THE UTICA CONVENTION.

The Probabilities as to the Action of the Republicans Next Wednesday.

GOVERNOR DIX UNOPPOSED.

Rumors as to the Fate of the Present Lieutenant Governor.

Possibility That the Ticket of 1872 Will Be Renominated in Its Entirety.

Position of the Custom House Party.

UTICA, Sept. 19, 1874.

Although the Republican Convention will not be held here until Wednesday next there are in town already a number of delegates from the rural regions and gentlemen from the "canal districts" who are not delegates, but who will have a great deal to say as advisers to some of the members of the Convention when it shall have begun its patriotic operations. However, none of the grand masters of the party have as yet put in an appearance, but it is rumored that A. B. Cornell, Chester Arthur, Tom Murphy and George H. Sharpe will arrive to-morrow for the special purpose, doubtless, of spending the entire Sabbath in religious exercises, which will have less to do with the unraveling of Gospel truths than to the fixing of plans and plots for the Convention's benefit and consideration. General Husted, the Speaker of the Assembly, so a despatch sent to a gentleman here says, will also be up to-morrow. It states that he started from New York to-day with

GOVERNOR DIX,

who is on his way to Albany, where he and Mr. Husted are to have a private talk. This reference to a consultation between them is, however, mere speculation, but as Mr. Husted is on the list of candidates for the Lieutenant Governorship it may be a little more than a coincidence, if the despatch speaks truly, that the Governor left West Hampton just in time to be on the same train with the Speaker. It is yet too early even to conjecture as to just exactly what the ticket of the Convention will be; but one thing that is now as certain as anything can be is, that it will renominate the Governor. A few weeks ago there was, it will be remembered, no small amount of trepidation among some of General Dix's friends at the rumors and even more than rumors, that flew thick and fast in political circles as to the intentions of some of the republican leaders; but now there does not seem to be the slightest chance of anybody being even mentioned in the Convention as a candidate against the General. The little job that was set on foot a month ago in which Mr. Fenton was fixed upon as the chief cook and administration bottle washer is now pooh-poohed here by one of the very men who was credited with having been the first person to suggest the manner by which the job could be made successful by the time the Convention met. The complexion of the delegates selected day before yesterday

THE NEW YORK REPUBLICANS

show that the Custom House, which was in dead earnest in its underhand opposition to General Dix's renomination a month ago, has been able to get absolute control of almost every district; but its opposition to the Governor was knocked out of it for good over a fortnight ago, and so it matters very little now, in those opinion of those country republicans, who have all along been in favor of the renomination idea, whether the delegation from New York comes here under the name of Custom House or Anti-Custom House. Indeed, I may go so far as to state that, as matters have been arranged thus far, the renomination will be proposed by a New Yorker, and that the vote of the delegates from your city will be cast solid for Dix, without any apparent reluctance. A gentleman from the extreme western part of the State, who is a power in his party is now here, with his headquarters at Bagg's, has all his ground wires laid and his batteries prepared for the furtherance of the designs upon the Lieutenant Governorship of a friend of his. General Batchellor, of Saratoga, tells me that the New York men will be the very first to work against

OPPOSITION TO DIX,

were it to be shown by any number of the country delegates. Of opposition to him coming from any rural member of the Convention of any prominence there is but little fear; still I heard it rumored to-day, on pretty good authority, that Senator Woodin intended to get up a fight against the Governor; but a gentleman from Auburn states that the rumor has no foundation for truth whatever. Even if Mr. Woodin ever had any notion of opposing Dix, the fact of a strong Custom House delegation coming from New York would be enough to turn him into the right track; for he had a close shave of it in his district last year, and but for the timely aid of the Custom House influence he would have been elected to stay at home. Senator Conkling has now too, I hear, given up all idea of defeating Dix, and will use his "powers of organization" to have the renomination made by acclamation. And yet right here I may add that there are a few republicans whom I have spoken to on the subject and who are known to be strong supporters of Senator Conkling, who suspect that Cornell may be sprung upon the Convention and elected by underhand engineering of certain New Yorkers, who will on the surface appear to be in favor of Dix down to the very moment before the vote is taken.. But this suspicion, I think, does not amount to much. It was the strong feeling of indignation which burst forth in the country districts, on their hearing of the August plottings in the southern portion of the State to kill Dix, which finally compelled the anti-renominationists to

PULL IN THEIR HORNS.

It is not possible, in my opinion, judging from what I have heard from gentlemen to-day who are familiar with the haymow intentions of the republicans in the interior, that the Custom House, even if willing to try its hand once more in the old plot, could win over a sufficient number of rural delegates to defeat the Governor by any promises or any kind of log-rolling in the making up of the ticket; for if the interior counties are so outspoken for Mr. Dix as they are said to be, it is fully certain that the delegates they send will all be too strong for him in convention even to be meddled with. You can set down the old war horse, therefore, as safe for a renomination, without even the formality of a vote by counties.

THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNORSHIP.

By Tuesday next, when the New York delegation will arrive, and possibly a majority of the delegates from the interior will be on hand, there may be some sure indication as to who will be Lieutenant Governor; for if there is to be any contest over any nomination it will be over this one. Judge Robertson and General Batchellor, it is expected by a few, will be the two strongest candidates; but as the former bankers after the Governorship itself, and on Dix getting it will be content to wait, it is believed, till 1876 rather than accept the second place on the ticket this year, he may not be mentioned in the Convention one way or the other. There is unquestionably a strong desire on the part of some strong republicans to get rid of Lieutenant Governor Robinson, and I heard it manifested today in no very courteous language by a well known member of the Legislature, who says if the Custom House party should declare against him the General will run a poor chance of a renomination. In view of the rumored present determination of the Custom House party to support General Dix against all comers the supposition of some of the wiseacres in this county, and elsewhere, too, I learn, is that they have bargained, in consideration of this magnanimity, for the second place of honor on the ticket, and that Mr. Cornell is spoken of as the man who will secure the prize. The idea is that if this should be accomplished Governor Dix could go to the Senate, and that Cornell would then become Governor, and thus everybody be made happy, even Mr. Conkling. This story, however, I give simply for what it is worth. It is one of the

RUMORS OF THE HOUR,

and as such may or may not be worthy of a second thought. I incline to the belief myself that not only will Governor Dix be re-nominated by acclamation, but that the entire ticket which he headed in 1872 will be put up again. This idea, I am informed, has grown into a strong belief in the western part of the State, and as a majority of the present eighteen republican Senators are said to be in favor of it, General Robinson may not, after all, be sacrificed to gratify the whims and fancies of a mere clique, who care less half the time for the success of their party at large than for that of their own little schemes of profit and political notoriety. From all I can hear now, the coming convention will be one of the strongest that has assembled in the State for years. The list of delegates shows this, and if the determination is really arrived at on Wednesday to renominate the entire ticket of 1872—the Associate Judge of the Court of Appeals, of course will be a new place on the ticket—the party will go into the campaign with an undivided strength in every part of the State and with the certainty of winning the day by a handsome majority. Yet, as I said before, there may be a hitch in the machinery of the wire-pullers not now discernible that may do mischief on Wednesday, at least so far as one of the places on the ticket is concerned, and if there is there may be trouble for a part of the ticket in November. In conclusion, I will add that the republicans hereabouts and the political visitors to the Convention, whom I have elsewhere alluded, look upon

TILDEN'S NOMINATION

as a very weak one. Said one of them:—"It is such a weak one that I think we could now put up an out-and-out republican and elect him." This remark was meant to convey the idea, I dare say, that Dix was not "an out-and-out republican," and that while there was a chance of the democrats taking up a very strong man it was but policy for the republicans to look upon Dix as their only sure hope of success at the election. But this enthusiastic ruralite will have but few followers on Wednesday, and will learn that General Dix will be considered "an out-and-out republican" and the sure hope of the party's success at the polls next November.

The Two Candidates.

[From the Evening Mail.]

Mr. Tilden has succeeded. No man ever worked harder to get the nomination for Governor. No man ever entitled himself to the primacy of his party more than he has. Whatever force the democratic party has in this State as a party of honesty it owes to Mr. Tilden more than to anybody else. All this we are ready to concede to Mr. Tilden. But we are not prepared to say that he is worthy to contest the highest honors of the State with such a man as Governor Dix. While Mr. Tilden was in doubt as to the reception of the Tweed delegation to the State Convention, Governor Dix had no hesitation in avowing his condemnation of the New York ring. He was then, and has been since, an avowed and open and undisguised enemy of the politicians who were running the city government at the time when Mr. Tilden was not quite sure that the honest people of this city would triumph over their oppressors.

Governor Dix had no fears as to the result of the war that was begun by the Committee of Seventy. He was sustained by an unfaltering trust in the integrity and courage of the people, and was as sure of the triumph of the right at the beginning of the struggle as he was at its end. It was not until the movement which was begun by the Committee of Seventy was virtually successful that Mr. Tilden had the moral courage to identify himself with it.

An Old-Line Democrat's Views of the Late Democratic Convention.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

In your issue of September 19 you refer to the platform of this body and say, in substance, that it is a very good platform, but the next moment admit that there is nothing explicit in it except the declaration in favor of payment of the federal debt in coin. You refer to the fifth paragraph—the longest of the thirteen—and admit its obscurity and lack of point. This was but a sample of the rest.

Now, let an old-line democrat say what he thinks of that Convention, its nominations and its platform. It was composed, in due proportions, of the the mercenary, piebald crowd whose trumpet the windy Cochrane blows, and of the old party hacks in the democratic ranks who have so long and submissively followed their leaders from one departure to another, each one more shameful and disastrous than that which preceded it, until all ended in the infamous abandonment of all pretence of character or principle in 1872. Such leaders will never bring the democratic party back to principle or conduct it to victory. And what was the action of this Convention? In all things it submitted to the dictation of the one man power, which so insolently and proscriptively rules in Tammany Hall. In the nomination for Governor it surrendered to the railroad monopolists and the aristocratic fossils of the Manhattan Club. In the nomination for Lieutenant Governor it surrendered to Cochrane and the anti-Irish spirit. In its platform it surrendered to Belmont and the bondholders. All the other parts of the platform were a string of pointless political platitudes, revealing throughout the hand of that falsest of pretenders, Manton Marble. And what did it say in behalf of the down-trodden sovereignties and oppressed people of the South? Not a solitary protest against negro and bayonet rule, or even the feeblest and faintest demand for justice to our common white race, and ignoring the grand uprising of a whole people to rid themselves of the most flagrant usurpation and scandalous system of robbery ever known in history, and the threatened suppression of this sublime expression of the popular will by federal bayonets, since shamelessly carried into execution. No, they did not dare even to whisper the faintest murmur against that "bill of abominations," the proposed Civil Rights Bill. But what better could have been expected, when the gentleman at the head of the Committee on Resolutions is remembered as having, as Governor of this State, in 1863-4, cowered before the federal dictator at Washington, and shaken, as if in an ague fit, at the bare mention of a provost marshal. Out upon such pretended democracy and such false, cowardly leaders. Is it not time for true men to combine "for the public safety."

UNTERRIFIED.

Republican Delegates from the Annexed Wards.

The republicans of the First Assembly district, Westchester county, comprising the Twenty-third ward of the city (old town of Morrisania), and Twenty-fourth ward of the city, or old towns of West Farms and Kingsbridge, the city of Yonkers and the town of Westchester, held a convention at Morrisania yesterday for the purpose of choosing delegates and alternates to the State Convention at Utica; also five delegates to the Congressional Convention. The following are the delegates and alternates:—

Delegates—Hon. G. Hilton Scribner, of Yonkers; James R. Angel, of Morrisania; W. R. Davidson, of West Farms.

Alternates—George A. Henshaw, of Morrisania; E. G. Bell, of Yonkers, and George H. Foster, of Kingsbridge.

The following were appointed to the Congressional Convention:—J. G. Peene, of Yonkers; John A. Henry, of Morrisania; George H. Foster, of Kingsbridge; James L. Wells, of West Farms; Thomas Wilson, of Westchester; George H. Foster, of Kingsbridge, and Ernest Hall, of Morrisania.

The Hon. G. Hilton Scribner, ex-Secretary of State, briefly addressed the meeting in which he reviewed the political career of Samuel J. Tilden, whom he described as the mutual friend of the old Tammany ring, and condemned his political career throughout. Several other speakers addressed the Convention.

KELLY'S CAUSE.

He Will Probably Sue the Mayor for Libel—Under Sheriff Cummings Explains Kelly's Charges—The Nomination for Mayor To Be Forced Upon "Honest John."

Speculation was rife yesterday among politicians of all stripes as to the course Mr. John Kelly would probably pursue in relation to the arraignment of his official integrity by Mayor Havemeyer. Mr. Kelly will not return till Monday evening. He left Syracuse on Friday noon for Mexico, in Oswego county, where his only sister, Mrs. Thomas, resides, and where he will spend the Sabbath. Before leaving Syracuse he said to an intimate friend, who requested that his name might not be mentioned, that he was not certain as to the course he would pursue in regard to the charges of Mayor Havemeyer, but that he intended to take legal steps against him. He plainly intimated that he would sue Mayor Havemeyer for slander; and although he would give his reply to the charge to the public he would seek his redress before a legal tribunal.

WHAT TAMMANY THINKS.

This determination of Mr. Kelly being bruited about among Tammany politicians caused a great deal of gossip among them. They all expressed to the HERALD reporter their firm belief that the Havemeyer *expose* would not injure Kelly in the least, but that, on the contrary, it might induce them to force the nomination for Mayor upon Kelly, so as to give him a signal mark of their unimpaired confidence. One of his friends who had conversed with some of the leading Tammany chiefs said positively that this was the feeling with which Havemeyer's attack had inspired them, and that it was now probable that Kelly, despite all his opposition, would be forced into the contest for the Mayoralty. "Everybody who has lived in the city any length of time," he said, "knows that John Kelly is the embodiment of honesty and that the Mayor, in making up his figures, must have resorted to falsehood. They know that John Kelly is incapable of committing a dishonest act."

Defending His Former Chief.

The reporter called upon Under Sheriff Cummings, who occupied the same position for a year and a half under Sheriff Kelly, and who, it was thought, could tell whether the figures adduced by our worthy Mayor could be explained so as to disprove the charge of dishonesty. Mr. Cummings, who was very busy, showed the reporter a number of brief memoranda which he had made to disprove the allegations of the Mayor.

"The entire array of facts, as he calls them," said Under Sheriff Cummings, "is nothing but an elaborate tissue of falsehoods. I have examined every one of them and I can say that there is not one which is not in accordance with the law; further, and that there is not a dollar which was not a legitimate charge against the county. The best proof of this is that the Board of Supervisors, who were required by law to audit the bills, allowed the charges which Mayor Havemeyer now stigmatizes as dishonest and fraudulent."

"How can you explain the discrepancies in the figures?"

"Very easily. Take, for instance, the number of convictions reported to the Secretary of State. Now the Mayor makes it appear that we reported 60,000 more convictions than actually took place in the respective periods. He forgets the convictions

IN ALL THE POLICE COURTS

which the law, for the purposes of these reports to the Secretary of State, makes equivalent to convictions in the Court of Special Sessions. There is the entire discrepancy. Mayor Havemeyer might search the records for every other Sheriff's term of office and find the very same state of affairs. The convictions in the police courts are always put down under the head of "Special Sessions," and there are, of course, a great many more of them than there are in the last mentioned court alone. We have just the same trouble now with Comptroller Green. Auditor Earle sent up to the Clerk of Special Sessions for the number of convictions in that Court for the first three months of the year and the number returned was about six hundred. Now, the number of convictions in all the police courts for the first three months of the year (which are included under the head of "Special Sessions") was not less than six thousand."

"How can the figures upon which Kelly's charges are based be proved to be correct?"

"We can prove them to be correct by the records of the police courts and the transcripts of those records in the Sheriff's office. Some of the papers—it being so long ago—may have been mislaid, but I think there will be no difficulty, upon the whole, to establish

THE TRUTH OF WHAT I SAY

by the documentary evidence which I have alluded to. We have two or three clerks specially detailed to gather this information in regard to the convictions in police courts. They are supplied with blanks with some twenty columns for the registration of every detail connected with each case of conviction."

"How about the charge of summoning over sixty thousand 'imaginary' jurors, Mr. Cummings?"

"That is susceptible of explanation. The Mayor takes only two courts, the Oyer and Terminer and the General Sessions, and his figures fall, of course, far below the mark. He ought to have included the jurors summoned to the Supreme, Superior and Marine courts, and he would have found that Kelly's figures were correct, and that there was not one 'imaginary' juror in the number charged. The whole letter bristles with falsehoods prompted by malevolence. Take, for instance, the charge for hanging Jeremiah O'Brien in 1867, $940. That charge the Mayor contrasts with the very small charge for the execution of James Stephenson in 1859. But is the explanation not apparent? In 1867, when the war had been fought, everything had risen enormously in its price. The carpenter who could be hired for the erection of a scaffold in 1859 at $1 50 a day had to be paid $5 a day in 1867. Of course the contrast is superficially effective.

BUT THERE IS NOTHING IN IT

after all. There is the charge of $200 for watchers at the execution of O'Brien. Well, that is reasonable, as we have to keep two men alternately to watch the prisoner night and day for ten or twelve days, and, dividing the amount between four watchers, you will find that the charge is only about $5 per day for each.

"How as to the alleged overcharge for conveying prisoners, seventy-five cents each?"

"The Board of Supervisors raised the amount from seventy-five cents to $1 50, and as they had a perfect right to do that there can be no doubt about the legality of the charge. Afterward they raised it to $1 75, and this increase figures in the Mayor's statement as an 'overcharge' of $1 for each prisoner. The Board of Supervisors could have allowed $10 if they liked. They had the authority to fix the charge, and nobody else."

"How about the overcharge for summoning over 21,000 'alleged' jurors at thirty-five cents each?"

"The Board of Supervisors raised the amount allowed from thirty to thirty-five cents each. That disposes of this charge. Then there is the charge of 'pretended' attendance at the drawing of 713 jury panels not drawn, $1 each. Here the Mayor leaves out the panels drawn for the Supreme, Superior and Common Pleas courts. Then there is the charge of summoning over 23,000 jurors,

NOT SERVED AS REQUIRED BY LAW.

Well, there is a statute that if more than fifty out of 100 jurors are not personally served the Clerk of the Court shall not allow the Sheriff's charge for the service. Perhaps some five or six panels in these many years were served in this faulty manner—that is not impossible—but then it was the duty of the clerks of the respective courts to report the fact to the Board of Supervisors, who should not have allowed the charge. That's all there is about this. I cannot, of course, pretend to meet every charge in this voluminous arraignment; but the foregoing explanations will give you an idea of its glaring falsity and malevolent misrepresentations. I leave Mr. Kelly to fully expose the Mayor's skilful tissue of lies."

A Talk with the Mayor.

The reporter enjoyed subsequently an interview with our jolly Mayor. He was in very good humor, evidently relishing his victory over his accusers.

"What do you think of Waterbury's letter, Mr. Mayor?" said the HERALD representative.

"Oh, I don't think anything about it. If Kelly wants to arrest him or me, I suppose he's welcome. I don't know whether Kelly will reply to my letter or not, and I don't care. There are the facts. Can he disprove them?"

"I suppose they have been collected with care?"

The Mayor smiled complacently. "Well, I am generally pretty careful. I can't say whether there isn't a flaw in them. I suppose the records of the Secretary of State are correct, and I suppose those of the clerks of the courts are correct. That's all I have to say about that. There may be a mistake in my figures, but if there is I don't know it. (The Mayor burst into a fit of laughter.) He positively imprisoned his own friends, so that when he couldn't get enough convictions to charge for he made it appear as though almost all the criminals were Irish. Ha, ha, ha, ha!"

ANOTHER BOMBSHELL TO BURST.

"I suppose you are done with him now, Mr. Mayor?"

"No, not yet. I have something new in course of preparation. I haven't got through with him yet. I always like to have ready something of that sort, but I don't know whether I shall publish it."

"Are you not afraid that John Morrissey will challenge you to a pugilistic contest, Mr. Mayor, and that you will have the worst of it?"

"I am never afraid to speak the truth. Here is this man Kelly, who has hounded me because I put Charlick and Gardner back, and he wanted to send them to State Prison—for doing nothing. What was his motive? Ah, he wanted to show his power (with a dramatic flourish) and to prevent the Police Commissioners in the future undertaking to interfere with his (it would be impossible to exaggerate the malicious emphasis which His Honor laid upon this pronoun) inspectors of election. 'Don't you dare to interfere with my inspectors!' This is what he meant to say to the world."

The Mayor was then asked about Mr. Kelly's chances for the election to the Mayoralty, but politely declined to express any opinion on that subject. What the new disclosures about Mr. Kelly will be it is impossible to foretell.

A NEWARK MANSLAUGHTER MYSTERY.

Was Noll Assaulted or Killed by a Fall? A Trio of Boys in Custody.

Last Monday a German dame named Noll appeared before the Newark police authorities and made affidavit that her husband, Peter Noll, a man about sixty years of age, had been feloniously assaulted the previous Saturday night by George Lippert, Jacob Lindeman and George Ball, all youngsters of eighteen or nineteen, and, like Noll, residents of Lillie street. The details of the alleged assault were not given, but warrants were issued for the arrest of the boys and duly executed. They were let go on bail, however. Subsequently Noll's condition became dangerous, and the boys were rearrested and lodged in the county jail, where they now are. Meanwhile on Friday Noll died. The heavy storm melted away the papier mache sort of house in which the Nolls lived, and a portion only was left standing. Hence the corpse had to be removed to a neighbor's pending the inquest, which is ordered for to-day. As Noll never spoke after being picked up, as his wife speaks English very imperfectly, and as the boys around all declare themselves innocent, but on the contrary that he was drunk and fell, thus fatally injuring himself, the case is in great doubt, the question being open as to whether he was killed by being assaulted or through having fallen.

THE HYDROPHOBIA INQUEST.

The inquiry by Coroner Woltman into the death of R. T. Entwistle, who died, as supposed, of hydrophobia at No. 12 Bedford street on the 1st of July last, being set down for yesterday, many witnesses put in an appearance at the hour appointed. The unavoidable absence, however, of the physician who, with Dr. Thomas Knox, had attended deceased before his death, compelled an adjournment of the inquest until another day not yet specified. It will be remembered that the deceased was bitten by a Newfoundland slut belonging to a man named Mellen. This slut was shot before the symptoms of hydrophobia had an opportunity to develop themselves, and therefore it was at the time doubted, even by the friends of deceased, that his death was the result of the bite, for no evidence could be produced that the dog had the disease. Subsequently, however, a single pup retained by Mellen, which had been suckled by the slut, died in great agony, as some people assert, of hydrophobia, while Mellen is almost willing to swear that its death was due to its having eaten too much meat. The death of the pup is to be brought forward as evidence of the mother's madness by those who believe that Entwistle died of hydrophobia.

SHAKESPEARE AND BACON.

The Relations of Shakespeare to the Modern Stage.

Opinions of Shakespearian Scholars.

The Great Authors Contrasted and Reviewed.

Opinion of Professor Hiram Corson.

Sweet Swan of Avon! what a sight it were
To see thee in our waters yet appear,
And make those flights upon the banks of Thames
That so did take Eliza and our James!
But stay! I see thee in the hemisphere
Advanced, and made a constellation there!
Shine forth, thou star of poets! and with rage
Or influence chide or cheer the drooping stage;
Since which thy flight from hence hath mourned like night,
And despairs day but for thy volume's light!

BEN JONSON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

All lovers of truth, whether lovers of Shakespeare or of Bacon, or of both, will read with pleasure the views of the justly eminent Professor Corson, of Cornell University, on the Shakesperian controversy. Professor Corson has made the life, character and plays of Shakespeare the study of his mature years, and now stands in the first rank of the Shakesperian scholars of America. Your correspondent was granted an interview in the Professor's study, and, in addition to his conversation, had the privilege of reading the full and comprehensive notes Professor Corson had made upon the subject. The Professor said:—

After giving the Shakesperian controversy much thought I had finally dismissed it from my mind, never having been able to discover any basis of facts in the controversy and deeming the question but an idle one. Yet since such men as Judge Nathaniel Holmes and others have attempted to pluck the laurels from Shakespeare and add them to the already burdened brow of Lord Bacon, it may be well to examine closely and ascertain if there can be any facts that will justify such Rob Roy dispensation and exchange of literary honors. For more than 250 years Shakespeare had borne unquestioned the bright honors that his genius had won for him, but about the middle of this century one William Henry, of the family of Smiths, writes a pamphlet in which he attempts to raise a doubt in regard to the authenticity of the plays which had been for so long attributed to William Shakespeare, of Stratford-upon-Avon, gent. The date of this pamphlet was September, 1856, Brompton, and bore the wondrous title "Letter to the Earl of Ellesmere," suggesting whether the Shakesperian plays were not really the productions of Lord Bacon. It is true that this question had been anticipated by one Delia Bacon, in an article contributed to *Putnam's Magazine* of January, 1852. Thus originated a controversy, amusing at first, on account of its perfect absurdity, but growing in interest as men who professed to be scholars adopted the Baconian theory, until, in the year 1856, a writer in the London *News* says:—"I know the vapors will soon pass away and the steady glories of William Shakespeare blaze forth again, but in the meantime we shiver under the passing cloud." The cloud did pass away, the question died out, but for the second or third time again assumes the form of a controversy among American critics.

Two characters stand prominently forward in history and furnish indisputable proof of Shakespeare's claims to the works attributed to him—Ben Jonson and the Earl of Southampton. We know the character and disposition of Ben Jonson better than the character and disposition of any writer of his period; and, knowing him as we do, we know he would not wink at the fraudulent appropriation of one man's fame by another, or even permit him to wear plumes stolen from another. He was a man of wonderful self-conceit, and this fact bears evidence to Shakespeare's merit and greatness when we find him paying willing homage to the superior genius he was forced to recognize in his contemporary and addressing to him the beautiful lines from which the above passage is taken. In 1619 Ben Jonson visited Drummond, of Scotland. Drummond, during his visit, played the Boswell and noted down many of Jonson's conversations, among which we find these allusions to Shakespeare:—"But he redeemed his vices with his virtues. There was ever more in the man to be praised than blamed." And again, "I remember the players often mentioned it as an honor to Shakespeare that in his writings (whatsoever he perused) he never blotted out a line. My answer hath been, would he had blotted out a thousand, which they thought a malevolent speech. I had not told posterity this but for their ignorance, who choose that circumstance to commend their friend by wherein he most faulted, and to justify my own candor, for I loved the man and do honor his memory (on this side idolatry) as much as any." Had Jonson been the friend of Shakespeare only, and not of Bacon, then the believers in the Baconian theory might have some ground for pronouncing the lines of Ben Jonson in the folio edition of Shakespeare's plays false; but we find his admiration and appreciation of Bacon almost as great as of Shakespeare. Speaking of the former he says, "But I have and do reverence him for the greatness that was only proper to himself, in that he seemed to me ever by his work one of the greatest of men and most worthy of admiration that had been in many ages. In his adversity I ever prayed that God would give him strength, for greatness he would not want. Neither could I condole in a word or syllable for him as knowing no accident could do harm to virtue, but rather help to make it manifest." Not only do these few passages cited from Jonson prove him the friend of his two great contemporaries, but evince that strict integrity and purity of character that have ever been awarded him, and render it impossible for him to have been ignorant of or winked at such a monstrous fraud and deception as the Baconian theory would attribute to Shakespeare. If any further evidence is needed we have but to turn to the "Life of the Earl of Southampton," for the only two letters that have come down to us of Shakespeare's are two dedicatory letters to this nobleman, one appearing in May, 1594 with the publication of "Rape of Lucrece." It may be interesting as well as important in determining the position of Shakespeare as a dramatist and poet, to know something of his noble and honored patron. Modern researches prove beyond a doubt that this young nobleman not only loaned Shakespeare money, and presented him with a handsome token of his appreciation in the form of £1,000, but even interested himself in the affairs of his theatre, as is shown by a letter discovered by J. Payne Collier among Lord Ellesmere's MSS. at Bridgewater House. This letter was written in 1608 and addressed either to Lord Ellesmere or to some person in authority, in behalf of the King's players whom the Lord Mayor and Aldermen endeavored to expel from the Blackfriars. This letter may be found in "New Facts regarding the Life of Shakespeare" by J. Payne Collier. These facts alone would seem sufficient proof to all who were not wilfully blind, yet they are not a tithe of what can be brought forward to confute the Baconian theory.

The first folio edition of Shakespeare's works, published seven years after his death, and of which many *fac simile* copies are extant, affords incontrovertible testimony to its being the product of the mind of William Shakespeare and not of Francis Bacon. This folio was published in 1623 by his friends and fellow actors, John Heminge and Henry Condell. To the pious care of these two lovers of the great poet we owe the preservation of his great dramas. Our knowledge of these two men, though not extensive, cannot be denied, since it is derived from public documents still existing. The knowledge of Heminge's connection with theatrical affairs extends back to 1596, so that we know for twenty years at least he must have been personally and intimately acquainted with Shakespeare. In this year of 1596 Heminge, Shakespeare and six other actors petitioned the Privy Council of the city of London that they might be permitted to repair and enlarge the Blackfriars Theatre. In 1599 the office book of the Treasurer of Queen Elizabeth's chamber shows that a warrant was made out for the payment of money to Heminge, he representing the Lord Chamberlain's theatrical servants. Our knowledge of Henry Condell is equally certain, coming from the same source—the public documents. In 1598 he was one of the actors in Ben Jonson's "Every Man in His Humor," and in the folio edition of that play, published in 1616, Henry Condell's name is given as fifth in the list of "principal comedians." Henry Condell, we know, was an acquaintance of Shakespeare, for in the patent granted by James I., in May, 1603, by which he constituted certain players his own theatrical servants, we find the name of Henry Condell as sixth and Shakespeare second; Condell was still a member of the company in 1619, when James I. confirmed the patent of 1603. These two persons Shakespeare mentions in his will in those quaint but kindly terms:—"I give and bequeath * * * to my fellows, John Heminge, Richard Burbage and Henry Condell, twenty-six shillings eight pence apiece, to buy them rings." Sufficient evidence has been shown to prove the reliableness of what these men affirm in the dedication of their first folio of Shakespeare's works. All who are interested in this controversy are doubtless acquainted with this edition and to it let them turn if yet more evidence is required to prove Shakespeare's claims to the authorship of the great dramas contained in this book.

The friendship that existed between the Earl of Southampton and Shakespeare has been clearly shown and also that honorable mention was made by this well known peer of the manager, actor and poet to a third person; the testimony of Ben Jonson, John Heminge and Henry Condell has been added, so that it must be concluded that the Baconian theory is an absurdity, and yet it is clung to by many real lovers of Shakespeare. This is perhaps due to the demolishing character of the age—an age in which everything not solved by the analytic faculty is suspected—an age in which scientific men would reach the soul with the dissecting knife. The leaders in this demolishing age are last to believe that a man, who had not gone through the curriculum of Cambridge and Oxford, who had not been trained in gerund-grinding and all rhetorical rules, could have written these great dramas, but prefer to attribute them to the founder of the inductive system and the author of the "Novum Organum."

It is also urged against Shakespeare that he was not in a position to acquire the learning that is evinced by his plays; such men recognize but one avenue through which one may enter the temple of knowledge—the analytic intellect is made to overrice everything else, and that other grand source through which genius obtains its knowledge is left out of view. In their opinion the Elizabethan period furnishes but one man who has this unlimited analytic power, and they make him the "protagonist in the arena of poetry." But in the dramas of Shakespeare there is little learning, but a rich storehouse of that very kind of knowledge that comes only through "mediumistic" powers—powers so peculiarly belonging to Shakespeare's impressive nature. Two men may walk through a forest a beautiful landscape, or one of the grand gorges near Ithaca; one (a scientific man) watches the vegetation, examines the rocks in his path or the spiders building their nests, his intellect is analytic and he may add facts to his knowledge of botany, geology or minerology; but the other man is a Wordsworth, he has a highly impressible nature, and drinks in the whole beauty and grandeur of the scene and their relations to the human spirit, that the other has probably not noticed, and obtains more real wisdom. He is more negative, the scientific man more positive, and proportionally less impressive. Yet granting that Shakespeare obtained his knowledge in the usual way, his position was much more favorable for this than the majority of writers of his day. He was connected with the two theatres, he was a stockholder, an actor and an excellent business man. His knowledge of princely characters has been questioned. A man of Shakespeare's genius can obtain more knowledge of court life in one hour than an analytic intellect could in a year's residence at court. Edwin Booth once said that the author of the plays in question must have had an intimate knowledge of stage business, and such knowledge must be the result of actual theatrical experience. It is the want of such knowledge on the part of many writers of merely literary plays that has been the secret of their failure on the stage. Some in their blind support of the Baconian theory even affirm that Bacon furnished the material and Shakespeare made the artistic construction; but this cannot be, the two are so inseparably connected that they must be born of the same grand genius. Parallelisms of thought have been cited from the dramas and from Bacon's works to prove the identity of their authorship. They are amusing, as showing how infatuated a man may become with a favorite theory. Any one who has read the dramatic literature of the reign of Elizabeth and James will easily recognize this general coloring of thought and even of peculiarity of diction. Yet for this reason he does not conclude that it was a period of literary plagiarism in which one author was constantly pilfering from another. The meagreness of the knowledge that we have of Shakespeare's character, save that shown by his works, has been made a point of by the advocates of this bizarre theory. It is true that of many men not to be compared with Shakespeare we know much more, but of many who rank next to him our knowledge is much more meagre. This ignorance of the great poet's character is not peculiar to Shakespeare alone, but to all literary men of the Elizabethan period. The indifference in regard to the lives of these great men is owing to the political convulsions following the death of Shakespeare and also to the degenerated taste of the school that came in with the restoration of Charles II. and prevailed for so many years. This indifference in regard to the private lives of poets, painters and scientific men continued among people of all ages and countries up to within the last 150 years. We know more of Shakespeare than the Greeks knew of their great tragedian, Æschylus, or of their comedian, Aristophanes, two centuries after their death. Of Molière, the greatest of French dramatists, who lived fifty years after Shakespeare, there is almost total ignorance. Not a page of his manuscript is known to exist. The personal history of Bacon is extensive and well known, but had he not been the King's Attorney General, Sir Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Albans and Lord High Chancellor of England, Bacon might have written his essays in unobserved obscurity. Of Beaumont and Fletcher, both born in the ranks of the gentry—one descended from a judge, the other from a bishop—we know less than we do of Shakespeare. The only clew that we have to the year of Chapman's birth is the mark that time has left upon his portrait, while the minor stars of the Elizabethan galaxy leave hardly a trace which is not made by their own pens. And Ben Jonson himself owes the favor that history has shown him to the longevity of his life, for over his earlier years hangs the same dark clouds that shroud the lives of his great contemporaries.

ITHACA, N. Y., Sept. 16, 1874.

Opinion of L. Clarke Davis.

PHILADELPHIA, Sept. 18, 1874.

I had a very pleasant interview recently with Mr. L. Clarke Davis, managing editor of the Philadelphia *Inquirer*. I called upon him as a matter of course in relation to the present Shakesperian discussion, and confess myself glad to become the medium through which to express his very bright and interesting opinions. I don't suppose that any further introduction of this gentleman is needed beyond the simple mention of his name, for the little literary coterie composed of himself and his accomplished wife, Mrs. Rebecca Harding Davis, is so well known, and among the readers of magazine lore so highly appreciated, that to almost every one who reads this will be suggested a dozen reasons why the views given below are entitled to very considerable weight. I discovered Mr. Davis away "aloft," where editors are usually found, up to his elbows in his manuscripts and proofs, and after climbing several pairs of stairs, I learned that access was much easier to his thoughts than to his whereabouts. The hour of my arrival was exceedingly inopportune, and the interview of necessity conducted in an off-hand sort of a way; but yet I was in his presence just long enough to secure some very happy thoughts, which, I am sure, will be regarded as rich contributions to all who defend the authenticity of the plays.

"You have read Mr. Holmes' work?" I queried.

"Yes," was the response; "and Delia Bacon's also; the latter is not quite as large as our city directory, but very nearly so. Despite the fact that I am only middle aged, I deem it, however, a very felicitous circumstance that I have digested the volume, sentence by sentence, and still survive."

"Then you do not consider the work a powerful one," I asked.

"No, not powerful," was the response; "Archbishop Whateley once wrote an essay in which the claim was made that no such character as Napoleon Bonaparte ever had an existence. I defy any unprejudiced mind of the present generation to read this work without having his faith shaken in the identity of Napoleon I. But Miss Bacon's book has not the clear, strong, and apparently logical arguments that characterize the work of Whateley. The style of Delia Bacon's book is very obscure, and in her arguments she does very little else than beg the question."

"You are not a Baconian, then?" was my next question.

"No, I am not," was the emphatic response, "and I will tell you why. Most of us admire Shakespeare for what he has said; for the terseness, strength and beauty of his diction and for the solidity and comprehensiveness of his style. But there are other qualities in his plays equally deserving our astonishment and admiration. Suppose we sacrifice, for instance, every word in the great tragedy of 'Macbeth,' suppose we curtail 'Midsummer Night's Dream' of every syllable it contains, and what is the result? Why, sir, we have a combination of situations and attitudes that would render both these plays eminently successful as pantomimes. I mean to say that everything in Shakespeare shows a consummate knowledge of stage business and dramatic effect that Lord Bacon could never have possessed in the dull, isolated life which we know that he led. Recall the murder scene in 'Macbeth.' The crime has been effected, and the hands of the author of the deed are stained with blood. Suddenly there comes a loud knocking on the outer gate. Why, the effect of this simple stage trick upon the audience is terrible; it signifies detection, and this little thing must be ever regarded as one of the greatest incidents in the entire play. The prompter produces it by pounding upon an anvil located in one of the wings, and yet it conveys more to the audience, more excitement, consternation and terror, than could be conveyed in volumes of words. Think you Francis Bacon would have known anything of this?"

"But, Mr. Davis," said I, "don't you think that Bacon or some one else might have furnished the language of many of the plays, and that Shakespeare might have adapted it to his knowledge of stage effects?

"No; I do not think so," answered Mr. Davis. "There is a uniformity and consistency between the language and the situation that conclusively prove to me that the author of one was the originator of the other. The language is always consistent with the situation, and nothing but the situation can explain the force, vigor, vehemency or else the grace, sweetness and purity of the great dramat