THE SHAKESPEARE MONUMENT.

BY THE EDITOR.

SOME time ago the Shakespeare problem was treated in an editorial (Open Court XVIII. 65), which collected all the best known contemporary documents positively or possibly referring to Shakespeare, the poet. In summing up the evidence the editor of the Open Court came to the conclusion that there was no proof for the identity of William Shaksper, the owner of New Place at Stratford, and the playwright who always spelled his name “Shakespere,” or even hyphenated it as if with the purpose of showing the new spelling of the name “Shake-sphere.” The proposition was made that the connecting link between the two has been established by the Shakespeare monument, erected in Stratford soon after the death of the poet. There are reasons to doubt the identity of the two persons, although there is no evidence to show that the famous dramas were written by either Bacon or any other person except one called William Shakespere, for the poet William Shakespeare was known to Ben Jonson, Robert Greene, Chettle, and others.

We are now in receipt of a book entitled The Life of William Shakespeare Expurgated (Boston: W. A. Butterfield) by William Leavitt Stoddard, a graduate of Harvard. He informs us that for some time he doubted whether he should call his book “Expurgated” or “Unexpurgated,” and as a matter of fact neither title wholly expresses the author’s intention. He means to state the facts, nothing more, nothing less, and his book consists of an enumeration of data referring to William Shakespeare, whoever that may be, and he comes to the conclusion that there is no evidence as to the identity of the poet with any Shakespeare mentioned in the documents or in allusions by contemporaries. He finds the connecting link in the first folio, which refers to the Stratford monument, and then he adds that “the first folio did not supply absolutely the first link,” for the first link was actually the monument built into
the wall of the Stratford church in memory of William Shakespeare.

Mr. Stoddard is apparently unacquainted with the *Open Court* article on the subject, otherwise he might have utilized it and added some of the materials to his collection of documents, which are pretty well arranged but not quite complete.

There is one point of great interest in this book which is new to us and has not yet been noticed by Shakespeare scholars. It is the fact that the Stratford monument now standing is not the
original one, for there exists an engraving of the original Shakespeare monument which was made for a certain Sir William Dugdale, presumably in the year 1636. This engraving "represents quite a different looking Shakespeare from the familiar portrait, picturing as it does a man with a thin face, full beard, melancholy down drooping mustache. The design of the monument also is unlike the present one". With the author's permission we here reproduce the Dugdale engraving of the Shakespeare monument in evidence of the difference between the two. The inscription is not legible on the reproduction, except the first two words, "Judicio Pylium," but these are sufficient for Mr. Stoddard to accept the conclusion that the present inscription is the same as that on the original monument.

Mr. Stoddard also adds a reproduction of a fly-leaf from a book in handwriting, called the "Northumberland Manuscript". According to the table of contents this must have contained some essays by Francis Bacon, speeches written by him and spoken in a "Device" played before Queen Elizabeth, and also two dramas entitled "Richard II" and "Richard III". That the latter are Shakespeare's plays appears from the fly-leaf reproduced by Mr. Stoddard, which contains much senseless scribbling and shows that the author's imagination was engaged with both Bacon and Shakespeare. William Shakespeare's name appears repeatedly, as does also that of Francis Bacon. In addition there are misquotations from Shakespeare's "Rape of Lucrece", a few scraps of Latin poetry and the mysterious word combination "honorificabiletudine".

Mr. Stoddard's book is interesting in so far as it is a collection of facts. It proposes a problem but does not solve it. Unfortunately the author deemed the spelling of names irrelevant, and so he proposed to spell the names of Shakespeare always in the same way as the poet spelled his name. We would also add that instead of simply referring to such documents as church entries, it would have been better to reproduce literally the entry itself. A few omitted references, especially some by Ben Jonson, might easily be added and would not have greatly swelled the contents of the book. Owing to the scarcity of positive material it is not so voluminous as many lives of Shakespeare in which our deficient information is supplied by the fertile imagination of their authors.