

- p.24/12-13 'his last wishes were dictated to... Francis Collins' to whom (20-21) the drafting may be ascribed; then it's surely very curious that it was not Collins but his hypothetical clerk who took down the hypothetical dictation? here announced as a fact? Must it not then have been the clerk's drafting?
- /20-21 'the impersonal drafting' may also have something to do with Shakespeare's own legal knowledge; but that knowledge permits, if it does not entail, the immediate economical inference that the will is holograph, a conclusion later denied (25/14) on logically invalid grounds.
- /25 'merry party': recte 'merry meeting' .
- p.25/ 9 'not unusual' ??
- /10 'also drawn by Francis Collins' ??
- /10 'similar in appearance' ??? (v.p.23)
- /11 'probably written by Collins'(s) clerk': i.e. an imaginary person, to whom nothing can properly be 'probably' ascribed.
- /11-12 'a glance... is enough'; is it, in view of the later cautioning against such assumptions?
- /13-14 'a comparison of Shakespeare's signatures with the text of the will shows that the will is not holograph': but this absurdly assumes that the signatures are genuine, which ^{Mrs Cox} ~~the-writer~~ wishes to deny. On her own actual thesis, the will may well be holograph, ~~a-view-already~~ (v.20/21 above)
- /14 'most unusual' ???
- /15 'no 17 century gentleman ~~wre~~... penned his own last wishes' ???
But perhaps lawyers weren't gentlemen?
- /18 'the clerk': the probable imaginary clerk has now become an actual real clerk.
- /29, 33 'Hamnet': Hamnet or Hamlett, which is how the will spells him.
- p.26/28 ('ommission')
- /45-6 'one is tempted to make some speculations about Shakespeare's sexual confusion': but why is one, one wonders?
- /49-50 'granddaughter... referred to ... a s/his niece.. descriptions of relatives.. often very vague...': but 'niece' meant granddaughter, OED I. though the usage was old-fashioned and outmoded by 1616. An elderly clerk?
- /50 'referred to later in the will': earlier (p.31/27)

p.27/12, 17: 'Hamnet': Hamnet or Hamlett, v. 25/29

/14 'hint of theatrical connections': hint??.. 'my fellows', i.e. the world-famous actors and First Folio editors.

/16, 19 'mourning rings': commemorative, surely, not merely mourning.

p.31, 8 from end: (omitted)

33/4 'British Library... Guildhall': do they agree that one of these signatures (which?) must be a fake?

/5 'of very poor quality': but what of the earlier facsimiles?

33/6 'It is obvious ~~to~~ a glance'; but only to Baconians, Oxfordians, etc, and Mrs. Cox.

~~/7-----'Almost every letter is formed in a different way'???'--But this is--~~

33/6 'with the exception of' 25d and 25e: but why are they excepted, since they contain different letterforms?

/7 'Almost every letter is formed in a different way in each'????; this wild exaggeration is manifestly untrue.

/7-8 'Literate men in the 16th and 17th centuries developed personalized signatures much as people do today'???? :But they didn't all then and they don't all today, as any autograph collector can testify.

/9 'unthinkable': sic.

/9-10 'which ~~of~~ the signatures.. is the genuine article is anybody's guess': (a) assumes that some if not all are fakes (b) contradicts 'with the exception of the last two', i.e. the hypothetical lack of genuineness is not random (c) contradicts David Thomas, who takes 25a to be genuine (p.10)

(literary)

/10,12 'Some/scholars... Tannenbaum ...': but he was a graphologist, not a literary scholar. Perhaps Schoenbaum is meant?

/11 'calligraphy': but the question is one of handwriting, not penmanship.

/12 'Tannenbaum saw a 'striking similarity'.. ': so he did, in frequent references, none of which however occurs on p.19 of his book, which is entitled Problems in Shakespeare's Penmanship

34/ 3 'the solution' i.e. the solution to a problem created solely by what Mrs. Cox thinks unthinkable.

/3, 4 'Sir Hilary Jenkinson's opinion ..', for which Jenkinson himself

now assumed to be so totally persuasive and irrefutably true that it not only annihilates a Shakespeare signature ('so much for the signature on the deposition ') but can actually be extended to quite different fields for the purpose of uprooting Shakespeare signatures there too.

p.34/7-9 'If this was the practice in the equity courts, why should it not also have been the practice of attorneys' clerks when drawing up conveyancing documents'

This rhetorical flourish not only erases ~~the~~ two more signatures, but sweeps Shakespeare out of London at the time, so that he couldn't have been responsible for them even if he'd tried:

/9 'Possibly Shakespeare was not even in London'; so much for the Gatehouse signatures.

and

/24-5 That just leaves the will signatures; they are defenceless against further 'possibilit~~ies~~es ', such as the 'possibility' that the clerk who wrote the will, i.e. the imaginary clerk to whom it was not dictated, forged Shakespeare's signatures. Oh, and there is also a 'possibility' that the so-called

/13-4 original will is a facsimile (sic) copy made either by the court of Collins'(s) ubiquitous all-purpose clerk again.

/24-5 This same clerk may also have forged the names of the witnesses on the will, on which the authenticity of the signatures 'must (sic) be questioned', because of what Jenkinson opined in 1922, in a context which makes no~~t~~ mention of 'the Prerogative Court of Canterbury' . Why are those

/21 wor s added?
At the same time, on the same page, we are told that it is 'not very likely' that the will is a copy at all ; and further that 'there is no positive evidence that Shakespeare did not sign his will'; the 'shaky pen strokes certainly look those made by a sick man'. But perhaps there should be some evidence, to justify all this wild speculation? Or are we to postulate a sick clerk or a sick copyist or a sick forger, for the sake of an opinion offered by Jenkinson in 1922 on some quite different point in an entirely different context?

/36 'if one must select one of the four signed documents as being the sole example of our greatest playwright's hand': a big if - why 'one', why 'sole', except ^{for} what is deemed to be 'unthinkable' by one sole person? Of course one must do nothing of the kind.

/36-38 'if one must select... the will has no better claim': but if one must select, then of course it has, if indeed 'the shaky pen strokes certainly look those made by a sick man'.