

Mr. Norris, who has lately been much exercising his mind upon the various portraits of Shakespeare, and doing a good service by completing the work commenced by James Boaden in 1824, followed by Abraham Wivell in 1827, continued by J. Hain Friswell in 1864, and William Page in 1876, has not, I hope, allowed his enthusiasm to affect or afflict his judgment. I can sympathise with his bewilderment in trying to solve the question: "Are any of the so-called portraits of Shakespeare authentic?" I would much rather see him in company with Mr. J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps than in the company of Dr. C. M. Ingleby. The one considering that the forehead and the formation of the head of the Stratford Bust should alone be decisive evidences in favour of its authenticity; and that there is, in truth, a convincing and a mental likeness in it that grows upon us by contemplation and makes us unwilling to accept any other resemblance.—The other characterizing the bust as "coarse and clownish, suggesting to the beholder a countryman crunching a sour apple, or struck with amazement at some unpleasant spectacle;—an unintentional caricature."

I have had in my library for the past twenty-six years a mask of Shakespeare, taken direct from the Stratford Bust, with which I am so familiar that I regard it with as much affection as I do the portraits of dear friends. The question never occurs to my mind whether it is or is not an authentic portraiture; I admit that there is nothing delicate in its execution, and that in refinement, expression, character