind of literary faculty underlying the Plays on the one hand and the Works on the other, are about as different as those of Burns and Hume, or those of Rabelais and Descartes. I have lived, I suppose, as much in the spiritual society of both Shakespeare and Bacon as the majority of men of letters, and I have never for a moment felt it to be otherwise than a ludicrous fantasy to conceive

of Bacon as writing either the Falstaff scenes in HENRY IV or the love scenes in ROMEO AND JULIET. I would suggest to any reader who claims to have an open mind, a perusal of the scene in which Antony explodes at the sight of Thyreus kissing Cleopatra's hand :

> Approach there ! Ah, you kite ! Now, gods and devils,
> Authority melts from me : of late, when I cried "Ho !"
> Like boys unto a muss, kings would start forth
> And cry, "Your will ?"
> Have you no ears ? I am Antony yet !
>
> *Enter* Attendants.
>
> Take hence this Jack, and whip him.
>
> *Eno.* (*Aside.*) 'Tis better playing with a lion's whelp
> Than with an old one dying.
>
> *Ant.* Moon and Stars !
> Whip him !

and I would then invite him to say whether he can conceive Bacon writing it. One can go vaguely through some conceptual process of imagining Bacon composing one of the "philosophical" passages in the plays, where his thought—versification apart—could chime with the author's ; but to associate him with the lightning flash of fury which Shakespeare can lend to Antony or Coriolanus, Othello or Cleopatra, is as impossible, to my thinking, for any one who has really lived with Bacon, as to imagine that stately personage drinking with Falstaff or breathing out his soul to Juliet.

But all this is by the way. Baconians ostensibly either can imagine these things or can make up their minds on the critical problem without realising that any such things are implied. Let purely æsthetic convictions then be waived ; and let the theory be tested as it might be by judges competently versed in the literary subject-matter and morally indifferent to the issue. Let what is a thesis in literary history be judged in the light of all historical facts available. Let us simply try to suppose Bacon, gifted with any order of literary faculty we may care to ascribe to him, writing the Shakespeare plays under the

known theatrical conditions in the given period, and the hypothesis must be relegated to outer darkness.

§ 4

Considering it all comprehensively, one realises that what plausibility it can ever have had for ordinarily reasonable men must have arisen, as aforesaid, from some spontaneous difficulty in conceiving that a Stratford lad, who left school in his early or middle teens, married before he was out of them, and soon thereafter fared to London to make a living as an actor and actor-partner, cannot well have been the author of what so many men of so many nations pronounce to be the greatest total achievement in pure literature. Most of this difficulty, I think we have seen, either proceeds upon or takes shape through the common assumption or acceptance of the "orthodox" form of the doctrine that the author of the plays was at once a skilled lawyer and a deep classical scholar. We have seen, I think, how baseless are both of those positions, whether as put by Baconians or by idolatrous Shakespeareans. Much of what is not thus accounted for in the difficulty felt about the writing of the plays by the "Stratford actor" is to be ascribed to the state of mind set up by other idolatrous propositions to the effect that Shakespeare was a profound naturalist, a master of Italian literature, a deep student of medicine and biology, a man of absolutely universal reading, and so forth. Every one of these extravagances can be as decisively disposed of as the "legal" and "classical" theories. Mr. Greenwood, who is professedly not a Baconian, unwittingly puts not merely a stumbling-block in the way of Baconians, but a weapon in the hands of the "Stratfordians" when, proceeding upon the QUARTERLY REVIEW article of 1894, on "Shakespeare's Birds and Beasts," he goes about to establish the view that the author of the plays was no observant or studious naturalist. Quite so, we answer. That was part of the

idolatrous conception of the playwright as the Superman. And the rejection of it, so far from putting any difficulty in the way of the "Stratfordian" view, gives that a new force of rationality. We are not in the least bound to suppose that Shakespeare must have been an accurate naturalist because he spent his youth at Stratford. It was no scientific observer who went from Stratford to London to start as play actor and play maker: it was a youth with a genius for the perception and the rhythmic utterance of human feeling. But, above all, it was not the would-be naturalist Bacon who versified a description of a horse from Du Bartas, and one of a bee-hive from Lilly or Elyot or Bartholomew or another!

But while thus unintentionally helping Shakespeareans to rectify their conception of Shakespeare, Mr. Greenwood is at pains to demonstrate that somehow the Plays are at once incommensurable with the potentialities of the "Stratford actor" and perfectly compatible with the training of a thorough professional lawyer. He scouts the idea that "genius" with scanty schooling could capacitate any human being to write even VENUS AND ADONIS. Agreeing with me that it is absurd to suppose that Shakespeare wrote the poem in his teens and kept it by him unpublished till 1593, he proceeds to say [1] that in his judgment "the real absurdity is in the belief that the 'Stratford rustic' could have written such a poem at all. . . . In Shakespeare's time, and for a youth in Shakespeare's environment, it would have been a miracle of tenfold marvel. The truth is that we do not gather figs from thistles, nor can we make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Even 'Genius' cannot do this."

I confess to being somewhat mystified by these forcible propositions. Mr. Greenwood cannot mean that the being born and bred in a country town constituted a man an irreclaimable "rustic," a moral "thistle," an intellectual "sow's-ear," even if the town were "squalid" and the

[1] Work cited, p. 64, *note*.

man were a son of "illiterate parents," whether in the Elizabethan era or in ours. He must mean, I take it, that to make such a youth capable of writing the Plays and Poems there would have been required an elaborate education; and that this Shakespeare did not receive. But perplexity remains. What kind of education does Mr. Greenwood suppose is required to qualify a genius for writing plays and poems? What kind or degree of culture, for instance, does he ascribe to Sappho, to Terence, to Catullus, to Hans Sachs, to Bunyan, to Burns, to Keats, to Jane Austen, to Balzac?

Being myself responsible for a thesis on "The Economics of Genius," to the effect that genius undoubtedly requires culture-opportunities for its evocation—that, in short,

> Haud facile emergunt quorum virtutibus obstat
> Res angusta domi—

I am not going to dispute the importance of culture to poets. But I think Mr. Greenwood misconceives the nature of the culture they require. It is true that, on a general survey of literary history, what we term university culture counts for a great deal, the great majority of our great poets having had that or its equivalent. But the exceptions are sufficient to warn us to reject the notion that it is essential. Keats will rank with any poet of his age in respect of (1) "rhythmical creation of beauty," and (2) sympathetic seizure of the spirit of classical antiquity. Yet Keats certainly had small Greek; his sonnet ON FIRST READING CHAPMAN'S HOMER tells as much; and though he learned Latin enough to do in his teens (so, at least, we are told) a prose translation of the ÆNEID—with what accuracy or what crib help no one now can say—he "was in childhood not attached to books. His *penchant* was for fighting. He would fight any one—morning, noon, and night, his brother among the rest. It was meat and drink to him." So testifies an admiring schoolfellow.[1] It was only in his last few

[1] Colvin's *Keats*, p. 8.

terms at school, in his fourteenth and fifteenth years, that he took earnestly to books and studies; and at fifteen he was bound apprentice to a surgeon. At nineteen he became a medical student at Guy's; and save for that he had no "college" education. At twenty-one he produced ENDYMION, and at twenty-three the ODE TO A NIGHTINGALE. His effective culture thus came substantially from the reading of English literature.

Now, concerning the schooling of Shakespeare we know very little; but we do know that he was entitled to free tuition at the Stratford Grammar School; and it would be as irrational to doubt that he had it as it would be to reject Ben Jonson's testimony that, nevertheless, he had "small Latin and less Greek," which, after all, is a very different thing from saying that he had none. On the other hand we have really no testimony that can justify us in saying that he left school "very early." Sir Sidney Lee, on the strength of Aubrey's late recital of the statement of old neighbours that "when he [Shakespeare] was a boy he exercised his father's trade," of a butcher—which was *one of* his father's trades—writes (after Halliwell-Philipps) that "probably in 1577, when he was thirteen, he was enlisted by his father in an effort to restore his decaying fortunes." For this "probably" there is no clear basis. As we have seen, the "decaying fortunes" have been inferred, not proved; and there is a strong contrary inference. But even if we knew that at thirteen Shakespeare helped his father in the village-butcher business, we should not be entitled to say that he then left school. Boys may help their fathers and still go to school. I did, for one. Having myself, nevertheless, left school at thirteen; with small Latin and no Greek, I am not prepared to admit that such an experience excludes a boy from future culture; but I am concerned here simply to stipulate for strict adherence to the evidence. Mr. Greenwood argues that inasmuch as he accepts the "tradition" that Shakespeare went to the

Grammar School, he is entitled to press the "tradition" that the boy left school at "an unusually early age"; but he has really no tradition to that effect to go upon. Aubrey specifies no age; and Shakespeare would be "a boy" at fifteen.

That, however, is really not the vital point. Shakespeare's *special* culture for his life's work began when he went to see the players, or, it may be, to the little customary court at Stratford;[1] and his effective culture would come to him after he had gone to London. If he went thither, as is commonly reckoned, in 1586 or 1587, he spent some six or seven years as an actor before he published VENUS AND ADONIS. Mr. Greenwood seems to take it for granted that this actor's-life meant the negation or exclusion of "culture."[2] I cannot imagine a more thoughtless view of the case, unless it be taken in terms of a conception of culture which seems to me wholly irrelevant. Discussing the VENUS, Mr. Greenwood quotes approvingly Mr. Appleton Morgan's hyperbolical account of it as "the most elegant verses which the age produced, and which for polish and care surpass his very latest works"; and adds: "Polished, indeed, and scholarly, is this extraordinary poem, and, above all, it is impressed throughout with that which we now call *Culture*. It is, in fact, imbued with the spirit of the highest culture of the age in which it was written."[3]

In support of this assertion, what data are offered? Simply these: a few borrowings from Ovid; a borrowing of the description of the horse from Sylvester's translation —then in MS.—of Du Bartas; and a *possible* imitation

[1] It may be worth while here to recall Grote's luminous exposition of the relation of the Athenian drama to the Athenian Dikasteries.

[2] At the same time he notes that even the art of acting is not to be learned in a day. Quite so. It is only the art of *playmaking* that, in the opinion of Mr. Greenwood and the Baconians alike, requires no apprenticeship!

[3] Work cited, p. 59.

of the ODE DE LA CHASSE of Etienne Jodelle, which also, in the terms of the case, may have been current in an English MS. translation. That is all; unless we are to understand Mr. Greenwood as implying that the legal allusions in the poem belong to "the highest culture of the age." It is hardly necessary to dwell on the utter inadequacy of the evidence to the assertion. The borrowings from Ovid *are made through Golding's translation*;[1] but even if they were not, it is merely ridiculous to describe them as standing for "the highest culture of the age." The poem shows no such range of knowledge as does Sidney's APOLOGY FOR POETRIE, to say nothing of the earlier poems of Chapman. Considered as a psychic distillation of knowledge of life, the VENUS might fairly be said to stand for *want* of "culture" in the modern and larger sense of the term. But the *kind* of culture it shows, the fluent and mellifluous use of English verse, the multiplicity of image, the superfœtation of verbal fancy, the unlimited play of description—all this was just what Shakespeare, given genius to start with, would acquire in his six or seven—or even five—years of acting.

To deny it would be to refuse recognition of the obvious fact that as an actor Shakespeare was habitually using more or less academic as well as poetic diction, speaking a language above the level of that of common talk; inflated, doubtless, but copious, colorate, rhythmic, eloquent. Even the acting of the more literary Interludes must have meant considerable training in diction, a good vocabulary, a fair range of literary and classical association; and the young Shakespeare had a larger range open to him than that. When not engaged in acting, he could turn to the literature of the Tudor age—the prose and verse of Elyot, More, Greene, Gascoigne, Lilly, Spenser, Sidney, Peele, Lodge, Nashe, Sackville, Latimer, and the divines; much miscellaneous English poetry, down to

[1] See *Montaigne and Shakespeare*, 2nd ed. pp. 309–316.

Lodge's GLAUCUS AND SCILLA, the model of the VENUS; Chaucer; the treatises of Puttenham and Webbe on English Poetry; the Chronicles; a number of Voyages; many translations of Latin classics and of Italian prose and poetry; and, from the Greek, Herodotus and Thucydides, Hall's ILIAD, three orations of Demosthenes, a good deal of Isocrates, some of Lucian, the Axiochus, Diodorus, Appian, Ælian, the Ethics of Aristotle, Epictetus, Xenophon's Cyropædia, North's Plutarch, something of Theocritus, something of Hippocrates and Galen, and the Æthiopic History of Heliodorus. How much or how little Shakespeare read in these translations no man can say; but there they were, in English—a great deal more of culture material than any one can pretend to find behind the VENUS AND ADONIS and the LUCRECE. And when we remember that Taylor the Water-Poet, a Thames waterman, living by his boat, avowedly devoid of all scholarship, had read in English in Ovid, Homer, and Virgil, Plutarch's Morals and Lives, Marcus Aurelius, Seneca, Suetonius, and Cornelius Agrippa, as well as in Fairfax's Tasso, Du Bartas, Montaigne, Guevara, Josephus; and in Chaucer, Sidney, Spenser, Daniel, Nashe, Camden, Purchas, Speed, Fox, and Holinshed [1]—we are really not entitled to doubt that the Stratford actor could have read widely enough in English to give him all the "culture" manifested in the Plays and Poems. Mr. Greenwood will not deny that the Stratford actor could read; and as he cannot without a *petitio principii* deny him genius, his primary case is thus quashed and done with. For nothing more than genius and culture in English, with some smattering of Latin, is needed to account for the Plays and the Poems.

The "polish" of VENUS AND ADONIS is just the kind of

[1] Last section of *Taylor's Motto: Et Habeo, et Careo, et Curo*: Workes, 1630, section II, p. 57. Taylor was then, by his own account, in his later forties. It is here that he tells how he never got beyond *possum, posset*.

polish that an actor who was also a poet of genius could acquire. In all ages some actors, without university training, have spoken their own language like men of culture, acquiring facility in it from the nature of their work ; and if genius be added, there is no special problem to solve in the case of Shakespeare. The general problem of genius lies outside the issue. A supreme gift for rhythmic speech involves of necessity a spontaneous study of language ; and Shakespeare, so conceived, must have read much *belles lettres* in his own tongue, as did Burns, and as did Keats. If they with their culture could produce masterpieces in song ; why in the name of reason should not he have done so in drama ? His actorship, which Mr. Greenwood and the Baconians so strangely assume to have been a bar thereto, was part of the special culture that made him supreme. Given poetic genius, the practice of acting was the very discipline required to make him transcend the declamation of his academic predecessors, and reach the ring of living utterance where they had mostly vended conventional rhetoric.

In failing to see the significance of Shakespeare's experience as an actor, Mr. Greenwood seems to me to be obsessed by what I would term the university fallacy. He makes a strenuous attempt to rebut the argument of Sir Theodore Martin to the effect that the early life of Shakespeare was no more a bar to the development of his genius than was that of Dickens to his. Dickens, replies Mr. Greenwood, actually found in his early life the material upon which his adult genius worked ; but he will have it that Shakespeare's " material " was the kind of " culture " he claims to find in VENUS AND ADONIS. Denying that there is any noteworthy scholarly culture in that poem, I deny that there is any force in Mr. Greenwood's attempted rebuttal. It was not scholarly culture that went to the writing of either the comedies or the tragedies ; still less could such culture have prepared the poet to create Falstaff. But as regards the writing of

living verse and the creation of living characters, his training as an actor was relevant culture of the most important kind.

Classical culture prepared Ben Jonson to write SEJANUS and CATILINE and the POETASTER and CYNTHIA'S REVELS; but what part had it in EVERY MAN IN HIS HUMOUR and THE ALCHEMIST and BARTHOLOMEW FAIR? And which were his more successful plays? Such culture was possessed, in some degree, by Greene and Peele; but was it classical example or actual experience in play-writing that—with quickly growing faculty—made Greene capable of rising from ALPHONSUS KING OF ARRAGON to JAMES THE FOURTH? and was it the scholarship indicated in the TALE OF TROY that went to the making of what dramatic success was attained to by Peele? If (a very large *if*) it was university training, and not genius, that made Marlowe capable of writing the blank verse of TAMBURLAINE and FAUSTUS, does it follow that it took *more* scholarly training to make the poet of MACBETH and CORIOLANUS write blank verse far finer and greater? The broad culture-fact is that every one of the dramatists above-named exhibits far more of mere classical scholarship, in the way of quotation and allusion, than does Shakespeare, who finally writes a verse incomparably superior to theirs. If we are to frame an *a priori* hypothesis at all, should it not be to the effect that the visibly less learned poet vitalised his English diction and rhythms as he did in virtue of *not* having had a regular scholarly training, and of *having*, besides genius, a practical training in the actual handling of the verse of the other men?

I do not stand on such a proposition: I merely urge its relative reasonableness. I note that whereas Spenser and Peele and Chapman held to the vicious old usage of falsifying final accents to make rhymes, Shakespeare, perhaps encouraged by Greene, never once conformed to it. He seems to have been as free of mere archaism as he was of pedantry, though he had his own faults of

diction. The VENUS AND ADONIS is for its time an essentially *modern* piece of work; and I do not remember that any of the contemporaries who praised its "sweetness" ever said a word about its learning. So far as we know, no one in that day ever asked, How came the Stratford actor to produce this distillation of culture? I do not ask Mr. Greenwood to accept the "tradition"; but I do ask him how, on his view of the impossibility of the actor's having, with his culture, written such a poem at his age, not one of the actor's contemporaries, so far as we know, ever so much as remarked that any notable culture was required to write it.[1]

Much has been made, further, of the "difficulty" of supposing a mere actor to be permitted to dedicate poems to the Earl of Southampton. There is really not a grain of good ground for suggesting any difficulty in the matter; and the very reason assigned—the difference of status between poet and patron—destroys itself the moment it is understood. If it be held unlikely that a literature-loving nobleman in Shakespeare's day should allow a mere actor to dedicate to him, as to a friendly patron, two poems, how in the name of common sense

[1] Mr. G. C. Bompas (*Problem of the Shakespeare Plays*, 1902, p. 70) is responsible for the statement that "One of Shakespeare's contemporaries, the author of *Polimanteia* (1595) . . . wrote that Shakespeare was both a 'schollar' and also a member of one or more of the 'three English universities, Cambridge, Oxford, and the Inns of Court.'" No such passage is known to the commentators. Dr. Ingleby (*Centurie of Prayse*, i, 12) cites the marginal note from *Polimanteia* which runs "All praise worthy [Lucrecia] Sweet Shakespeare," and classes the poet with "well-graced authors." In a footnote, Dr. Ingleby mentions that probably it was on the strength of this side-note that the late Rev. N. J. Halpin arrived at the rather hazardous conclusion that Shakespeare was a member of "one (or perhaps more) of the English Universities." See his *Dramatic Unities of Shakespeare*, 1849, p. 12, *note*. This appears to be the source of the hallucination of Mr. Bompas. He has been guilty of more "howlers" than any other Baconian, except perhaps Mr. Donnelly.

are we to suppose that the nobleman would let all the world go on believing that the poems *were* so dedicated if they really were not? The cavil is sheer absurdity.

§ 5

And, once more, if, ignoring that absurdity, we are to suppose that the publication of the VENUS and LUCRECE as his own by Shakespeare the actor was a pure fraud, what kind of solution have we offered us of the mystification? Mr. Greenwood must have a lawyer who was a "courtier," but will not say it was Bacon, herein taking up a singularly weak position. He naturally resents being called a Baconian when he is not; but he will not say No to the Baconians, and leaves the question open, with a mere "anti-Stratfordian" negative. When he comes to the positive Stratfordian evidence, he can offer nothing but confessedly inconclusive cavils. The testimony of Ben Jonson, a solid rock of first-hand proof, he vainly seeks to get round, as we have seen, by suggesting that Ben's prose is inconsistent with his poem prefaced to the Folio; and that the players' preface, presumably written by Jonson, is inconsistent with the facts as to the sources of the Folio. The inconsequence of the whole argument is staggering. To what exorbitance of self-contradiction this line of reasoning leads, we have partly noted in dealing with the positions of Mark Twain; but there are further enormities of fallacy involved. If Jonson had spoken of the player Shakespeare to Drummond as a mere actor, or had so described him in the DISCOVERIES, there would indeed have been a rift in the lute of his evidence. But the very criticisms to which Mr. Greenwood so strangely points as somehow invalidating or countervailing the poetic tribute prefaced to the Folio are explicit avowals of the artistic productivity of the man named. Ben, in talk with Drummond, said of Shakespeare that he "wanted art, and sometimes sense," even as he said of Donne that "for not keeping of accent

he deserved hanging." To the same Donne he wrote, sending his Epigrams:

> If I find but one
> Marked by thy hand, and with the better stone,
> My title's seal'd.[1]

Does Mr. Greenwood infer from this either that Jonson thought Donne a good critic but a bad poet, or that he believed some one else had written Donne's verses? Or is he restrained merely by the fact that Drummond cites also the praise: "He esteemed him [Donne] the first poet in the world for some things"? Without that praise, the testimony to Donne's authorship of poems would be just as valid; and the very criticism passed to Drummond upon "Shakespeare" is a testimony that in Jonson's belief "Shakespeare" wrote THE WINTER'S TALE. It is a criticism of the author, whosoever he was: Mr. Greenwood unintelligibly cites it [2] as somehow hinting a knowledge that the putative was not the real author. In what police court would Mr. Greenwood venture to advance such an argument?

The mystification set up over Ben Jonson's testimony is the most gratuitous thing in the whole debate. Jonson was notoriously a man both jealous and generous, given to cavilling and quarrelling, with a high sense of his own value, and a very critical eye for other men's work. Ready to flout and contemn, to strive and blame, he was also ready to forgive and praise. After his quarrels with Marston and Dekker, he became reconciled to both. It is reasonably to be inferred that in the "Apologetical Dialogue" appended to THE POETASTER he alludes to Shakespeare among others of his censors in the lines:

> Only, amongst them, I am sorry for
> Some better natures by the rest so drawn,
> To run in that vile line;

seeing that in THE RETURN FROM PARNASSUS the players tell how their fellow Shakespeare had administered to

[1] Epigram 96. [2] *Shakespeare Problem*, p. 482.

Jonson "a purge." Ben for his part had in his EVERY MAN OUT OF HIS HUMOUR jeered at Shakespeare's coat of arms, parodying the *Non sans Droit* by the motto *Not without Mustard;* and had well deserved his "purge" in other ways. But he was one who could give and take, forgive and forget. In his lines to Donne he praises him expressly for his freedom in criticism :

> Who shall doubt, Donne, whe'r I a poet be,
> When I dare send my Epigrams to thee ?
> That so alone canst judge, so alone dost make;
> And, in thy censures, evenly, dost take
> As free simplicity to disavow
> As thou hast best authority t' allow.

These are the very qualities that he would have claimed for himself. That such a man, alive to the greatness, and, by his own avowal, to the lovableness of Shakespeare, should pen a splendid panegyric for the Folio, touching even that with critical qualification, and should at other times, in critical talk with Drummond and in his DISCOVERIES, comment on what he held to be flaws in Shakespeare's work, is so perfectly compatible not only with literary but with ordinary human nature that it is astonishing that either a layman or a lawyer should profess to find in it anything strange.

By Mr. Greenwood's tests, we should be led to believe that in Jonson's opinion Daniel wrote none of his signed verses save the CIVIL WARS, inasmuch as Jonson (1) told Drummond that Daniel, who wrote that work, was no poet, and (2) wrote of Daniel that he was a "verser," and again of Du Bartas that "He was no poet but a verser, *because he wrote not fiction.*" Again, Mr. Greenwood seems bound to deny to Marston the authorship of *his* plays, because Jonson told Drummond that "Marston wrote his father-in-law's preachings, and his father-in-law his comedies." Gifford in fact offers the Baconians an opening in advance, by his footnote with the query : "But who was this father-in-law? Nay, who was

Marston ?" Unfortunately, Gifford supplies particulars in respect of which, he tells us, "I flatter myself that I have here recovered both father and son"—as well as father-in-law.

Jonson's gibe at Marston, obviously, is a mere jest: his comments on Shakespeare are one and all criticisms of a recognised author. And if Mr. Greenwood here raises afresh his nugatory protest that the contemporary encomiasts of Shakespeare do not tell us "who" he was, it suffices to answer that neither did Jonson tell Drummond "who" Donne or Daniel or Spenser or Drayton was. It was really not customary to say "who" a man was when you praised him by his name, for his known works. As for the astonishing argument (1) that the famous reference to the original form of the "Know, Cæsar doth not wrong" passage may have meant that "Shakespeare the player misquoted the passage on the stage," and (2) that "surely it is of the player, not the poet, that Jonson speaks when he says that his volubility was such that, like Aterius, he had to be (or ought to have been) shut up,"[1] I find myself at a loss to discuss it with gravity. Where will Mr. Greenwood stop ? The sentence he cites is from the paragraph in the DISCOVERIES in which Jonson tells how "the players have *often* mentioned it as an honour to Shakespeare ['their friend'], that in his writing (whatsoever he penned) he never blotted out a line. My answer hath been, Would he had blotted a thousand. Which they thought a malevolent speech." And the very sentence ending with the allusion to Haterius tells that Shakespeare "had an excellent phantasy, brave notions, and gentle expressions, *wherein he flowed with that facility* that . . ." Has Mr. Greenwood found any Apella who can credit his theory here ?

Such a fantasy is of a piece with the desperate suggestion of "a learned German, Dr. Konrad Meier," a

[1] Work cited, p. 481.

little hesitatingly welcomed by Mr. Greenwood in a footnote,[1] that Jonson's line:

> And *though* thou hadst small Latin and less Greek,

is to be read in the sense "And *if*," or "even if," = "even had it been true that." Need it really be pointed out that while "and if" *could* have meant "and though," "and though" could *not* mean "and if" in the sense suggested? "Though" can stand for "if" when put before a hyperbole: as in "though I speak with the tongues of men and angels"; not before a carefully quantified proposition such as "*small* Latin and *less* Greek"—a specification if ever there were one. Mr. Greenwood, for the rest, really should have spared English readers Dr. Meier's theorem that the "would" in the following line:

> From hence to honour thee I *would* not seek,

"is conditional," and that "as in every conditional sentence, the conditional word *would* points to the *unreal* alternative, which is to be taken as the opposite of the actual fact." It is from a translation in BACONIANA for October 1907 ("into which, by the way, an error seems to have crept") that Mr. Greenwood derives this precious philological sophism. It "would" seem, then, that we must explain to Mr. Greenwood as well as to Dr. Meier and the Baconians, that "I would" is perfectly normal English for "I will" in predication. Has Mr. Greenwood never said to an audience, "I would now direct your attention . . ."? or "Before sitting down, I would like . . ."? Anti-Stratfordianism has made him acquainted with strange allies. Jonson's lines simply mean: "Though you had small Latin and less Greek, I would not on that account seek merely to pit you against other unlearned men, but would back you against all the classic dramatists, from Æschylus to Seneca." Mr. Greenwood is as hard pressed for pleas when he seeks to

[1] Work cited, p. 475.

get behind *that* testimony as when admitting that the "sweet swan of Avon" line "undoubtedly . . . *to all outward appearance*" identifies the dead dramatist "with Shakspere of Stratford." Mr. Greenwood can find no better shift than to echo Dr. Ingleby's wish "that Ben had said all this in Shakespeare's lifetime." O lame and impotent conclusion!

The cavilling about the players' statement that they had "scarce received from him [Shakespeare] a blot in his papers" is no better. The assertion that "we now know that this statement is ridiculous,"[1] is utterly unwarranted. We do know that Shakespeare revised plays after they had been for some time played: we do *not* know that he sweated over his anvil in first composition as Jonson did; and Jonson's claim, in the panegyric, that every writer of living lines must so sweat is an impeachment of Jonson's consistency, not of the players' veracity, or of their common sense. Elsewhere, he accepted their statement as true. The suggestion of Stevenson, confidently repeated by Mr. Greenwood, that the unblotted manuscripts, if such there were, must have been merely fair copies, is idle. Unless Shakespeare deliberately tricked his partners—a hypothesis which Jonson did not advance, and which Mr. Greenwood had better not raise—they must have known that whereof they spoke. Neither Ben Jonson nor Stevenson was qualified to say, nor is Mr. Greenwood entitled to reaffirm, that the abnormal genius who wrote the plays could not compose in verse otherwise than did Jonson and Stevenson. Jonson *did* later accept the statement of the players as true; and the fact that he nevertheless made his general assertion about the indispensableness of "sweat" proves simply that he could contradict himself on a question of that kind as he and most men could and can on others. But to suggest that such inconsistency discredits his evidence as to his personal knowledge that

[1] Work cited, p. 480.

Shakespeare was a man of genius, is really as unworthy of a practical lawyer as it is of a man of letters. Either Jonson was a deliberate and unscrupulous liar or he was not. If he was, neither Mr. Greenwood nor the Baconians can make anything of his testimony, one way or the other. If he was not, his evidence overthrows and overwhelms all their cavils. *He* did not think that the plays and poems could have been written only by a professional lawyer. *He* held that Shakespeare had small Latin and less Greek, yet had no hesitation in believing that his unlearned friend wrote the plays which he declared to be "for all time." And his opinion on that head surely has as much weight as any.

§ 6

In dealing with the Baconian argument from Jonson's *Scriptorum Catalogus* in the DISCOVERIES, in which Bacon is extolled and Shakespeare is not mentioned, Mr. Greenwood candidly warns his Baconian allies that the matter will not bear their inference; that Jonson is thinking of "wits" or orators as such, and not framing a comprehensive list. In point of fact, the list names no playwright whatever; only one or two poets, and those of a bygone generation; and indeed only a few writers in all.[1] Yet Mr. Greenwood goes on to argue that "still" it is "remarkable" that Shakespeare is not named. If the paragraph were meant as a "bead-roll" it would be no less strange that Spenser and Marlowe are also unnamed: the only really remarkable thing is that Jonson or any one else should ever have headed such a jotting as a "Catalogus." But Mr. Greenwood, with sorrow be it said, proceeds from this trifling cavil to endorse the truly "Baconian" argument that there is a deep significance in Jonson's use of the phrase about "insolent Greece and haughty Rome" in his eulogy of Bacon, after using it in his poem on Shakespeare.

[1] The critic cited by Mr. Greenwood, who called the *Catalogus* "a bead-roll of English writers," has something to answer for.

This particular divagation, I may note, really gives a good excuse to those critics who describe Mr. Greenwood as a Baconian, though he apparently does not perceive that he has supplied them with any pretext. He insists upon his specific denials; but to what purpose has he dwelt upon the fact that Jonson applies one phrase of panegyric to both Bacon and Shakespeare? Through seven pages he dwells on the "remarkable," "more remarkable," and "most remarkable" aspects of that item. He finds it "extraordinary" that Jonson, after Bacon's fall, wrote of the ruined great man's character in the highest terms, and yet has not "left us any noble eulogy *of this sort* consecrated to the memory of Shakespeare." Is not the panegyric prefixed to the Folio a noble eulogy in *its* sort? After thus making a mystery out of nothing, he proceeds to dilate on the line:

Thou stand'st as if some mystery thou didst,

in Jonson's Ode on Bacon's Birthday. The phrase simply means that on Bacon's birthday the "Genius of the pile" stands among the guests as might a priest celebrating a rite; but Mr. Greenwood will have it that "the Stratfordians . . . are unable to give any plausible explanation of Jonson's meaning," as against the Baconian thesis that Jonson knew "the secret Shakespearean authorship."[1] After this, how can he complain of being reputed a Baconian? The poem itself, after speaking of "some mystery," goes on: "Pardon, I read it in thy face." None are so blind as those who will not see aught but their own theory.[2]

All the while, the argument from Jonson's double use

[1] Is it suggested, I wonder, that Bacon was *telling* his guests that he had written the plays? The phrase "as if some mystery thou *didst*" plainly points to a *quasi-rite* or *sacramentum*, not to a "mystery" in the modern sense.

[2] The point was made clear by Mrs. Stopes four-and-twenty years ago. Yet Mr. Lang oddly acquiesced in Mr. Greenwood's cry of "mystery."

of the phrase "insolent Greece and haughty Rome" is simply the crowning instance of the futility of non-comparative study over the whole field of our problem. Jonson did but repeat himself in that case as he did in many others. I put to Mr. Greenwood this simple and sufficient challenge. Jonson in his Ode on Bacon's Birthday speaks of the Lord Chancellor as one

> Whose even thread the fates spin round and full,
> Out of their choicest and their whitest wool—

—alas for the forecast! In THE HUE AND CRY AFTER CUPID the same Ben Jonson writes of

> A prince that draws
> By example more than others do by laws . . .
> That was reserved *until the Parcae spun*
> *Their whitest wool; and then his thread begun.*

Does *this* passage suggest any misgivings to Mr. Greenwood? Does he find it "most remarkable of all" that Jonson should have used the same figure in benison of Bacon and of King James? And does he see fit to suggest that Jonson had cause to think that King James wrote Bacon? Will he not rather grant me that Jonson, who uses this same figure yet another time in his APOLOGETICAL DIALOGUE appended to THE POETASTER—

> The Fates have not spun him the coarsest thread—

applying it to *himself*, and who in the same Dialogue as well as in his ODE TO HIMSELF wrote of "the wolf's black jaw and the dull ass's hoof," was simply prone to repeat a sounding phrase upon which he "fancied himself"?

If not; if Mr. Greenwood still elects to minister platonically to the Baconians, he will do well to frame either for them or for himself some presentable rebuttal to the bayonet-line of challenge which faces him and them. The hero of the Baconians, presumably, stopped writing plays when Shakespeare died because, even in view of his miraculous luck in having his literary secret

thus far kept for him, he could not find another "mask." Mr. Greenwood's occult lawyer, perhaps, was similarly swayed. For both sets of theorists, then, Shakespeare at least had the somewhat weighty merit of supplying the learned and legal author with a means of vent for his plays and poems which would otherwise have been unattained. There is no more new "Shakespeare" after Shakespeare's death, under any signature. And Mr. Greenwood's lawyer is as hardly pressed as Bacon by the demand of those who insist that an author shall prove his reality by having his manuscripts regularly printed. Mr. Greenwood's Man in the Paper Mask, affirmed to be lawyer enough to make Venus talk like one, secretly produces poems, plays, and sonnets, Bacon-wise, over a period of twenty years; then lays down his pen or dies; and either in his own despite or with no touch of supervision from him, has his work perpetuated in an inextricable blend with that of other men, and flawed by a multitude of printers' blunders, at the hands of the player-partners, who, in the view of Mr. Greenwood and the Baconians, either lied venally or were strangely deluded for twenty years by an impostor, their partner.

I am not going to play the panegyrist for the actor-partners, who have it standing to their account that, with the literary heedlessness of their age, they published what they must have known to be a mass of largely composite work without a hint to help posterity to discriminate. But if we deal with evidence in the common-sense spirit in which the sane lawyer is supposed to deal with it, we are bound to say that, under the reservation mentioned, their general testimony far outweighs all the cavils of the various schools of critics. They have been harshly and heedlessly accused, even by "orthodox" scholars, of falsely professing to print solely from true original copies when they were supplying the printer with printed quartos for "copy." That attack, unimportant at best, is disposed of by the argument which

proves certain quartos to have been authorised, and therefore to stand reasonably enough for the "true original copies." The alleged "difficulties" of the "Stratfordian" case are thus as dust in the balance against the insanities of the other; which posits a nightmare of protracted conspiracy and fraud unexampled out of Bedlam.

§ 7

A number of other items in Mr. Greenwood's negative case seem to me hardly to deserve discussion. All the problems he raises as to the young Shakespeare's life at Stratford, apart from the schooling, are practically outside our problem: it matters not to the question of the authorship what were young Will's relations with Sir Thomas Lucy, or what were the precise circumstances of his marriage. Equally irrelevant to our inquiry is the pother over the portraits.[1] As to Mr. Greenwood's unhappy chapter on "The Silence of Philip Henslowe," I confess to being somewhat at a loss for comment. The chapter seems to have been written without any examination of Henslowe's Diary,[2] upon some vague inferences from remarks by Collier and Judge Stotsenburg. Mr. Greenwood argues that whereas the unknown lawyer of his fantasy would naturally not take any payments from such an *entrepreneur* as Henslowe, the actor, on the contrary, readily would; and that accordingly the absence of the name of Shakespeare (or Shakspere or Shaksper, &c.) from Henslowe's Diary "is certainly a very remarkable phenomenon, and one . . . very difficult to reconcile with the supposition that Player Shakspere wrote plays."[3] In the name of mystery, why? Mr. Greenwood claims

[1] Long ago Dr. Ingleby pointed out: "As to portraits, Edmund Spenser stands in precisely the same position as Shakespeare. The portraits claimed for him are hopelessly discrepant" (*Shakespeare: The Man and the Book*, Pt. I, 1877, p. 78).

[2] Mr. Lang, who has an amusing chapter in reply to Mr. Greenwood's, seems also not to have studied the Diary.

[3] Work cited, p. 360.

to solve his own enigma by the simple pronouncement that "Neither Shakspere [*i.e.* the actor] nor 'Shakespeare' [*i.e.* Mr. Greenwood's unknown lawyer] ever wrote for Henslowe." In other words, the actor (in Mr. Greenwood's opinion) could not; and the mysterious lawyer, who provided the plays for the actor and his partners, would not write for Henslowe. Q.E.D.

I collect myself to ask, How on earth can Mr. Greenwood know this? That Shakespeare ever "wrote for Henslowe" I do not affirm: there are no means of determining what were the business relations between Henslowe and the Chamberlain's (Shakespeare's) company when they played in either of Henslowe's theatres. I am disposed to surmise that whatever refurbishing of old or writing of new plays Shakespeare did while his company was playing at either the Rose or the Newington Theatre, in the years 1592–96, was done "for" his company and not "for" Henslowe. But seeing that the Diary does not contain *any* entry of payment to *any* writer for playwriting before 1597,[1] when Shakespeare's company were successively at the Theater and the Curtain, and had no longer any dealings with Henslowe, the non-existence of any note of any payment to *him* is obviously neither here nor there. The payments beginning in 1597 are noted as made "for my Lord Admirall's men," for whom Shakespeare never wrote. It is simply impossible to understand the use of such an argument as Mr. Greenwood's save on the inference that he never examined the Diary at all. He notes Collier's remark that in the years 1594–96 the Admiral's men and the Chamberlain's men were jointly or alternately using one of Henslowe's theatres; and he exclaims accordingly. But had he

[1] These entries begin on Folio 43v., p. 82 of Mr. Greg's edition. Earlier in the book, which is not continuous in order of time, occur similar entries for 1599—Folio 29, p. 57. Even Collier's forgeries, it should be noted, begin only in 1597. *See* ed. cited, introd.

gone to the Diary he would have found that in those years there is no note of a payment to a playwright for either company.

As to the period from 1596 onwards, there is simply no rational ground for expecting to find any note of a payment from Henslowe to Shakespeare, seeing that Shakespeare and his company had no more dealings with that personage. In 1599 they settled at the Globe, for good. Henslowe paid the playwrights who worked for him or for the Admiral's company; and his Diary is simply a day-book of his many receipts, loans, and payments, theatrical and other, with a few "receipts" of the other sort and some notes of agreements, &c. Obviously, Mr. Greenwood's theory disposes of itself. If an outside friend *could* solely supply Shakespeare, who catered solely for his company, then Shakespeare, a partner, *might* so supply his own company, if he had the required literary capacity. Mr. Greenwood, I trust, will not insist on begging the question throughout the discussion! Now, that Shakespeare should go on steadily supplying his own company with plays instead of writing for Henslowe was not only natural: it was the way of advantage as against the way of disadvantage. Mr. Greenwood, presumably, does not deny that Shakespeare the actor was from about 1594 a partner in the Lord Chamberlain's (first known as Lord Strange's[1]) company of actors, who successively played at the Rose and at Newington and ran "*the* Theater" and the Globe Theatre. There is, says Mr. Fleay, "no vestige of evidence that Shakespeare ever wrote for any company but one."[2] This holds whether we think of Shakespeare the actor or of Bacon-Shakespeare or of Mr. Greenwood's unknown literary lawyer. And what could be more a matter of course

[1] Originally, in all likelihood, Lord Leicester's, but this is matter of inference. *See* Fleay's *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 91–6. As to the changes in the company's name, *see* Fleay, pp. 114–5, 128.

[2] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 115.

than that Shakespeare the actor should supply with plays the company in which he was a profit-sharing partner, instead of selling plays outright to Henslowe for a few pounds? By the former course he enriched himself; by the latter, he would insanely have condemned himself to the life of chronic beggary led by all the other playwrights of the day, including even Jonson. That Mr. Greenwood should see something "very remarkable" in such a choice is quite the most remarkable thing in his remarkable tissue of error and paralogism. All his attacks upon "the Stratfordian editors" and others in this connection are a mere fiasco. They and Sir Sidney Lee, as it happens, did not say, as Mr. Greenwood alleged,[1] that Shakespeare began his dramatic career "by writing plays for Henslowe": they said that Shakespeare's work "doubtless" began[2] at the Rose theatre, about 1592. As Mr. Greenwood does not himself believe that the plays there and then played by Shakespeare's company were Shakespearean, it is hard to see why he took to this line of argument at all. But when he exults in this connection over "a delightful specimen of Stratfordian reasoning," and proclaims it "the more extraordinary—*indeed incredible*—that the old manager should have made no mention" of Shakespeare in his DIARY, his Stratfordian foes are truly avenged. It *would* have been extraordinary, "indeed incredible," if Henslowe had been found entering payments to Shakespeare for plays he did *not* write, in a period of years in which the Diary records no payments to any other playwrights for the plays they *did* write, whether "for Henslowe" or for any of the companies who used his theatres.

When Mr. Greenwood goes on to quote Judge Stotsenburg as to Henslowe's payments for a "King Leare" and "The Tamynge of a Shrowe," he strangely abets

[1] Work cited, pp. 353, 354.

[2] Sir Sidney Lee's words are: "The earliest scene of Shakespeare's *pronounced* successes" (*Life*, 2nd ed. p. 37).

another gratuitous confusion. Judge Stotsenburg is quoted[1] as saying, concerning those two plays, and TITUS; and HENRY THE SIXTH, that "since these plays have *the same names* as those included in the Folio of 1623 the presumption is that they are the same plays until the contrary is shown." Mr. Greenwood is well aware that the old "Leare" was KING LEIR AND HIS THREE DAUGHTERS; that the old TAMING OF *a* SHREW is not the TAMING OF *the* SHREW; and that both of the old plays named are extant. As he expressly admits that TITUS and the HENRY VI plays are non-Shakespearean (save for adaptations in the latter), his entire use of Judge Stotsenburg's argument is a mere confounding of confusion. Of the same order is his use of Judge Stotsenburg's contention in regard to TROILUS AND CRESSIDA. The production of a non-Shakespearean TROILUS by Dekker and Chettle in 1599 was perfectly well known to all of us, like the rest of Henslowe's record; and the existence of plainly non-Shakespearean matter in the Shakespearean TROILUS is an old story among the critics. But if Mr. Greenwood means to suggest—as, apparently, does Judge Stotsenburg—that what is generally accepted as Shakespearean matter in TROILUS was really written by Dekker and Chettle, I am content to leave the question to Shakespearean readers, undebated. That Dekker could have written the great speeches in TROILUS is a proposition which I cannot conceive to be advanced by any critic who has read Dekker, and who can discern the qualities of a style. As to the non-Shakespearean matter in JULIUS CÆSAR, careful analytical research is highly desirable; but it does not seem likely to be supplied by the school of Judge Stotsenburg. It seems to me a rather lamentable thing that a critic like Mr. Greenwood; who might be doing real service to the study of Shakespeare by furthering the scientific dissection of the composite plays, should join hands with con-

[1] By Mr. Greenwood, p. 355.

fusion-mongers who merely darken counsel by ignorant inference.

It all comes of *parti pris*; and, as Johnson said of Capell, of "acquiescence in his first thoughts." In his resolve to disparage the Stratford actor, he will not even attach rational weight to Heywood's testimony that when Jaggard in 1612 published an edition of THE PASSIONATE PILGRIM with two poems of Heywood's unwarrantably included, "the author, I know, was much offended with Mr. Jaggard that (altogether unknown to him) presumed to make so bold with his name." "Here," says Mr. Greenwood,[1] "we observe that Heywood does nothing to identify 'the author' with the player. *He is somebody of whom Heywood speaks in very deferential terms.*" And Mr. Greenwood adds that "'the author' *does not seem* to have raised any protest as Heywood did." What possible justification can Mr. Greenwood have for this assertion? He appears to be bent at once on disparaging the actor and affirming the authorship of the literary lawyer; for he argues on the one hand that had not Heywood interfered, the publisher's fraud would have been acquiesced in, and, on the other hand, that the hypothetical real author—"a courtier, for instance, holding or aspiring to high office in the state"—might have thought it expedient to hold his tongue. *Yet he implies that Heywood knew who this real author was, and that it was somebody in high station.* So the secret was known to Heywood—and to how many beside! What concern, then, had the "courtier" shown for expediency when he had already let his secret be thus known? The whole argument is an irreparable mess. The plain answer to all Mr. Greenwood's cavils on these heads is that he knows and can know nothing whatever as to what Shakespeare the actor spontaneously did or said when his works were pirated or other men's works were ascribed to him. These were not occasions for

[1] Work cited, p. 349.

public announcements, and no one has any right to allege that "the author," whoever he were, did not do whatever little was in his power to stop the printers.[1]

It is hardly necessary, finally, to debate Mr. Greenwood's claim to support his case from subsidiary conflicts of opinion among those whom he lumps together as "Stratfordians." He actually challenges us all, under that name, to deal with the "difficulty" of the authorship of ARDEN OF FEVERSHAM, which some Shakespeareans have assigned to Shakespeare. The historical fact is that two "Stratfordians," Mr. Fleay and Mr. Crawford, have in turn claimed, and the second demonstrated, that ARDEN is a work of Kyd. The problem is exactly the same for Mr. Greenwood as for the Stratfordians; and to suggest that any conflict on such issues discredits the common conviction that the Stratford actor wrote the plays, is to "suborn" a sophism. As well might it be said that a conflict of views among students of Bacon as to his character and capacity is a reason for doubting his authorship of any of his signed works. There will long continue to be dispute among students of Shakespeare as to his share in some of the works assigned to him, whether canonical or apocryphal: it is the business of Shakespearean scholars to go on with those quests as do other scholars with theirs. A desire to further this legitimate mission has helped in the penning of these pages. But it is hard to see how it can be otherwise than very indirectly furthered by contributions to the great "anti-Stratfordian" enterprise of straining at gnats and swallowing camels.

§ 8

Something must be said, finally, concerning the so-called arguments founded on the facts that Shakespeare in his will left only his second-best bed to his wife, and

[1] If he had sued them, would not Mr. Greenwood have accused the Stratford actor of oppressing poor tradesmen?

that the signature to the will is tremulous—or, as some say, "illiterate." To me personally it has always been so astonishing that reasoning men should treat such items as having a real bearing on the question of authorship, that I have some little difficulty in discussing it without raising the question of their good faith. Their positions appear to be (1) that the bequest of the second-best bed proved Shakespeare to have been on bad terms with his wife; (2) that a man capable of being on bad terms with his wife could not be a man of genius; and (3) that bad handwriting is incompatible with great literary production. It seems necessary to meet these propositions seriously.

Whether Shakespeare was or was not on bad terms with his wife I do not pretend to say. No one has any clear right to an opinion on the subject. It seems unlikely that the "myriad-minded" dramatist should put as a general proposition, on the strength of his own experience, the passage in the TEMPEST in which Prospero warns Ferdinand against anticipating the marriage rite: he must have known some strictly conventional households in which the conjugal relation was inharmonious. My own youthful surmise, on first reading the will, was that the second-best bed had been the marriage bed; and that Anne desired to have it secured to her, dwelling on her past as elderly women—and men—so often do. The most probable solution seems to be that she was either physically or mentally in a condition which made it desirable that she should not be left a control of property. But, on any conceivable view of the case, what has the bequest to do with the question of the authorship? I will not go into the cases of Jonson, Molière, Byron, Shelley, Milton, Victor Hugo, Hazlitt, Goethe, and Dickens, who were so variously infelicitous in their married lives: I will take simply that of Bacon. *He* made a will in which he devised a great deal of money that he did not possess, so that it had to be administered

by creditors, who got about seven shillings in the pound—a circumstance that does not seem ever to have troubled the Bacon-Shakespeareans. To that will, in which he had made an abundant nominal provision for his "loving wife," Bacon added a codicil, curtly declaring: "Whatsoever I have given, granted, or appointed to my wife, in the former part of this my will, I do now, for just and great causes, utterly revoke and make void, and leave her to her right only." Does that codicil, one asks, in any way affect the question of Bacon's authorship of anything he did or did not claim to have written? If not, what is the difference in the case of the will of Shakespeare?

As the Baconian argument on this topic remains purely ridiculous for me, while appearing to have for some people a mysterious force, I will cite one more case of a literary man's will, which raises the question about books, much discussed by the Baconians. The will of the poet Samuel Daniel is extant. It begins with the customary "committing" of body and soul to their respective destinations. It then allots "to my sister, Susan Bowre,[1] one feather bed, and with the furniture thereto belonging, and such linen as I shall leave at my house at Ridge." There follow four bequests of ten pounds each to members of the Bowre family, and "for the disposing of all other things" the testator's brother is left a free hand, as executor. There is not a word about books or wife, though Daniel is supposed to have had a wife. "When he was married, and to whom, still remain unknown."[2] Does all this set up any doubt as to the existence of Samuel Daniel, his authorship of the books to which

[1] The Rev. Mr. Grosart, who prints the will, mentions that Daniel "had no sister, so far as appears"—another "mystery," which I do not attempt to solve. *See* Grosart's ed. of Daniel's Works, 1885, i, pp. xxv-xxvi. [In his Index, I find, Grosart admits his oversight, and says he cannot account for it.]

[2] Grosart, as cited, p. xxiv. Jonson told Drummond that Daniel "had no children."

he put his name, and his reading of many other books? [1]

The question of the handwriting calls for no more elaborate treatment. The allegation that the signatures to the will, written near the death of the testator, are those of an "illiterate" person, is a sample of the way in which Baconians persuade. Mr. Greenwood does not scruple to write of "the hopeless scrawls that do duty for his signatures."[2] I know not what the palæographers say on the subject: to me, on a comparison of the Shakespeare signatures with others of the period, the assertion seems simply false. The recently discovered half-signature to the deposition of 1612 [3] is indeed very hastily and badly written—apparently with the kind of impossible pen still so commonly supplied for public use in banks and other offices. But such a signature was on any view a matter of no formal importance; and Shakespeare could conceivably have been much bored by the Mountjoye case, and impatient to get away from it. And the Baconian attack, as it happens, had been made on the signatures already known. Now, the signatures to the deeds of 1612–13, in particular the second, seem to me those of a good and firm penman: those to the will, written within a month of death, are surely not out-of-the-way.[4] Mr. Greenwood is able to cite Sir Sidney Lee

[1] The book query arises in regard to Reginald Scot, author of *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584). He must have read many books, and surely owned some, but no book is alluded to in his will. (See it in Nicholson's rep. p. xxvii.)

[2] *Shakespeare Problem*, p. 14.

[3] Art. *New Shakespeare Discoveries*, by Dr. C. W. Wallace, in *Harper's Magazine*, March 1910. This half-signature goes far to validate the similar one on the Bodleian Ovid. The abbreviated form will probably be exclaimed over by Baconians. I may note that I have seen just such a half-signature by a distinguished living statesman.

[4] I once had the idea, put by Mr. Nesbit, that the tremulousness of the signatures to the will might stand for a nervous malady, the likely cause of Shakespeare's retirement. But within a month of death, any cause might so operate.

as having pronounced, on the strength of the five signatures, that Shakespeare's handwriting was of an "illegible" type. It is rarely that Mr. Greenwood and Sir Sidney are at one: in this case I take leave to deny the assertion of both. But the whole of Mr. Greenwood's argument on the subject is obscure. He seems to imply that either to write or to sign in the old "Gothic" script as late as 1600 was to give evidence of lack of culture; but the suggestion that men who then wrote usually in the Italic script might sign law deeds in the old script he meets by citing Sir Sidney Lee to the effect that educated Englishmen in those days wrote their letters usually in the old character and signed their names in the new Italian hand. How such a question is to be settled; how we can know whether or not Shakespeare usually wrote in modern script, I am unable to understand. Sir Sidney Lee and Mr. Greenwood seem for once to have united in a dogmatic and unprovable assertion of the kind that Sir Sidney usually eschews and Mr. Greenwood professes to reprobate.

The common sense of the matter is that either hand could be written with facility; that probably the actors had been taught, as Shakespeare probably was, the old English script at school; and that he was therefore not unlikely to have written his plays for them in the said script.[1] That wills and deeds, written in old script, should be signed in old script, seems natural;[2] but I am content to leave that an open question, knowing of no adequate research on the subject. In any case, there

[1] The MS. of *The Birth of Hercules* (written after 1600), of which some facsimiles are given in the Malone Society's edition, is in old script, with names in italic.

[2] Mr. Greenwood jeers vigorously (p. 14) at Dr. Garnett and Dr. Philip Gosse for this suggestion. They had used the phrase, "appropriate for business matters"; and he asks why the old should be more appropriate for business matters than the new script. He knows that by "business matters" they meant legal matters. Will he explain why an old script is still partly retained in engrossing?

would have been nothing out-of-the-way in Shakespeare's adherence to the old script all his life, if he did adhere to it. Spedding notes that Bacon wrote the old script in his early youth, and later adopted the new. I have seen a number of books of Shakespeare's age, in which marginal annotations are made in the old English script. The writing is often firmer, doubtless, than that of the signatures to Shakespeare's will; to say nothing of the hasty half-signature to the deposition of 1612; but, as already remarked, the other signatures seem firm enough.

But what if they were otherwise? Supposing they had been all alike tremulous, or penned with apparent difficulty, what would follow? Anti-Stratfordians either are or are not aware (1) that many literary men and scholars have written very illegibly all their lives; (2) that men who could once write clearly and neatly have through some nervous affection or cramp ceased to be able to do so. The whole argument from the signatures is for me so nugatory that, not knowing what its supporters have in their minds, I think it well to mention (1) that the late Mr. Andrew Lang, one of the most cultured and one of the most productive men of letters of his time, wrote (latterly, at least) one of the very worst hands ever seen; (2) that several financial magnates of our day, in the case of whose signatures legibility would seem to be important, notoriously sign in scrawls which defy decipherment, and are recognised at the banks as a species of mark; (3) that cramp or other nerve affections will render stiff or tremulous the hand even of a man of genius; and (4) that when we are near death, infirmity of body is likely to occur in the case of any one of us.

Having thus put briefly all the arguments that seem to me necessary[1] to meet the Baconian case concerning

[1] *See*, however, Mr. Lang's posthumous work, and the smaller book of Canon Beeching, for other and weighty confutations of Baconian inferences of this order.

the will and the signatures, as I understand it, I will not seek finally to disguise my conviction that those who have advanced or been impressed by it have suffered either intellectually or morally from the contagion of a malady of opinion. When before was a literary man's faculty or authorship challenged on the score of the badness of his handwriting, or, for that matter, of his spelling ? [1] And when before were a man's relations with his wife considered to have a bearing on the question of his possession of literary genius ? The Baconians tell us that Shakespeare did not properly educate his daughters. Did Milton, who caused his to learn the mere alphabets of dead languages so that they might read aloud to him without understanding ? [2] In an age in which most women, especially in the provinces, did not learn to write, is there anything astonishing in Shakespeare's following of the general usage ? And even if there were, has the matter any more evidential bearing on the question of the authorship of the plays than has the fact of Milton's display of repellent characteristics upon the question whether he wrote PARADISE LOST as it stands, or whether the poem was "edited" as Bentley maintained ?

[1] In the two letters of Bacon first printed by Dr. Grosart in the introduction to his ed. of Sir John Davies, six separate words are given up as "illegible," and the spelling is lax.

N.B.

[2] Mr. Greenwood (p. 204) has a note on this subject, in which he strives to show that Milton did *more* for his daughters than Shakespeare for his. Denouncing the "pitiful" pleas of "Stratford apologists," he strives to evade the fact that Milton forced his daughters to read to him in languages which they did not understand. All the while, he has never faced the real issue—the probable difference between the culture-standards of *Stratford* in Shakespeare's day and those of *London* in Milton's. Milton had his daughters taught to read, but not to know any language save their own, because "one tongue was enough for a woman." In the end he was fain to teach the youngest Latin. The others, forced to read in languages they knew not, came to hate their father. Mark Pattison was more severe on Milton in this connection than is Mr. Greenwood on Shakespeare. (*Milton*, pp. 147–8.)

Postscript

Even Mr. Lang, in the act of confuting the "anti-Stratfordian" case, seems to me to make one unwarranted concession to it. On the strength of Shakespeare's four law suits to recover small debts, he pronounces him a "hard creditor." Now, it is not inconceivable that the author of the Plays may have been a hard creditor; but it seems to me unlikely; and the four small law suits are very inadequate proof of such a charge. It ignores (1) the far greater commonness of such litigation in that day than in ours; and (2) the obvious possibility that Shakespeare was dealing with slippery debtors. Shakespeare, described by Jonson as of "an open and free nature," might well have to leave such matters to his attorney. John Shakespeare, as we have seen, ran many more law suits than his son ever did, some of them with his personal friends. *Moi qui parle,* I once sued a rascally debtor for a small debt, because he was brazenly bilking me; and he succeeded, despite the court's order against him! I cannot on that score reckon myself a hard creditor—I never sued anybody else—and I can conceive that Shakespeare, in a day of lower standards than ours, found more than one of his debtors dishonest, or otherwise exasperating. Still, the point is quite irrelevant to the question of authorship or genius—as irrelevant as is that of Bacon's laxness and indebtedness, or Scott's indefensible and unprofessional speculations, or Burns's or Musset's drinking, or Defoe's trickeries, or Heine's malice, or Tourguénief's timidity, or the aberrations of Poe, or the fanaticism of Dante, or the lying of Pope, or the scurrility of Milton, or the brutal quarrelling of Jonson, to the question of the faculty of any of these writers.

CHAPTER XV

CONCLUSION

On a broad retrospect, the Baconian theory constitutes a singular example of what men call "the irony of fate." If there was one task upon which Bacon was more bent than on any other, it was that of goading or leading men to sound methods of induction. The "idola" of his antipathy were the heedless presuppositions and prejudices, the arbitrary persistences in "fore-deeming" which with most men did duty then, as they do now, for the spirit of inquiry and truth-seeking. He miscarried often enough in his own inductions, constructive and negative; but his great service to thought and science consisted precisely in the force and instancy of his warnings against the snares of intellectual "will-worship." And it has been left to the professed "Baconians" of to-day to supply the most flagrant instance in modern history, theology apart, of the intellectual sin which he so forcefully denounced. They have trodden his law underfoot. They have gone about their task with a more complete disregard of the first principles of inductive research than was shown by any alchemist or physicist in Bacon's age. Catching at a conventional falsism as to the legal knowledge in the Shakespeare plays, they have made it an article in their creed without an attempt to check it by a collation of other men's plays. Starting with the other conventional falsism as to the classical knowledge exhibited in the plays, they have but angrily flouted all contrary contentions in a spirit of sheer fanaticism, and, instead of checking their first data by inductive comparison,

have heaped a Pelion of nonsense upon an Ossa of error.

If, again, there was one thing that a *true* Baconian ought to have done before drawing an inference from random coincidences in the Plays and the Works, it was to turn to the plays and works of coeval writers, to ascertain whether the coincidences were special or general. Not one in a hundred of the professed "Baconians" has ever made the attempt; a few read one other dramatist and decide straightway that Bacon wrote his works also; a few read a little more widely and decide that Bacon wrote everything. We are witnessing, not a process of induction, but a process of absurdity, not easily distinguishable from monomania. But the monomaniac who affirms that Bacon wrote all the Elizabethan drama and Spenser and Montaigne and Puttenham and Burton and Nashe, and in addition did the Authorised Version of the Bible, is only persisting in extending the primary fallacy of the inference that Bacon wrote Shakespeare because similar expressions occur in the Plays and the Works. His wildest extravagance is what men quaintly call a "logical" extension of the first absurdity, said to have been embraced by John Bright.

True; but, once more, he and they have thus merely extended that play of uncritical belief and heedless advocacy which, as Bacon saw, pervades more or less the thinking and the propaganda of most men. We have had gross nonsense from Lord Campbell; and only rather grosser nonsense from the Baconians; he doing his special pleading with half-professional unconcern for pure truth; they doing theirs with all the zest of self-pleasing fanatics; as little awake as he to the laws of intellectual righteousness. And other forms of "orthodox" dogmatism have sinned about as heedlessly against the true Baconian statute. A generation ago the general body of Shakespearean scholars either violently affirmed or tacitly accepted as final the "expert" dictum that poor Peter

Cunningham's discoveries in the "Revels" papers, assigning to "Shaxberd" certain plays performed at court on certain dates, were impudent, wicked, and senseless forgeries. And now Mr. Ernest Law convincingly affirms,[1] with the highest backing from expert authority, that they are not forgeries at all. In a world in which such things happen, we cannot dismiss the Baconian heresy as a mere negligible freak of human nature.

Not that I suppose it possible to lead zealous Baconians back to common sense. A preliminary passage in Dr. Theobald's SHAKESPEARE STUDIES IN BACONIAN LIGHT (p. 2) tells how, after reading Bacon and Shakespeare "in perpetual juxtaposition for years"—that is to say, *with no corrective resort to the writings of other Elizabethans* —"the persuasion which came by a flash of perception,[2] ripened into a strong and well-grounded conviction, resting on facts and arguments, solid and secure as mathematical demonstration." Quite so. All the vital countervailing facts and arguments had been ignored, and the resulting conviction, obtained like that derived from a mathematical demonstration of the squaring of the circle, is held like an article of religious faith. Such a psychosis is not corrigible. I should as soon expect to convert a bishop to rationalism as one of Dr. Theobald's way of reasoning to the comparative method.

But something may be done to prevent the spread of such hallucination among the normally uncritical. The Baconian chimera will persist, and may even be outgone. There has recently been produced, by Professor Celestin Demblon of Brussels, a new "demonstration" that the Plays were written by Roger Manners, Earl of Rutland (1576–1613), who married the daughter of Sir Philip Sidney, and shared in the insurrection of Essex. It will be interesting to follow the relations of M. Demblon with the Baconians: no one else need intervene. Transcend-

[1] *Some Supposed Shakespeare Forgeries*, 1911.

[2] Word so corrected by hand in my copy of the reissue of 1904

ing their method as they have done that of common sense, M. Demblon in his opening *Vue d'ensemble* tells us the circumstances under which Lord Rutland wrote the plays, and why he wrote them, sparing us the trouble of digesting any evidence to show that he *did* write them. So far as I can gather, the whole proof is contained in the plea that he *might* have written them, chronologically speaking, if we do not date any of the plays too early. Of either external or internal evidence to show that Rutland had anything to do with the plays, or wrote anything else, M. Demblon produces not a scrap.[1] He presents us with the hero's portrait, that of a sweetly pretty young man. For the rest, we learn that this youth

> has successively depicted himself in Biron of *Love's Labour's Lost*, in Bassanio of *The Merchant of Venice*, in Romeo, in Benedict in *Much Ado About Nothing*, in Jaques of *As you Like It*, in Hamlet, in Brutus of *Julius Cæsar*, in Prospero of *The Tempest*—as did Goethe in Werther, Hermann, Faust, and Tasso; as did Honoré de Balzac in Raphael, in Balthasar Claes, in Albert Savarus, &c.[2]

[1] M. Demblon appears to have built his entire hypothesis on the discovery that at Rutland's death his brother, acting as his executor, paid "To Mr. Shakspeare *in gold, about* my Lordes impreso, xliv*s.*; To Richard Burbage for painting and making it, xliv*s.*" An "impreso," more correctly "impresa," was a personal "device" or badge, often worn in tournaments and masques. M. Demblon asserts that the payment, as noted in the family accounts, was to "William Shakspeare." It was not: there is no prenomen. M. Demblon is evidently unaware that it has been shown (by Mrs. Stopes, in the *Athenæum*, May 16, 1908) that "Mr. Shakspeare" was probably one John Shakspeare, a fashionable bit-maker of the time, concerning whom there are many entries in the Wardrobe Accounts of Charles I, as prince and as king. Among other things he made "guilt bosses charged with the arms of England." Such an artist was very likely to be employed to do the metal work of an impresa. Mr. John Shakspeare would seem to have been a cousin of the poet, which would explain the connection with Burbage. *Et voilà tout*—for the theory of M. Demblon.

[2] *Lord Rutland est Shakespeare.* Par Celestin Demblon. Paris, Ferdinando, 1912. P. 16.

The details are filled in with the same masterly simplicity. Rutland was incarcerated for his rebellion from 1601 till 1603, and "exhala sa douleur dans le premier HAMLET, écrit en 1602." Why he chose for this purpose the old HAMLET of Kyd, and how he managed to arrange the matter with the players while he remained in custody, are questions that M. Demblon neither asks nor answers. In his second chapter, the Professor informs us that "notre étude d'ensemble," published in the GRANDE REVUE, "a fait beaucoup de bruit, dans la presse européenne, notamment à Paris, à Rome, à Milan, à Madrid, à Cologne, à Berlin, à Moscou, et quelque pen à Londres et à New-York. Ce n'est qu'un commencement."[1] So one would suppose. But when, citing some of the comments, for the most part skilfully non-committal, of his continental critics, M. Demblon deals with that of M. Henri Roujon, of the Académie Française, he dashes the cup of promise from our lips. In the best French manner, M. Roujon had written :—" As for the proofs, in the sense in which the word would be understood by a magistrate, it appears that M. Célestin Demblon reserves them for a book which he is going to publish. He will pardon our waiting till then to adhere to his theory." To which M. Demblon replies : "While thanking M. Roujon for his kindness, we permit ourselves not to be of his opinion : with the French ex-Minister of whom we have spoken, with M. de Pawlowski, with the scholars of England, of Germany, and of New York who have written to us, we believe our first chapter to be *absolutely decisive*."[2] And there the matter rests ! "That does not signify," adds M. Demblon, "that we have not a quantity of new proofs to give ! Our whole book so testifies, and some more will be found already in this chapter." The further "proofs" are of like kind with those which M. Roujon was unable to detect in the first chapter : that is to say, there is not a grain of evidence in the book. Running to

[1] Work cited, p. 27.

[2] Work cited, p. 29.

559 pages, it is occupied chiefly with the thesis " Shaxper de Stratford hors cause." Incidentally M. Demblon discusses at great length many biographical and literary points, sometimes quite intelligently; but as to his grounds for asserting the authorship of Lord Rutland he is resolutely uncommunicative.

It is rather hard on the Baconians. He has calmly annexed all their case against " Shaxper "; and for the rest he simply tells them that they are mistaken about Bacon, who did not and could not write the plays. It is quite conceivable that he may convert some of them: confidence of assertion seems to be the way to get at the Baconian mind; and as he spares them all worry over parallel passages he offers them some spiritual compensation for the loss of Bacon. They are not required by him to ascribe to Rutland the whole of the Elizabethan drama, and the rest of the Baconian load. It should be noted that he provides Mr. Greenwood with his lawyer; for Rutland had done some legal study at Gray's Inn. Whether Mr. Greenwood finds this sufficient to dispose of his difficulties, I leave to him to say.

At one or two points, M. Demblon and Mr. Greenwood are partly in agreement. They concur—or incline to do so—in making Jonson's line,

> And though thou hadst small Latin and less Greek,

and the sequel, mean: " and *if* you had small Latin and less Greek I would none the less," &c. The other obstacles presented by Jonson's testimony M. Demblon gets round very much as Mr. Greenwood does. On his own account he has, as might be expected from his *Vue d'ensemble*, the courage to allege that the reminiscences of Ovid in the VENUS and the LUCRECE " recall always the original text, *never the text of Golding*."[1] " La verité a ses droits," is nevertheless one of M. Demblon's propositions.[2] Like Mr. Greenwood, he has assumed that those who deny

[1] Work cited, p. 49. [2] P. 68.

Shakespeare's possession of classical scholarship represent him as being "presque inculte"—almost devoid of education. This nobody but a Baconian ever did. "Comme s'il avait jamais existé un grand poète inculte!" continues M. Demblon. "Comme si l'on pouvait même en concevoir un!" It may be worth while to say a final word on that head.

If by *inculte* M. Demblon means a modern who had not read the Greek and Latin classics, he in effect destroys his own case later, for he is willing to accept Plautus as knowing no tongue but Latin, and Robert Burns, "ce charmant poète," as having "fait de bonnes études primaires et lu des livres dont il nous cite lui-même les titres."[1] This is just a trifle too puerile. No one with whom M. Demblon has to debate ever suggested that Shakespeare had not read as many books as did Burns. The whole question, once more, is as to whether the Shakespeare of the Plays needed much *classical* culture to write them. If M. Demblon means to assert this, we need not argue with him as to whether Plautus had read any Greek. On his principles a *Homer* could not have been a great poet, whether or not he could read or write. M. Demblon is at pains to remind us that Musset made "bonnes études dont il ne fait jamais étalage," and to argue that Balzac was not an ignoramus because he assigned to a deputé a fictitious department. Quite so: the question about the "sea-coast of Bohemia"—copied from Greene's tale—has really nothing to do with the case; though that was certainly not a lapse possible to Bacon. But when we are discussing Balzac, is nothing to be said on the question whether *his* "Comédie humaine" was or could have been constructed without classical culture? Balzac (concerning whom posterity may be presented with a new Baconian myth, on the score that the family name was really "Balssa"), was certainly no scholar. He left school at seventeen. Is it alleged

[1] Pp. 42-43.

that the smattering of classics he had at a *collège* made possible for him a work of imaginative creation such as the schooling and actor-training of Shakespeare made for him impossible? I am content to leave the issue at that—and M. Demblon to the Baconians.

In one attitude of mind they are truly akin. Determined to deny that the "Stratford actor" can have produced the Plays, they never once balk at the notion of their being produced as a kind of recreation by any university man, however otherwise engaged. Unconcerned as they are to inquire how their exalted hero contrived to be man-of-all-work to a theatre-company, they are if possible still less moved to wonder how that manifold mass of dramaturgy was created secretly by a man of affairs, ostensibly occupied throughout his life in wholly different ways. Even Mr. Greenwood has no misgiving in suggesting that his unknown lawyer-author was a "*busy man*, whose aim it was to use the stage as a means to convey instruction to the people, and to teach them a certain measure of philosophy"![1] All that mighty mass of poetic creation was a by-product of a busy lawyer; and its aim—from Falstaff to Coriolanus, from Juliet to Perdita—was "to convey *instruction* to the people"! For the Baconians, it is not even a problem that the full-handed Bacon should have added the seven-and-thirty Plays to a performance which, apart from these, ranked him with the great thinkers and workers of his time. For M. Demblon, it is not even a matter for surprise that his young Earl threw off the Plays in the intervals of travel, study, rebellion, and court life. The work of the greatest of all dramatists, it appears, could be written "standing on one foot," provided one had only been at a university!

There need, then, be no limit to the list of claimants. From Mr. Greenwood's book, as above noted, and from an Appendix to Mr. Harold Bayley's entitled THE SHAKE-

[1] *Shakespeare Problem*, p. 514.

SPEARE SYMPHONY (1906), I learn that an "able work" has been written by Judge Stotsenburg, under the heading AN IMPARTIAL STUDY OF THE SHAKESPEARE TITLE, to show, says Mr. Bayley, "that the Shakespeare Plays are not the work of one single author, but of a poetic syndicate, including among others Drayton, Dekker, Heywood, Webster, Middleton, and Porter. To this group Bacon was merely a polisher and reconstructor." This last idea is, in Judge Stotsenburg's own words, "a conclusion that forces itself upon my mind because, first, I believe that Bacon if he originated the plays would have observed the unities, and secondly, because his philosophical views and peculiarities are interwoven in some of them." I confess to having abstained from taking the trouble to read Judge Stotsenburg's book. One must draw the line somewhere. The judges have an awful record in this business: only Judge Willis has stood for critical investigation and common sense,[1] as against Lord Campbell, Lord Penzance, Judge Webb, Judge Holmes, and Judge Stotsenburg. *Ne sutor ultra crepidam:* a judge is no judge in a literary problem when he lacks either due knowledge or literary judgment. The last seems to be Judge Stotsenburg's weak point.

His "syndicate" theory appears to be a modification of that of Delia Bacon. How he can assign the great tragedies to any combination of the writers above-named, and why he does not assign all *their* works to other men, I am not concerned to inquire. If he had been able to recognise in the really alien or composite plays the hands of Peele, Greene, Marlowe, and Kyd, he would have creditably marked himself off from the Baconians; and if he could indicate in TROILUS or TIMON or JULIUS CÆSAR the hand of any of the writers he has named (Dekker, I have suggested, wrote the Prologue to TROILUS), he would be doing some critical service. That there is something

[1] Even Judge Willis did strange things in his mock-trial of the Bacon-Shakespeare question!

of Middleton in MACBETH was argued by others before Judge Stotsenburg. But to assign the whole of the Shakespeare plays to a syndicate of which not one (at least of those named by Mr. Bayley) was capable of writing the finest Shakespearean poetry, is merely to out-Bacon Delia and the Baconians. Mr. Greenwood notes that the learned judge assigns the Shakespeare Sonnets to Sir Philip Sidney; and Mr. Greenwood does not wince! The learned judge, says Mr. Bayley, "has collected a large number of parallel passages from the writers I have dealt with; but, curiously enough, he notes none of those which happen to have struck me." That would seem to mean that the learned Judge, reading the Elizabethan dramatists, has failed to notice (as Mr. Bayley has noticed) the multitude of tags and echoes and coincidences which might have revealed to him how those playwrights could have tags and sentiments in common without community of genius.

Probably the whirligig of Time will cast up yet other fantasies in far greater numbers than rational contributions to Shakespeare study. I do not despair of seeing seriously advanced the theory that the Plays were written by Queen Elizabeth, who was a good classical scholar, and must have heard, from her law officers, a good deal about law. Sir John Davies pronounced her the "richest mind" of all time.[1] And if any man tell us—as we are at times tempted to tell ourselves—that in a world in which folly is thus forever heading this way and that, like an uncontrollable epidemic, it is a waste of time to reason with or against it even when it affects thousands, we can but rest on the analogies of civic life. If we are well employed when we strive to minimise disease in the body politic and the body corporal, we are surely not much less rationally employed when we seek to minimise delusion in the life intellectual.

Perhaps we may overrate the importance of that

[1] Dedication to *Nosce Teipsum*.

on the æsthetic side. But here again we can plead the common human interest. If we be asked, Who and what was this Shakespeare, that you should spend so much time and trouble in settling exactly what he wrote? we answer that it is all part of the eternal tribute men pay to genius, as to beauty, were it only because each is so rare. The very vogue of the Baconian delusion is to be traced to that "witchcraft of the wit," that dominion of masterly speech, which has won Shakespeare his sovereignty. In seeking to dethrone one potentate of the æsthetic life, the Baconians have not chosen a commonplace substitute. It needed a great power over men's spirits to move such a multitude even of unscientific reasoners to acclaim in Bacon a possible claimant to Shakespeare's realm. And if they have loved not wisely but too well, they have therein shown themselves members of the human family.

The trouble is that, set agoing as they were by the rebound of the idolatrous habit in regard to Shakespeare, they have developed a more extravagant idolatry in regard to Bacon. As the old Shakespeare-worshipper saw in his idol the sum of all intellectual excellence, the Baconian, carrying credulity to new extremes, proclaims a double miracle, and, giving two kingdoms to one man, quadruples every folly of his predecessor. There has never been a truly critical procedure in his whole development. Instead of correcting the faults of omission and commission in the idolatrous criticism of Shakespeare, he has wholly abandoned Shakespearean analysis, taking the entire mass of the plays without question as wholly one man's work, and fathering on Bacon a quantity of matter of which the considerate Shakespearean was long ago glad to relieve Shakespeare's credit.[1] At that level of delusion, no corrective thinking is possible. Even

[1] From such blame Mr. Greenwood is honourably exempt. His discussions of the composite and spurious plays are the soundest parts of his book.

the conceivably possible gain from a reaction against idolatry of Shakespeare has been turned to naught by the Baconian resort to mere vilification of the rejected divinity. Uncontrolled in animosity as in adoration, the heretic will see no kind of merit in the renounced God, seeing all things in the new. Worshipping a man who was fain to leave his reputation to "men's charitable speeches," they catch at every pretext for defaming the man of Stratford. Refusing to accept any tradition to his credit, as they are entitled to do, they gloat over the tradition, caught from a village vicar of a much later time, that the worshipped poet had died of a drinking-bout with old friends who visited him from London. Mr. Greenwood, standing partly outside the Baconian fold, has the fairness to admit that this is in all likelihood a myth; but the Baconians are not that way inclined.

The argument appears to be that if once Shakespeare can be proved to have misconducted himself, the case against his authorship is strengthened. Such a method would make short work of the claims of Marlowe and Greene and Peele and Jonson to *their* plays; and it is to be hoped that saner critical methods will in future reign even among the "anti-Stratfordians." In so far as they are sincerely perplexed, with Emerson, to "marry this man's life to his verse," and are exercised by all the "difficulties" they find in it, they may usefully ask themselves how they can hope to solve these by a hypothesis which, whether they insert Bacon or merely Mr. Greenwood's unknown lawyer, involves on the bare issue of the fact the most mountainous improbability in literary history. And perhaps they may no less usefully ask themselves how, on their principles, we are to solve the difficulty of the strange incongruity between Bacon's precepts for the right management of personal finance and the laxity of practice which wrought his ruin. A little extension of this field of inquiry may lead them to

perceive that there are "difficulties" in reducing to strict congruity the life of any man.

Whatever may be the developments on that side of the dispute, it is to be hoped that something has been done in the foregoing pages to force it out of the field of literary and philological myth-mongering upon which the "anti-Stratfordian" case has been so largely founded by all its advocates. That at least seems worth doing. On any view, in the house of science there are many mansions, and the method of science is as reasonably to be applied to any one problem as to any other. After all, it may be as humanly useful to settle "æsthetic" questions of this sort as to develop the law of projectiles, to the end of more easily and surely destroying life in war, or even as it may be to perfect the theory of "the grip" in golf.

GENERAL INDEX

Ablative absolute, the, 226
Actors, status of in Tudor times, 27, 28
Adams, Thomas, legal phraseology in sermons of, 170
Adonis, "gardens" of, 183 *sq.*
Æsthetic taste, as arbitrator, 8, 14
Against Dicing, Dancing, &c., classical matter in, 182
All's Well that Ends Well, law and legal phraseology in, 65 *sq.*, 85
Anacreon, Shakespeare's alleged knowledge of, 215
Anthon, Prof., cited, 188
Anti-Stratfordians, the, 1, 5, 594
Antony and Cleopatra, legal phraseology in, 84
Appius and Virginia, Webster's, trial scene in, 162 *sq.*
Arden of Feversham, legal allusions in, 61, 68
  written by Kyd, 575
Ariosto, 249
Aristotle, Bacon and, 529
Arnold, prose and verse of, 485
Artist and King, story of, 476
Ascham, on English vocabulary, 259
  on poetic imitation, 392
Asseveration, terms of, 477
Astrophel, Spenser's, 17 *n.*
Astrophel and Stella, 91–2
As You Like It, legal phraseology in, 47 *sq.*
"Atheistic academy," the, 25
Augustine, St., Shakespeare's alleged knowledge of, 203

Bacon, Delia, Theory of, 11 *n.*
Bacon, Francis, 1, 2
  our knowledge of, through Rawley, 23
  Baconus or *Baco?*, 3
  personality of, contrasted with Shakespeare's, 7, 547 *sq.*
  claims for, by Baconians, 5
  and Montaigne, 5
  on the bankruptcy of modern languages, 534
  handwriting of, 580, 581 *n.*
  essays of, 6, 526
Bacon, Francis, character of, 527
  does not talk law in non-legal works, 17, 525
  and Essex, 32
  occupations of, 32, 384
  didactic ideals of, 528, 534, 583
  imitates Montaigne, 386
  prose style of, 490, 503 *sq.*, 507 *sq.*
  vocabulary of, 504 *sq.*, 511 *sq.*
  intellectual interests of, 384, 525 *sq.*
  attitude of, to the theatre, 531 *sq.*
  will of, 576 *sq.*
Bacon and Shakespeare, 8 *n.*, 11 *n.*
Bacon is Shakespeare, 3
Bacon-Shakespeare Question, The, vii
Bacon-Shakespeare Question Answered, The, 566*n.*, 586*n*
Baconian Mint, The, 272, 276
Baconian Theory, the, 1 *sq.*, 6, 7, 9, 10
  advocated by Mr. Donnelly, 5 *sq.*
    Dr. Theobald, v, 5, 94, 201 *sq.*, 253 *sq.*, 376
    Wm. Theobald, 218 *sq.*
    Sir E. Durning-Lawrence, 3–5
    Mr. Castle, with qualifications, 127 *sq.*
    Delia Bacon, 11 *n.*
    W. H. Smith, 11 *n.*
    Mark Twain, 12–14
  not accepted by Mr. Greenwood, 38
  extension of, beyond Shakespeare, 5
  motived by "orthodox" doctrine, 6
  never accepted by a trained English scholar, 8
  insanities of, 221, 382 *sq.*, 509, 528, 536, 545, 584
  its defiance of Bacon's precepts, 583
  doubly idolatrous, 593

Baconians, attitude of, 9, 221, 534, 536, 594
  Bacon's precepts trodden under foot by, 583 *sq.*
Bale, cited, 85 *n.*; vocabulary of, 262
Baluffe, A., cited, 30 *n.*
Balzac, culture and performance of, 589 *sq.*
Bancroft, T., eulogy of Shakespeare by, 21
Banquet of Jests, A, 20
Barnes, Barnabe, "legal" sonnets by, 88 *sq.*
Bartholomew, 206
Bayley, Harold, on word-creation, 265 *n.*
  on Judge Stotsenburg, 592
Baynes, Prof., 182
Beaumont, 97
  and Fletcher, use of "purchase" by, 99 *sq.*
    legal phraseology of, ch. iii, *passim*
    echo Shakespeare, 396
    rivalled Shakespeare in plot-making, 544
Beeching, Canon, xii, 580 *n.*
Bees, described by Shakespeare, Elyot, Lilly, and others, 204 *sq.*
Bentley, on the "gardens of Adonis," 184 *sq.*
Berni, 249
Bible, translation of, ascribed to Bacon, 5
  Shakespeare's alleged knowledge of, 68, 145
Biography, lack of, in Shakespeare's age, 24 *sq.*
Blackstone, 208
Blind Beggar of Alexandria, The, legal matter in, 168
Bompas, G. C., on Shakespeare's vocabulary, 517 *n.*, 520–1 *n.*
  miscarriages, of, 521 *n.*, 558 *n.*
  on Bacon's use of law terms, 525 *n.*
Brandes, G., 249 *sq.*, 251
Burns, culture of, 556
Breton, N., 104
Browne, Sir T., prose of, 508
Browning, prose and verse of, 484
Burbage, Richard, 586 *n.*
Burton's *Anatomy*, ascribed to Bacon, 401
Butler, J. D., 184
Byron, prose and verse of, 484

Cæsar, on vocabulary, 259
Camden, on Spenser's funeral, 15
Campbell, Lord Chief Justice, on Shakespeare's legal acquirements, 35 *sq.*
  inconsistencies of, 37, 156, 157 *sq.*
Carlyle, on Emerson, etc., 17
Carter, Rev. T., cited, 145 *sq.*
Castle, E. J., on Shakespeare's legal knowledge, 36–37, 127 *sq.*
  on law in *Macbeth*, 39; in *Titus*, 173
  theory of, as to "legal" and "non-legal" plays, 127
  on Lord Campbell, 127–8
  uninformed as to Elizabethan literature, 128
  blunder of, as to use of "colour," 128 *sq.*
  blunder of, as to name "Escalus," 134
  follows Mr. Donnelly, 138 *sq.*
Catullus, Shakespeare's alleged knowledge of, 208, 214
Centurie of Prayse, 22
Cervantes, 30
Chaucer, 19, 26, 102, 260
  prose and verse of, 486 *sq.*
  scholarship of, 486
Cheke, Sir John, on neologism, 258
  influence of, 262
Chambers' Journal, art. in, on the authorship of the plays, 11 *n.*
Chapman, 20
  legal allusions by, 40, 76, 78 (ch. iii, *passim*), 168
  use of "purchase" by, 111
  use of legal maxims by, 40, 119
  on legal delays, 141
  on law courts, 145
  use of forms of trial by, 153
  imitates Shakespeare, 394
  imitations by, 389
  word formations by, 266 *n.*
Chloris, 91
Cicero, 203
Ciphers, Baconian, 2, 3, 536
Clarke, Mr. and Mrs. Cowden, 201
Cœlia, 91
Coincidences of phrase, alleged, between Bacon and Shakespeare, 376 *sq.*, 433 *sq.*
Cokaine, Sir Aston, on Shakespeare, 21

Coleridge, echoes Davies, 392
prose and verse of, 484
effect of biography of, 538
Collier, J. P., 36 *sq.*
Collins, J. Churton, on classical knowledge in the plays, ix *sq.*, 34, 179 *sq.*, 182, 190
on Farmer, 194
on MS. translations of classics, 195
on law terms in *Titus*, 39, 171
Colman, 223
Comedy of Errors, legal phraseology in, 46
composite authorship of, 197 *sq.*, 485
Contention of . . . York and Lancaster, 73
Copernicus, doctrine of, rejected by Bacon, 5 *n.*, 529
Coriolanus, legal phraseology in, 84, 122
sources of, 191 *n.*
alleged classical learning in, 192
Cornelius Agrippa, 208
Cornish, 181 *n.*
Cowley, allusion to Shakespeare by, 20
Craik, Prof., on *Julius Cæsar*, 191 *n.*
Crawford, C., on the Bacon-Shakespeare Question, vii, 7, 276, 380, 433
on authorship of *Arden of Feversham*, 575
Creighton, Dr., on Shakespeare and Barnes, 89 *n.*
Cryptogram, Mr. Donnelly's, 2
Cunningham, Peter, vindicated, 584–5

Daniel, echoed by Shakespeare, 280, 389
Johnson on, 561
will of, 577
Dante, prose and verse of, 484
Davenant, Sir W., his Ode to Shakespeare, 21
Davies, Sir John, "gulling sonnets" by, 93
echoed by Shakespeare, 189
poetry of, 523
on Queen Elizabeth, 592
Davis, Senator Cushman, on law in Shakespeare, 121 *sq.*, 174
on Jonson's law, 123
De Civitate Dei, The, Shakespeare's alleged use of, 203 *sq.*
De Proprietatibus Rerum, 206
Dekker, scanty details as to life of, 23–4
imprisonment of, 64
legal phraseology in, ch. iii *passim*
use of "purchase" by, 109
use of forms of trial by, 154
echoes Shakespeare, 395, 398
wrote prologue to *Troilus*?, 400
share in pre-Shakespearean *Troilus*, 573
Delia, 91
Demblon, Prof. C., his thesis of Lord Rutland's authorship of the Plays, 585 *sq.*
his treatment of facts, 588
on the possibility of a great uncultured poet, 589
Devecmon, on law in Shakespeare, 60, 157, 162, 174
on law in Webster, 157, 171
Devil's Law Case, The, 50, 61–2, 157 *sq.*, 173
Diana, 91
Dickens, 17, 556
Digges, Leonard, his eulogy of Shakespeare, 20–22
Dogberry and Verges, 52
Donne and Ben Jonson, 560, 561
Donnelly, I., theories of, 2, 16, 183 *sq.*
on Bacon-Shakespeare parallels, 376, 401 *sq.*
scholarship of, 183
on Bacon and Montaigne, 388
ascribes Burton's *Anatomy* to Bacon, 401
Double-endings in Shakespeare's plays, 198
Drake, scanty details as to life of, 26
Drayton, his lines to Shakespeare, 20, 22
his knowledge of Shakespeare, 22
legal phraseology in sonnets of, 92
influence of, on Shakespeare's sonnets, 92
description of a trial by, 145
echoes Spenser, 392
Drummond and Ben Jonson, 17, 20, 559

Dryden, prose and verse of, 484
Dugdale, Shakespeare monument shown by, ix
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin, Baconian arguments of, v, 3, 4, 5, 14

Economics of Genius, the, 551
Edward III. echoed by Shakespeare, 390
Edward IV. Pt. II. legal phraseology in, 144
"Eitherside, Serjeant," 38, 115
Elegies, Elizabethan, 17 *n.*
Elizabeth, Queen, Sir John Davies on, 592
Elyot, Sir T., on country sessions, 149
  on civil polity and that of the bees, 204 *sq.*
  on study of languages, 262
Elze, on Shakespeare's vocabulary, 517–8 *n.*
Emerson, on Shakespeare's life, 539
Enchiridion militis Christiani, 181
Epitaph, Shakespeare's, by Basse, 20
  Mrs. Hall's, 29
Erasmus, classical matter in *Enchiridion* of, 181–2
Errors common to Bacon and Shakespeare, 244
"Escalus," Mr. Castle's theory as to, 134
Essex, trial of, 32
Euphuism, 41, 91

Faerie Queene, legal matter in, 152
Farmer, Dr., on the learning of Shakespeare, 182, 192, 194, 222
  high qualifications of, viii
  on Shakespeare's abstention from publication, 540
Favorinus, on vocabulary, 260
Fees payable by prisoners, 64 *sq.*
Feltham, Owen, praise of Shakespeare by, 21
Fidessa, 91, 93
Fiske, Prof., 182
Fleay, F. G., on *Julius Cæsar*, 191 *n.*
  on Shakespeare's company, 571
  on authorship of *Arden of Feversham*, 575
Florio, 5, 16 *n.*
Flowers, allusion to, in the minor dramatists, 531 *n.*
Folio (1623), references to, 20, 220, 540, 545, 559
Fortescue, Sir John, cited, 56
Four Elements, The, 181
Fournier, E., cited, 29 *n.*, 30 *n.*
Foxe, 48
Furnivall, Dr., 220

Gascoigne, George, "legal" sonnet by, 88 *n.*
  comedy of *Supposes* translated by, 223
Genius, literary, assumptions and misconceptions as to, 538 *sq.*
  and culture, 550 *sq.*
George-a-Greene, 125
Gifford, on Marston's family, 561–2
Gloster, story of Duke of, 138
Goethe, prose and verse of, 485
"Golden Hind, The," 26
Gosson, 61
Greene, scanty details as to life of, 23
  development of, 557
  share of in *Titus*, 35, 399
  resort of to legal phraseology, 41, ch. iii, *passim*, 150 *sq.*, 155
  use of "purchase" by, 105
  anecdote of, 125
  plagiarised from Thynne, 151
  hostile to Shakespeare, 219, 543
  on neologism, 258
  imitations by, 389
Greenwood, G. G., positions of, xi, 9, 14, 15 *sq.*, 18, 157 *sq.*
  his imaginary playwright, 547, 553 *n.*, 559, 568
  on Shakespeare's death, 16, 17
  on allusions to Shakespeare, 19, 39
  on Shakespeare's knowledge of law, 34, 35
  use of Lord Campbell's thesis by, 35, 38, 60, 161, 171 *sq.*, 176
  his position negative, 34, 559
  on legal allusions in *Titus*, 39, 65, 171, 173
  follows Grant White as to "purchase," 99
  argument of, as to law in Webster, 157 *sq.*, 161 *sq.*, 171 *sq.*

Greenwood, G. G., on the law in Adams' sermons, 170
argument of, as to proofs of Shakespeare's legal knowledge, 171 *sq.*, 176
follows Lord Penzance, 173
blames Mr. Devecmon in error, 174
recognises alien elements in the Plays, 183
his theory of Shakespeare's "culture," 192 *sq.*, 550 *sq.*
its exiguous basis, 193
misconceptions of the author by, 195–6, 199 *sq.*
faced by problem of compositeness of plays, 542–3
on genius and culture, 550 *sq.*, 556 *sq.*
obtrudes the "university fallacy," 556
on the testimony of Jonson, 559 *sq.*, 564 *sq.*
misinterprets it, 562
rejects Baconian theory, 38
but gives excuse for calling him a Baconian, 566
on "The Silence of Philip Henslowe," 569
use of Judge Stotsenburg's argument by, 573
treatment of Heywood's testimony by, 574
on authorship of *Arden of Feversham*, 575
on Shakespeare's signatures, 577 *sq.*
on the education of Milton's and Shakespeare's daughters, 581
holds that the Plays were written to convey instruction to the people, 590
recognises their composite character, 593
Griffin, B., sonnets by, 93
Grosart, Rev. Dr., on Daniel, 577 *n.*
Grote, on Athenian drama and Dikasteries, 553 *n.*

Habington, W., alludes to Shakespeare, 21
Hales, of Eton, praises Shakespeare, 21
Prof., on Spenser's life, 26
Sir James, 78
Hales *v.* Petit, 78, 176
Hall, H., on Elizabethan litigiousness, 44, 143
Mrs. Susanna, 28; epitaph of, 28–29
Hallam, on neologism in Shakespeare, 253 *sq.*
Halliwell-Phillipps, on Stratford-on-Avon, 28
on the learning of Shakespeare, 183
Halpin, Rev. N. J., 558 *n.*
Hamlet, authorship of, 32, 399
legal allusions in, 63, 77 *sq.*, 121
Handwriting, literary men's, 580
Hannibal, Missouri, 23
Hannibal, name used for Cannibal, 236
Hawthorne, on Delia Bacon's theory, 11 *n.*
Heine, prose and verse of, 485
Henry IV (1), legal allusions in, 69 *sq.*
wholly Shakespearean, 200
Henry V. alleged classical learning in, 203 *sq.*
prologues to, non-Shakespearean, 400
Henry VI (1), authorship of, 135, 183, 201
(2) legal phraseology in, 73 *sq.*, 122, 136
Henry VIII, 48
legal phraseology in, 48
authorship of, 118 *n.*
Henslowe, 25, 569 *sq.*
Shakespeare's relations with, 570 *sq.*
Heresy, the word, 1
Herring, The Praise of the, 4, 5
Heywood, John, vocabulary of, 263
Thomas, his allusions to Shakespeare, 21, 22
legal phrases in his plays, ch. iii. *passim.*
use of "purchase" by, 107 *sq.*
use of legal maxims by, 119
scanty details of life of, 23, 24, 40
echoes Shakespeare, 395
his relations with Shakespeare, 574
Historie of Error, The, 197
Holland, Hugh, his eulogy of Shakespeare, 20

Holmes, Judge N. and the "American School," 11 *n.*
positions of, 377
cited, 12 *n.*
Hooker, 263, 509, 525
Hooper, Bishop, legalisms of, 70, 169–70
prose of, 489
Hopkins, version of Psalms by, 111 *n.*
Horace, Shakespeare's alleged knowledge of, 193, 207
Tudor translations of, 208
Hughes, C. E., 22
Hugo, prose and verse of, 485
Hunt, Leigh, on Shakespeare's scholarship, 201–2
Hutchinson, Roger, 103
on lawsuits, 141

Idea, 91, 92
Idolatry of Shakespeare, 1, 32, 538 *sq.*, 549 *sq.*, 593
If You Know not Me, &c., scenes in, 142–4
Imitation, poetic, 388 *sq.*
Impresa, the Rutland, 586
In re Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements, 157
Indictments, legal, in stage trials, 65 *sq.*
Ingleby, Dr., his *Centurie of Prayse*, 22
cited, 558 *n.*
on portraits of Shakespeare and Spenser, 569
Is Shakespeare Dead? 12

Jaggard, W., cited, 36 *n.*
Jaggard, the Elizabethan publisher, 574
James, King, 81
Jeronymo, 25
Johnson, Dr., effect of biography of, 538
Jonson, Ben, and Bacon's "secret," 2, 566
scanty details as to life of, 23, 25
on Shakespeare, 20, 22, 27–28, 34, 559, 562
on Spenser's death, 15
conversations of, with Drummond, 17, 20, 559
temperament of, 18, 560
Mark Twain on, 19
Jonson, Ben, his knowledge of Shakespeare, 22, 27–28, 219, 560, 561
critical inconsistencies of, 564
on Shakespeare's classical knowledge, 34, 563, 565
on the "gardens of Adonis," 188
use of legal phraseology by, ch. iii, *passim*, 115 *sq.*, 123 *sq.*, 152 *sq.*
use of "purchase" by, 106
legal maxims by, 119
forms of trial by, 152 *sq.*, 165 *sq.*
imprisonment of, 64
parallels between Bacon and, 381, 434, 437 *sq.*
imitates Shakespeare, 377–8
prose and verse of, 486, 489
culture of: its effect on his art, 557
and Donne, 560, 561
on Daniel and Marston, 561
Catalogus Scriptorum of, 565
His Ode on Bacon's Birthday, 566 *sq.*
Repetition of phrases by, 565–7
Jonsonus Virbius, 21
Judges, choleric, in Tudor times, 84–5
wicked, in Tudor and Stuart drama, 135
record of, on the Baconian question, 591
Julius Cæsar, originals and sources of, 190 *sq.*, 392 *n.*, 573

Keats, prose and verse of, 484
effect of biography of, 538
culture of, 551 *sq.*, 556
Kenyon, Lord, "legal" verses by, 87
King John, legal phraseology in, 67 *sq.*
King, Edward, on English vocabulary, 259
Knight, Charles, on learning of Shakespeare, 190, 203
Kyd, scanty details as to life of, 23, 25
author of the first *Hamlet*, 399
possible share of in *Titus*, 35
alluded to by Nashe, 38
use of "purchase" by, 105
author of *Arden of Feversham*, 575

LAMB, Charles, 7
Lang, A., viii *sq.*, 569 *n.*
handwriting of, 580
Langland, 56, 103
Latimer, 103, 263
on lawsuits, 142
on kinds of sessions, 148
Latinisms in, 261
Latin elements in English, 255 *sq.*
Laughton, Prof., on Drake, 26
Laura, 91
Law, Ernest, on Peter Cunningham, 585
Law, Shakespeare's alleged knowledge of, x, 13, 31 *sq.* 96 *sq.*, 117 *sq.*
general proclivity to, in Shakespeare's age, 44
courts much resorted to, 145
Lawsuits, duration of, 71 *sq.*
Lawyers, and clients, 44–45, 62–63
incompetent pronouncements by, on law in Shakespeare, 94
Lear, legal phraseology in, 75 *sq.*
Lee, Sir Sidney, 88, 572 *n.*, 579
Leir, pre-Shakespearean play on, 573
Leopardi, prose and verse of, 485
Licia, 91
Lilly, scanty details as to life of, 24
legal phraseology of, ch. iii, *passim*, 114 *sq.*
use of "purchase" by, 105
Litigation and Legalism in Elizabethan England, 140 *sq.*
Looking-Glass for London, A, trial scene in, 155
Love-philtres, 246
Lover's Complaint, A, 16 *n.*
Love's Labour's Lost, legal phraseology in, 52
Love's Labour's Won, 200
Lowell, 179
Luce, Morton, on Shakespeare's vocabulary, 518 *n.*
Lumley, Lady, version of Euripides by, 196

MACAULAY, G. C., cited, vii
Macbeth, "law" in, 39, 80
alien elements in, 546
MacCallum, Prof., on Shakespeare's Roman plays, 191, 391
Machiavelli, Bacon and, 529
McKerrow, 388
Maginn, Dr., 182
Magnetic Lady, The, legal matter in, 165 *sq.*
Malone, on Shakespeare's law, 34
on authorship of 1 *Henry VI*, 135
cited, 208
Mark Twain, attitude of, to the problem, v, 10, 12 *sq.*
followed Mr. Greenwood, 14, 19, 34
ill-informed as to details, 18, 20, 22, 23
ignorant as to Elizabethan life, 23
his case summarised, 13
his adoption of the legalist case, 31 *sq.*, 176
Marlowe, plays of, ascribed to Bacon, 5, 377
use of "purchase" by, 105
probable author of 1 *Henry VI*, 189
scholarship of, 189
echoed by Shakespeare, 208, 389
echoes Spenser, 389
Marsh on Shakespeare's vocabulary, 517 *n.*
Marston, imprisonment of, 64
family connections of, 561
Jonson and, 560
vies with Shakespeare, 391
Martin, Sir T., on the culture of Dickens, 556
Massinger, legal phraseology in, 54, ch. iii, *passim*, 112 *sq.*
use of "purchase" by, 110
use of legal maxims by, 119 *sq.*, 121
trial scenes in, 155
Maxims, legal, in Shakespeare and Bacon, 40, 119 *sq.*, 144
Measure for Measure, legal phraseology in, 44 *sq.*, 133
plot of, 134
Meier, Dr. K., 562 *sq.*
Merchant of Venice, The, legal forms and phraseology in, 55–61, 123, 161, 173
wholly Shakespearean, 200
Merry Wives of Windsor, legal phraseology in, 40 *sq.*
Middleton, legal procedure in, 156
Milton on Shakespeare, 20, 22, 202
on the "gardens of Adonis," 185 *sq.*

Milton, imitates Sylvester, 392
  prose and verse of, 484
  vocabulary of, 518 *n.*
  effect of biography of, 538
  education of daughters of, 581
Molière, prejudice of pietists against, 29 *n.*
  scanty biographical details of, 30
Montaigne, Florio's translation, Shakespeare's use of, 190, 207, 396
  imitated by Bacon, 388
More, Sir T., vocabulary of, 261
Morgan, Appleton, on styles of Shakespeare and Bacon, 483 *n.*
  on *Venus and Adonis*, 553
Much Ado About Nothing, legal phraseology in, 52 *sq.*
Müller, Max, on Shakespeare's vocabulary, 517 *n.*

NASHE, cited, 4, 5
  doctrine of Copernicus rejected by, 5 *n.*
  scanty details of life of, 23
  Epistle to Greene's *Menaphon*, 38
  legal phraseology in, ch. iii, *passim*
  use of "purchase" by, 109
  knowledge of law courts shown by, 135
  on lawyers and statutes, 137
  on English litigiousness, 140
  use of forms of trial by, 150
  plagiarisms by, 388
  prose of, 487
Neologisms, Elizabethan, 91, 258
  alleged, in Shakespeare, 253 *sq.*
Nero, 396
New English Dictionary, The, 265, 438–9
North's Plutarch, 191–2
Northbrooke, 182
Nosce Teipsum, 189

"ORTHODOX" errors, 9, 10, 538*sq.*, 549 *sq.*, 584
Othello, legal phraseology in, 81 *sq.*
Ovid, Bacon's and Shakespeare's use of, 530, 531
Oxford Dictionary, the, 265, 438–9

Palladis Tamia: Wit's Treasury, 5
Pattison, Mark, on Milton's conduct as a father, 481
Pecock, 257
Peele, our lack of knowledge of, 23
  share of in *Titus*, 35, 216, 399
  use of "purchase" by, 105
  use of forms of trial by, 152
  translation from Euripides by, 196
  imitations by, 389
  culture and dramatic work of, 557
Penzance, Lord, 35, 95, 173, 381
  on classical knowledge in the plays, 183 *sq.*, 190 *sq.*
  on coincidences between Bacon and Shakespeare, 380 *sq.*
Persius, 207
Phillis, 91
Plagiarism in Elizabethan period, 388, 436
Plato, supposed knowledge of by Shakespeare, x *sq.*, 184 *sq.*, 189 *sq.*, 202, 203 *sq.* 529
Playmaking, supposed by "anti-Stratfordians" to require no training, 553 *n.*, 590
Plays, sale of, by theatrical companies, 540
Pliny, on "gardens of Adonis," 187
Plowden, 78 *sq.*
  Bacon and, 529
Poe, echoes Mrs. Browning, 392
  prose and verse of, 485
Polimanteia, 558 *n.*
Pollard, A. W., on authorised and unauthorised quartos, 540 *sq.*
Pott, Mrs., 381, 521 *n.*
Promus of Formularies and Elegances, 381, 436
Prose, Shakespeare's and Bacon's, 483 *sq.*
Proverbs, currency of, 179

RALEIGH, 25, 171
Ramsay, H., his praise of Shakespeare, 21[illegible]
Ramus, 5 *n.*
Rape of Lucrece, The, legal phraseology in, 87
Rawley, Dr., his account of Bacon, 23
Renan, on Shakespeare's vocabulary, 517 *n*

Rhythm, magic of, 503
Richard II, played for the Essex conspirators, 535
Richard III, composite authorship of, 198 *n.*
Rhymes, vicious, used by Spenser, Peele, and Chapman, 557
Rolle, Richard, 487
Romeo and Juliet, legal phraseology in, 85 *sq.*
Rowley and Dekker, 121
Rutland, Lord, Shakespeare's plays ascribed to, 585 *sq.*
Rushton, W. L., on law in Shakespeare, 40, 117 *sq.*
  copied by Lord Campbell, 36 *n.*
  on Lord Campbell's mistakes, 117
  on Shakespeare's Euphuism, 117
"Rustic, the Stratford," 550 *sq.*

Scot, Reginald, will of, 578 *n.*
Scott, effect of biography of, 538
Shakespeare, Anne, 575 *sq.*
Shakespeare, John, litigiousness of, 145 *sq.*
  a Puritan recusant ?, 145–8
  supposed impecuniosity of, 146–7
Shakespeare, John, of London, 586 *n.*
Shakespeare a Lawyer, 36 *n.*
Shakespeare, Bacon, Jonson, and Greene, 36
Shakespeare Folios and Quartos, 540
Shakespeare Forgeries, Some Supposed, 585
Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements Considered, 36 *sq.*
Shakespeare Problem Re-Stated, The, 34
Shakespeare, Puritan and Recusant, 146
Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light, 201 *sq.*, 253 *sq.*, 377, 433 *sq.*, 585
Shakespeare Symphony, The, 265 *n.*, 590–1
Shakespeare, boyhood of, 147, 552
  bust of, ix, 10
  portraits of, 569
  allusions to, contemporary and later, 20–21
  schooling of, 552 *sq.*
Shakespeare, corrupt passages in 3, 4
  alleged knowledge of law in, ix, 13, 31 *sq.*, 147 *sq.*, 175 *sq.* (*See* Campbell, Castle, Devecmon, Rushton, and Greenwood)
  alleged classical learning shown by, ix, 20–21, 22, 34, 178 *sq.*, 192 *sq.*, 216, 253 *sq.*
  death and funeral of, 16, 17
  epitaph of, 18
  alleged knowledge of the Bible, 68, 145
    of Italian, 249 *sq.*
  biography of, 26
  and Lord Southampton, 558
  Roman plays of, 190
  general culture of, 192 *sq.*, 554
  early work of, 199
  doubtful plays of, 210 *n.*
  alleged large vocabulary of, 265 *n.*, 511 *sq.*, 517
  actual vocabulary of, 266 *n.*, 504 *sq.*, 511 *sq.*
  imitations of and by, 389 *sq.*
  prose and verse of, 483 *sq.*
  the genius of blank verse, 503, 557
  inspired phrasing of, 522
  moral attitude of, 530
  non-religious outlook of, 521
  avowals of, in the Sonnets, 535
  could not gain from biography, 538
  inaction of, as to publishing his plays, 539 *sq.*
  not given to proof-reading, 541
  composite character of many plays of, 542 *sq.*, 546 *sq.*
  produced plays on business lines, 543
  temperament of, contrasted with Bacon's, 547–8
  not a studious naturalist, 549
  special culture of, 553
  knew Ovid chiefly in translation, 554
  culture opportunities open to, 554, 556
  avoided vicious rhymes, 557
  and Jonson, 560
  unblotted manuscripts of, 562–4
  actor-partners of, 568

Shakespeare, relations of, with Henslowe, 570 *sq.*
will of, 575 *sq.*
signatures and script of, 578 *sq.*
and his daughters' education, 581
was he a hard creditor ?, 582
sonnets of, ascribed to Sidney, 592
Shelley, effect of biography of, 538
Shick, Prof., 25 *n.*
Sidney, elegies on, 17 *n.*
sonnets of, 91
echoed by Shakespeare ?, 390, 396
poetry of, 523
culture of, 554
Sir John Oldcastle, "law" in, 125 *sq.*
Smith, Mr. Pearsall, on Shakespeare's vocabulary, 266 *n.*
Society in the Elizabethan Age, 44
Sonnets, Shakespeare's, 29, 535
legal phraseology in, 87
written by an actor, 535
Elizabethan, legal phraseology in, 88 *sq.*
imitativeness of, 91
Soulié, cited, 30 *n.*
Southampton, Lord, 89, 558
Spanish Tragedy, The, 25 *n.*
Spencer, H., 7
Spenser, Baconian claim as to, 5
death and funeral of, 15, 16, 17
scanty details as to life of, 23, 25, 26
elegy of, on Sidney (*Astrophel*), 17 *n.*
use of "purchase" by, 104
use of form of trial by, 152
on the "gardens of Adonis," 184 *sq.*, 188
vocabulary of, 260
imitates Chaucer, 392
repeats his tropes, 392
portraits of, 569
need for annotated edition of, viii
Stapfer, 202 *n.*
Steevens, 34, 53
Stevenson, on Shakespeare's unblotted manuscript, 564
Stonyhurst's Virgil, 194
Stopes, Mrs. C. C., 566 *n.*, 586 *n.*
Stotsenburg, Judge, 572 *sq.*, 591
Stratford-on-Avon, 20, 28
Shakespeare's life at, 23
lack of Shakespeare *cult* at, 27
Puritanism in, 28
illiteracy in, 23
law-courts at, 145
Stubbes, Philip, legal phraseology in, 48, and ch. iii, *passim*
Suckling, praise of Shakespeare by, 21
Supposes, 223
Sylva Sylvarum, vocabulary of, 520, 521
matter of, 384
Symonds, J. A., cited, 24, 25 *n.*

Taming of the Shrew, legal phraseology in, 61 *sq.*
authorship of, 201, 399
Taming of a Shrew, 573
Tartuffe, 29 *n.*
Taylor, Jeremy, prose of, 508
Taylor, the "Water Poet" cited, 20, 387
Farmer on classical matter in, 194
evidence of, as to Bacon's view of the theatre, 533
culture of, 555
Ten Brink on Chaucer, 486
Tennyson, 17
prose and verse of, 484
Terms (seasons), legal, 72
Terrent, J., praise of Shakespeare by, 21
Theatre in Tudor times, 29
Theobald, Lewis, 182, 192, 202 *n.*, 204
Theobald, Dr. R. M., v, 5, 94
on "law" in Shakespeare's Sonnets, 94
on the classical scholarship of the plays, 201 *sq.*, 253 *sq.*
follows Mr. Donnelly, 202, 376
his list of "coined" words, 253 *sq.*
attempted reply to Judge Willis by, 272, 274
argument of, on "cumulative" force of instances, 377 *sq.*
on Bacon's treatment of love, 547
intellectual processes of, 585
Theobald, W., on *Classical Element in Shakespeare's Plays*, 218 *sq.*