

sons appointed for the new translation of the Bible; and he was one of eight to whom the whole of the New Testament, except the Epistles, was entrusted. In 1609, he was made Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; next year, translated to the See of London; and in little more than a month, he was elevated to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. Two other sons of the poor clothworker were almost equally fortunate in advancement. The Archbishop's elder brother and schoolfellow, Robert, became Bishop of Salisbury; and his youngest brother, Maurice, was an eminent London merchant, one of the first Directors of the East India Company, Lord Mayor, and representative of the City in Parliament. Archbishop Abbot attended King James in his last illness, and he crowned Charles I. "He founded a fair Hospital, well built, and liberally endowed," at Guildford, for 20 brethren and sisters. He was also a munificent benefactor to the poor of Guildford, Croydon, and Lambeth. The humble cottage tenement in which he was born exists to this day: in 1692 it was a public-house, with the sign of the *Three Mariners*.

## LXII.

## SHAKSPEARE AT STRATFORD-ON-AVON.

In the county of Warwick, at Stratford-upon-Avon, is a free grammar-school, founded by a native of the town, in the reign of Henry VI., and celebrated as the *School of Shakspeare*. Immediately over the Guild Hall is the school-room, now divided into two chambers, and having a low flat plaster ceiling in place of the arched roof. Mr. Knight thus argues for the identity of the room:

"The only qualifications necessary for the admission of a boy into the Free Grammar School of Stratford were, that he should be a resident in the town, of seven years of age, and able to read. The Grammar School was essentially connected with the Corporation of Stratford; and it is impossible to imagine that, when the son of John Shakspeare became qualified for admission to a school where the best education of the time was given, literally for nothing, his father in that year being chief alderman, should not have sent him to the school."

Thither, it is held, Shakspeare, born at Stratford in 1564, went about the year 1571. Mr. Knight impressively continues:

"Assuredly the worthy curate of the neighbouring village of Luddington, Thomas Hunt, who was also the schoolmaster, would have received his new scholar with some kindness. As his 'shining morning face' first passed out of the main street into that old court through which the upper room of learning was to be reached, a new life would be opening upon him. The humble minister of religion who was his first instructor, has left no memorials of his talents or acquirements; and in a few years another master came after him, Thomas Jenkins, also unknown to fame. All praise and honour be to them; for it is impossible to imagine that the teachers of William Shakspeare were evil instructors, giving the boy husks instead of wholesome aliment."

At Stratford, then, at the Free Grammar School of his own town, Mr. Knight assumes Shakspeare to have received in every just sense of the word the *education of a scholar*. This, it is true, is described by Ben Jonson as "small Latin and less Greek;" Fuller states that "his learning was very little;" and Aubrey, that "he understood Latin pretty well." But the question is set at rest by "the indisputable fact that the very earliest writings of Shakspeare are imbued with a spirit of classical antiquity; and that the all-wise nature of the learning that manifests itself in them, whilst it offers the best proof of his familiarity with the ancient writers, is a circumstance which has misled those who never attempted to dispute the existence of the learning which was displayed in the direct pedantry of his contemporaries." So that, because Shakspeare uses his knowledge skilfully, he is assumed not to have read!

To assume that William Shakspeare did not stay long enough at the Grammar School of Stratford to obtain a very fair proficiency in Latin, with some knowledge of Greek, is to assume an absurdity upon the face of circumstances.

Of Shakspeare's life, immediately after his quitting Stratford, little is positively known. Collier concurs with Malone "in thinking, that after Shakspeare quitted the Free School, he was employed in the office of an attorney. Proofs of something like a legal education are to be found in many of his plays, and it may safely be asserted that they (law phrases) do not occur anything like so frequently in the dramatic productions of any of his contemporaries." (1).

(1) The name "William Shakspeare" occurs in a certificate of the names and arms of trained soldiers—trained militia, we should now call them—in the hundred of Earlichway, in the county of Warwick—under the hand of Sir Fulk Greville ("Friend to Sir Philip Sydney"), Sir Edward Greville, and Thomas Spencer. Was our William Shakspeare a soldier?

"In these days, the education of the universities commenced much earlier than at present. Boys intended for the learned professions, and more especially for the church, commonly went to Oxford and Cambridge at eleven or twelve years of age. If they were not intended for those professions, they probably remained at the Grammar School till they were thirteen or fourteen; and then they were fitted for being apprenticed to tradesmen, or articulated to attorneys, a numerous and thriving body in those days of cheap litigation. Many also went early to the Inns of Court, which were the universities of the law and where there was real study and discipline in direct connexion with the several societies."—*Knight's Life of Shakspeare*.

(To be continued.)

### Suggestive Hints towards Improved Secular Instruction.

BY THE REV. RICHARD DAWES, A. M.

(Continued from our last.)

## III.

## POETRY.

The piece of poetry they learn by heart, having first made each piece the object of one or two reading lessons; they then write down from memory, either on their slates or as an exercise on paper, about one half of the short pieces at a time; at first they will run all the lines together, perhaps, as in prose, or begin the lines with small letters,—write *i* for the pronoun *I*, and so on; but in a very short time they write them out most correctly, and this exercise is a very useful one.

Again, (*Lesson Book*, No. 3, page 230.)

## ON HUMAN FRAILTY.

Weak and irresolute is man,  
The purpose of to-day,  
Woven with pains into his plan,  
To-morrow rends away.

The bow well bent, and smart the spring,  
Vice seems already slain:  
But passion rudely snaps the string,  
And it revives again.

*Weak and irresolute*; what parts of speech? Adjectives. What word do they qualify? Man. What does the prefix *ir* mean? Not. Can you quote any other words with the same prefix meaning *not*? Irregular, irreparable, etc. *Is*; what part of speech? An auxiliary verb. In what way does it differ from *have*, as to the case which comes after it? It always takes the nominative case both before and after it; it was *I*, it was he whom *I* saw;—*have* follows the general rule. *Woven*; what part of speech? Past participle from *weave*. Are the past participle and the past tense of this verb the same? No, *Sir*; *wove*, *I wove*, *thou wovest*, *he wove*, etc. What are the warp and woof in weaving? The *warp*, the threads that run the long way of the cloth; and the *woof*, the threads that run across; the woof is thrown by the shuttle over and above each alternate thread. Do you recollect any piece of poetry which you have learnt in which *Time* is called the *warp* of life? Yes, *Sir*. Quote it.

Time is the warp of life:—Oh! tell  
The young, the fair, the gay, to weave it well.

What is meant by *Time* being the warp of life? The length of life. What by *weave* it well? Spend it well. *With pains*, means what? With trouble. *His plan*; *his*, what part of speech? A possessive pronoun, referring to man; possessive case of *he*; the objective, *him*. In the second verse *rudely snaps*; what part of speech is *rudely*? An adverb explaining the way in which the action of the verb is performed. *Stain*, what part of the verb?

The class will then sit down, and write in their own words, the substance of what the first two verses have conveyed to their minds, or perhaps of one verse; afterwards get it by heart, and, as an

Why not? Jonson was a soldier, and had slain his man. Donne had served in the Low Countries. Why not Shakspeare in arms? At all events, here is a field for inquiry and speculation. The date is September 23, 1605, the year of the Gunpowder Plot; and the lists were possibly prepared through instructions issued by Cecil in consequence of secret information as to the working of the plot in Warwickshire—the proposed headquarters of the insurrection.—*State Papers*, edited by Mary Anne Everett Green.