

occurred in transposing figures: in setting the amounts down to make the subtraction, *i.e.*, the first figure of the 805 and the two last figures of the 426 were set down, making 826; then the first figure of the 426 and the last two figures of the 805 were set down, making 405; which taken from the 826 would make 421, the number arrived at, when, as a matter of fact, it should have been 379. Moreover, they both call Hugh Capet's heir King Lewes the tenth, whereas, he was, in fact, King Lewes the ninth. If any evidence further than the similarity in language is needed to show that Shakespeare copied the passage from Holinshed conclusive proof is shown by the fact that it is inconceivable that two authors could have made the same errors in calculating the time above referred to. Notwithstanding this fact that the author of "King Henry the Fifth" copied his exposition of the Salic Law from Holinshed and is in no manner entitled to credit for the arguments therein, this is one of the often quoted passages to prove Shakespeare's profound knowledge of jurisprudence. It illustrates how prone the admirers of his legal acquirements are to accept blindly everything in his plays as emanating from his own brain, instead of critically examining the sources from which he copied his legal material. His literary critics have not been guilty of quite such gross negligence, as they have fairly well traced the sources of his plots and found them, likewise, largely borrowed. In passing on we might also note that

HOLINSHED SAYS:

"The Archbishop further alleged out of the booke of numbers this saicing: when a man dieth without a soun let the inheritance descend to his daughter." (1)

SHAKESPEARE SAYS:

"For in the book of Numbers is it writ,
When a man dies, let the inheritance
Descend unto the daughter." (2)

(1) "Holinshed Chroniele." (2) Shakespeare's "King Henry V."