

in the style of The Winter's Tale. But the slight inconsistencies and irregularities in line arrangement, etc., cannot yield even presumptive evidence for such farfetched and needless fancies (p. 55).

~~Thus, a view identified as "higher criticism" of Shakespeare is today generally rejected.~~

Not only has ^{excessive literary} "higher criticism" now been rejected in ^{so} many works of general literature (of which we have cited only a few) ^{so} that its application to the Bible almost stands alone, but the principles themselves by which ^{such} "higher criticism" is conducted have recently come under general attack.

Richard Altick in The Art of Literary Research (1963) says: ^(New York: W. W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1963)

The determination of authorship requires the gathering and judicious assessment of as much evidence, both internal and external, as can be found. Internal evidence is normally more abundant, but it is also very slippery. The premise underlying its use (~~statistical studies of word usage, meter, etc.~~) is that every author's work has unique idiosyncrasies of style... Theoretically, this manner of proceeding is legitimate enough, and some of the results, ^{thus} obtained have won wide acceptance. Many authorship studies, notably in the later nineteenth century and early twentieth, laid claim to scientific rigor, and were published with an imposing panoply of statistical charts and tables. F.G. Gleay's Shakespeare Manual (1878) is an easily accessible example of such work (p. 61). 2

If it is to be admitted that "unique idiosyncrasies of style" may be valuable in determining authorship, ~~but only if we have known examples of the suggested authors' styles already in hand.~~

Even then, ^{still} there may be problems. Altick continues:

Sometimes, too, the styles of several authors, all of whom may have contributed to a work, are so similar that differentiation of their respective portions is impossible. Though we know that half a dozen men (Swift, Arbuthnot, Pope, Gay, Parnell, and the Earl of Oxford) composed the Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus, we cannot positively isolate the contributions of any one of them (~~but not for~~) 3

The easy assumption of multiple authorship has come on hard times, as Helen Gardner (The Business of Criticism, Oxford, 1959) ~~(cited above)~~ points out: