

The Shakespeare Fellowship News-Letter

SEPTEMBER, 1946

★
President: (VACANT)

EDITORIAL NOTES

The Annual General Meeting

The Annual General Meeting will take place on Saturday, September 14, 1946, at 33 Portman Square, W.1, at 3 p.m. The principal business will be the election of a President and the other officers, and a thorough discussion on the future activities of the Fellowship, in view of the somewhat meagre attendance at most of last season's meetings.

A Lecture by Miss Katharine Eggar, A.R.A.M., on *The Tempest* and another by Mr. William Kent on Shakespeare's London are among the Committee's suggestions for next session.

Members are earnestly asked to attend the Annual Meeting as it is important that the Committee should feel assured of full support.

Abstracts and Brief Chronicles

The veteran scholar, Professor Abel Lefranc, has been good enough to send over to the Fellowship, of which he is a Vice-President, an inscribed copy of his recently published *A La Découverte de Shakespeare*. Although we have some very definite reservations about his main conclusion, the work of this learned student of Renaissance and Reformation literature in France (who has likewise occupied himself with the Shakespeare problem for nearly forty years, off and on) must always command our respect, the more so when it is remembered that this lengthy book was entirely written during the German occupation. Like nearly all French scholars, he has also the gift of expression.

The number and variety of the illustrations will, in the circumstances, be a surprise to most of us. By far the most interesting is the somewhat dim reproduction of the Knowsley portrait of Derby by Marcus Gheerardts. It invites scrutiny and should be compared with the Welbeck Oxford and the Ashbourne Shakespeare.

A review will be found on another page.

At John O' London's Literary Circle

On Wednesday, February 20th a Brains Trust was held at Kingsway Hall, Holborn, W.C., in the rooms of "John O' London's Literary Circle": this was arranged through the good offices of Mr. William Kent. The meeting was well attended, notably by many English literature students of the City Literary Institute,

and there must have been about 120 persons present. The Question Master was Mr. T. L. Adamson and the three "Trustees" were Messrs. W. Kent, H. Cutner and J. J. Dwyer, who were kept busy up to the last moment of the two hours' traffic of their stage. The questions were mainly of the kind that can be called 'basic': e.g. "would not the writer have been openly identified?"; "how were all the people who must have known the secret persuaded to keep it?"; "had any of the 'candidates' for the authorship of the plays the necessary practical experience of the stage?" and the inevitable Baconian questions: "Shakespeare supplied the stage-craft and Bacon the scholarship." There were, however, two questions of deeper import: one regarding Ben Jonson, the other, on the possibility of William Stanley, sixth Earl of Derby, being the author of some of the plays, or the chief contributor in a joint authorship. The latter question gave one of the "Trustees" the opportunity of stating his opinion that Derby was the author of *The Tempest*, of *Cymbeline*, and of most of *The Winter's Tale*, and moreover, had probably revised and lengthened several other plays, particularly *Love's Labour's Lost*, *King Lear*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*.

It was, however, the former question which provided opportunity for two heavy blows on the strongest link of the Stratfordian chain, i.e., the testimony of Ben Jonson. Mr. J. J. Dwyer, after some general observations on Jonson's character and relations with other writers and players, gave a condensed account of the strange and sinister part played by him at the time of the Gunpowder Plot, when he was really acting as a Government spy while posing as a Catholic recusant. Mr. H. Cutner then dealt with the Droeshout Engraving, asserted to be "the portrait of Shakespeare." Speaking as a practising artist, Mr. Cutner maintained that the much-discussed "singularities of the so-called portrait were not deliberately intended to be enigmatical but were the result of lack of skill. Droeshout who made the copper or brass plate engraving was only about twenty in 1623 and could never have seen William Shaxpere who died in 1616. Droeshout was an inexperienced engraver and bungled the job. The portrait is not a "mask," nor is the sleeve on the right arm a left sleeve: it is merely a matter of very bad drawing. In all probability the portrait was drawn from the Welbeck portrait of Edward de Vere—made to look older. Jonson must have known very well.

if he knew Shaxpere personally, that this was not the likeness of the actor and therefore his testimony in the Folio was false. He himself says that the portrait was "ever writ in brasse": he was writing with his tongue in his cheek.

Great interest was shown by the audience of this Brains Trust from the outset and it visibly increased as the range and strength of the "Oxford case" was revealed in point after point. "Spontaneous answers to listeners' questions" was certainly a success and made converts on the spot.

'The Rival Poet' of the Sonnets— A Discussion

On February 23 Mr. J. J. Dwyer opened a discussion, "Who Was the Rival Poet?" After pointing out that Samuel Daniel, Marlowe, Spenser, Chapman, Barnabe Barnes and Sir John Davies—not to mention others—had all found advocates, the strongest support being that of David Minto for Chapman, Mr. Dwyer presented the case for Edmund Spenser. He said that the story disclosed in Sonnets 78 to 86 inclusive, which are plainly addressed to the Queen, is one of obvious competition by two Court Poets, of established fame, in praise and flattery of Elizabeth. He then read a number of passages and pointed out a remarkable series of expressions which, in his opinion, are meaningless if applied to anybody but the Queen; eg:—

And given *grace* a double *majesty*,

Her *Grace* was the title of the Queen in ordinary parlance, whereas *Majesty* was the new and more obsequious title; and who but the Sovereign could possess a *double* majesty? Sonnet 80 is full of references to the Ocean and to ships, at the very time when Elizabeth and England were enjoying the celebrity consequent on the defeat of the Armada. The known facts of Spenser's return from Ireland (1589) bringing with him three cantos of the *Faery Queene*, his introduction to the Court by Raleigh, and the remarkable terms of Spenser's dedication of his poem to Elizabeth were all plainly reflected in Spenser's own words, which Mr. Dwyer likewise read out to the meeting, and the argument was clinched by the reading of "If Music and Sweet Poetry Agree" (*The Passionate Pilgrim*) containing Oxford's own avowal of his friendship and admiration for Spenser, the poet whom he acknowledged as his superior.

Mr. Percy Allen put a totally different construction on Sonnets 78-86, maintaining that they were addressed to Southampton and were not concerned with the rivalry of Court poets in adulation of the Queen, but were explicit references to the acting of plays. He maintained that Southampton was himself accustomed to acting, that he had acted in the plays written by Oxford, and that Southampton had then by some means been induced to desert the stage of Oxford for that of Chapman. Consequently, the complaint in Sonnet 86:

But when your countenance filled up his line.

Then lacked I matter, that enfeebled mine . . . did not mean that Elizabeth preferred the more extreme adulation of Spenser to that offered by Ox-

ford. Finally, he held that the famous sonnet referred plainly to Chapman's *Hymnus in Noctem* and to the meetings of the group who were known as The School of Night.

In the second discussion, Mr. P. Allen introduced the subject: "To what extent was Oxford's authorship generally known in the XVI and XVII centuries?"

"A Walking Encyclopaedia"

On Saturday, March 23, the Fellowship met to hear Mr. William Kent's lecture: "Recollections of a Shakespeare Heretic." In autobiographical and humorous vein Mr. Kent recalled his early experiences as a speaker and a guide to London and told a number of amusing stories about the sort of people and the sort of objections he had encountered, particularly the assumption that anybody who questions the Stratfordian authorship is a Baconian. This is almost invariable—no matter what one says, or does not say. There is likewise an imaginative minority who, after listening to an "Oxfordian" argument, calmly tell you in reply that your case for Essex or Raleigh, or Rutland, is not at all convincing . . .

The main argument of Mr. Kent's lecture will be found in another column.

Wider Publicity for the Oxford Case

Members of the Fellowship were glad to see in the April number of *The Strand Magazine* an article entitled "April 23rd Doesn't Impress Me: Why? because: I Don't Believe in Shakespeare." by Marjorie Bowen (Mrs. Arthur Long.) In view of the virtual boycott of Oxfordian books, articles, and even letters to the Press, it is satisfactory to find that the well-known novelist succeeded in getting her article published in a periodical with a large circulation, and it is to be hoped that the argument had some effect. Letters of enquiry began to arrive immediately after publication and are still being dealt with.

In Honour of the Discoverer

On Saturday, April 13, the large Room of 33 Portman Square was filled by an eager audience who had come to hear Personal Recollections of the late J. T. Looney. The speaker was the Rev. Canon V. A. Demant, LITT.D., Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral. Dr. H. M. M. Woodward was in the Chair and in the front row were Mrs. E. Bodell and Miss G. Looney, daughters of the author of *Shakespeare Identified*, who had come to London specially for the occasion.

Canon Demant, whose "talk" was wholly biographical, recalled early days at Gilsland when he and Mr. Looney, to whom he then stood in the relation of a disciple, were drawn together by intellectual interests and by a strong feeling for the antiquities of Northumbria. Later, Mr. Looney, who concealed under the quietest exterior a searching and wide-ranging mental activity, became deeply interested in Positivism, a creed closely associated with literary and philosophical interests and with biographical research into the characters and careers of Great Men.

The speaker then emphasised the wise and tranquil disposition of the man who, far from being excited by his great discovery, showed always a keen sense of responsibility and who actually deprecated anything like eagerness to upset needlessly the convictions of people who did not comprehend his great achievement. Nobody was more completely free from the rabid or aggressive character of the "pioneer" and "reformer." Nobody was less like a "crank." If there was one word to describe him, it would be a Sage.

Short speeches were then made by several members of the Fellowship, each of whom testified to some aspect within his own experience of Mr. Looney's high character and attainments. All the speakers stressed the value of the letters received from him whenever he had been consulted, as he so often was, on points of difficulty or special interest.

Mrs. E. Bodell, after thanking the lecturer, thanked also those members of the Fellowship who had corresponded with her late Father. She said that in the retired life of his last years this correspondence was to him much more than a pleasure; it was the main business and interest of his life and had brought him very great comfort.

An Oxfordian at Stratford-on-Avon

On May 6 last Mr. Percy Allen went to Stratford, to cover the Shakespeare plays on behalf of the *Christian Science Monitor*. His visit synchronized with the delivery of three lectures on Shakespearian plays and production, by Mr. J. C. Trewin—Ivor Brown's understudy on *The Observer*—at Marie Corelli's house in Stratford, which has been bought by the British Council, under whose auspices Mr. Trewin was speaking.

Mr. Allen took an active part in the animated discussions which followed. On the third morning, he was invited by the Council to preside, and was then asked to speak, on May 10, at a specially arranged meeting, on the subject of *Lord Oxford and Shakespeare*—the first occasion upon which a non-Stratfordian has been officially invited to expound his views at Stratford-on-Avon. The meeting was well attended, and was completely successful. Col. Fordham Flower, Chairman of the Governing Board of the Memorial Theatre, suggested, with the full approval of the British Council, that, in view of the great interest aroused, Mr. Allen should return in July and give further talks. Unfortunately, however, owing to previous commitments and congestion of dates, these plans had subsequently to be cancelled, by Mr. Burbridge, the regional Director of the Council.

The Third "Brains Trust"

This was held at 33 Portman Square on Saturday, May 11, at 3 p.m. The Question-Master was Mr. J. Shera Atkinson, the "Trustees" were Messrs. T. L. Adamson, J. J. Dwyer and W. Kent, and there was a very moderate attendance of members. The questions, and consequently the answers, followed rather closely on the lines of those heard at previous discussions, notably whether the "secret" of the author-

ship was known to fellow actors of Shaksper, the reasons for concealment and so forth. The "Trustees" experienced no difficulty in dealing with them. One question recited the usual list of great writers who believed in Shaksper of Stratford; Dr. Johnson, Coleridge, Lamb, Hazlitt and so on, ending with Quiller Couch and Dover Wilson. This evoked in reply two lists of eminent men who did not: one, of English-speaking notables on both sides of the Atlantic; the other, a rather remarkable list of eminent French writers and scholars, viz.: Anatole France, Gabriel Hanotaux, Maurice Croiset, Comtesse de Noailles, Ferdinand Brunot, Maurice Barrès, Henri Bergson, Charles Bémont, Salomon Reinach, Emile Henriot, Emile Montégut, Louis Gillet, Jacques Boulenger, Prof. Gustave Rudler, Prof. Georges Connes of Dijon University, author of *Le Mystère Shaksperien*, and Prof. Abel Lefranc. It must, however, be admitted that the French list is more interesting than convincing; Elizabethan language can at times be an impalpable barrier, even to us. One cannot help recalling Madame du Deffand who told Horace Walpole that she had just read *Othello* and *Henry VI* and had been profoundly—and equally—impressed by both.

A Shakespeare "Find"

The Times of Friday, July 12, 1946, contained an interesting item of news. A bound copy of the nine Shakespearian quartos of 1619 had been found in the library of Girsby Manor, Lincoln, belonging to Sir John St. Vigor Fox. It was bought in the Sale Rooms by the well-known dealer, Ernest Maggs, for £1,000. This rare volume contained six authentic plays and three erroneously attributed to Shakespeare—all "Pirate" editions. It is the only one known to exist in this country, the only other comparable volume being that in the Folger Library at Washington.

Some day there may be a still more interesting discovery. Nobody knows what may be reposing peacefully behind some glass case that is never opened. High hopes were entertained during the great "Salvage Drive," but although many treasures came to light then, there was virtually nothing of importance about Shakespeare.

OLD AND NEW

Testimony is like an arrow shot from a long bow; the force of it depends on the strength of the hand that draws it. Argument is like an arrow shot from a cross-bow which has equal force though shot by a child.

ROBERT BOYLE (1627-1691).

Le meilleur commentaire sur un grand poète est le récit des circonstances où il a vécu.

Stendhal. *Promenades dans Rome*.

Nothing is so likely as a false theory to blind the eyes to existing evidence.

S. R. GARDINER.

When a thing is asserted as a fact, always ask who first reported it and what means he had of knowing the truth.

JAMES SPEDDING.

English Literature would have fared badly had it been solely dependent on Gloriana and Burleigh.

J. DOVER WILSON.

À La Découverte de Shakespeare

By Abel Lefranc. Paris 1945. 340 francs.

Professor Lefranc of the Institut Français and the University of Paris has followed up his *Sous Le Masque de William Shakespeare: William Stanley, Vle Comte de Derby* (2 vols. 1919) with a lengthy work intended to supplement the arguments he has already adduced*. His thesis is uncompromising: Derby was Shakespeare. Derby was the sole author of *Hamlet* and *Henry VIII* and all of it, the Sonnets and Poems, too; and nothing is specifically attributed to Oxford—or to anybody else. Members of the Fellowship will be eager to know what are the new arguments for so sweeping a conclusion and we regret that we have not space to recount them fully.

There is virtually nothing in this long and fluent argument which will upset informed Oxfordian conviction. The author insists on the aristocratic and "feudal" character of the plays and dwells with considerable exaggeration on Derby's political position and aspirations as a possible claimant to the Succession after Elizabeth. The prominence of Welsh characters and incidents is stressed and this is attributed to the Stanley property in Flintshire and to a Stanley residence at Chester. The evident knowledge of France and Italy is illustrated by various details and the Professor is careful to point out—following Montégut—the French atmosphere of *All's Well That Ends Well*. Needless to say, he expatiates on *Love's Labour's Lost* (his strongest point), and on another favourite of his, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. The little western flower was Elizabeth de Vere, whom Derby married in 1595; but what are we to make of the astounding suggestion that Oxford and his dead wife, Anne Cecil, are brought on to the stage and exhibited quarrelling as Oberon and Titania? The author himself calls it "chose à peine croyable"; but it is not credible at all. Minor points made in regard to these plays are: the Garter celebration at Windsor 1601, when Derby was invested; further details about Hélène de Tournon; the fact that Belleforest was a protégé of Margaret, Queen of Navarre; and the fact that the name of Ferdinand is used precisely in those two plays (*L.L.L.* and *The Tempest*) where the choice was left entirely to the dramatist in that he was not using any known sources.

An important part of the book is naturally that which deals with *The Tempest* and the other "late" plays. These, the so-called Romances, are truly described as being neither comedies nor tragedies, but dramas of Reconciliation, Forgiveness and Family Reunion. This is characteristically attributed to Derby's pre-occupation with the most important event in his own life, viz., the long and bitter series of law-suits brought against him by the widow and daughters of his brother Ferdinando, the fifth Earl; and the renunciation of Prospero is identified by Professor

* Slater's *Seven Shakespeares* contains (pp. 150-172) a useful summary—except for a reckless statement about the death of Ferdinando Stanley, fifth Earl of Derby.

Lefranc with the final abandonment by Derby of his dynastic claims. Moreover, these plays, particularly *The Tempest*, which has a strong strain of the "occult," are full of masques and visions and the like, as one would expect from the intimate friend of the magician-astrologer,* Dr. Dee. With all this the present reviewer is in full agreement.

The very long section devoted to *Hamlet* is an elaborate comparison with the Darnley-Mary Stuart-Bothwell mystery, the Mouse-trap Play being likened to the tragedy of the Kirk o' Field—with the consequent deduction that *Hamlet* stands in no small measure for James I. No real evidence that Derby could have written *Hamlet* is anywhere adduced, though the Professor is impressed by such details as the fact that the Castle at Edinburgh is on a high cliff whereas Elsinore Castle is at the end of a long spit of sand, that the governor of Malmo, when Bothwell was taken thither on a ship, was Rosenkrantz, while Guildenstern was the name of one of the noblemen who witnessed Bothwell's dying declaration that Mary was innocent of the murder of Darnley. On a par with all this is the notion that *Measure for Measure* is political advice offered to James I who, it seems, was much addicted to tyranny, the Gunpowder Plot being cited as an example of the discontent of James's new subjects. Finally, the Professor has convinced himself that the original of Malvolio was the Steward of the Stanley household, one William Ffarington, who was very pleased with himself and much given to fingering his chain of office. Of Alençon, Buckhurst, Sidney and Hattori in this context we hear nothing at all.

This book, therefore, adds nothing of substance to the arguments developed in *Sous Le Masque* These are obviously valid as against William Shaxper; but not as against any travelled nobleman with literary and theatrical proclivities, least of all as against

*His rock-crystal ball, used for divination, and his wax discs engraved with magical figures and names, etc., are on view at the British Museum.

THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP. (Founded 1922)

President: (Vacant).

Past Presidents: { LT.-COL. M. W. DOUGLAS, C.S.I., C.I.E.
PERCY ALLEN, ESQ.

Hon. Secretary: T. L. ADAMSON,
6 Upper Cavendish Avenue,
Finchley, N.3. (Finchley 2153).

Hon. Treasurer: J. J. DWYER,
88 Kings Court Road,
Streatham, S.W.16. (Streatham 0248).

Editor of News-Letter: J. J. DWYER.

The Hon Editor is always glad to receive MSS., letters, suggestions, etc., for publication and he counts upon the co-operation of members. Articles should, if possible, be typewritten. It is requested that the subscriptions (10/- p.a.) be sent to the Hon. Treasurer and not to the other officials.

Oxford. All that is now said about the latter is:—"Oxford, un noble seigneur aux façons entravagantes et doué de penchants littéraires"; and:—"auteur dramatique très admiré, encore que toutes ses compositions aient disparu, et qui passa pour le meilleur acteur de son temps. C'est le même personnage qui fut le beau-père de notre William et qui, probablement, n'est pas resté étranger au théâtre de Shakespeare." (Pp. 329-330.) The reader will not be surprised, after this, to be told in a footnote that the author "cannot now go into the Oxford case raised in 1920 by Mr. J. T. Looney," or to find himself briefly referred to "the excellent Life of the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford by B. M. Ward." Mr. Looney gets just another mention in a footnote, this time, about Burleigh and Thomas Cecil as Polonius and Laertes; but the Professor makes it clear that he attaches great importance to the views of Miss Lilian Winstanley, in which he was long ago anticipated by Mr. Percy Allen. He likewise has room, and attention, for the revelations of Miss E. Rickert of Chicago.

The Stratfordian chronology is generally adopted for the dating of the plays, as this obviously fits Derby (b. 1561) better than Oxford (b. 1550); thus, we are told that "the critics agree generally in dating *Hamlet* about 1600 or a little earlier." But we are not told that Admiral Holland in *Shakespeare, Oxford and Elizabethan Times*, 1933, has found in that play fifty topical allusions pointing to the year 1583, when William Stanley was a young man of twenty-two travelling abroad with his tutor, or that Thomas Nashe alluded (in his **Epistle to the Gentlemen Students of Both Universities*) to *Hamlet* as a play already well known in 1589.

Professor Lefranc has, on the one hand, tried to prove too much. Had he aimed at showing that Derby collaborated with his father-in-law, or that Derby was the "Great Reviser" and Continuator, he would have had a far easier task and I believe he would have succeeded brilliantly; on that ground, the strength of the Oxford case, which is here deliberately ignored, would have been with him and not—as it actually is—against him. On the other hand, he does not face the real difficulties of his theme. Notably, he does not touch the Sonnets, which he calls "un terrain trop mouvant." For the Derby case, that certainly is so. Whenever he does, he will, to begin with, have to provide his hero with a Fair Youth and a Dark Lady.

J. J. D.

Shakespeare and Politics

Another book worthy of attention (which did not come into our hands until after the March News-Letter had gone to press) is *The Political Characters of Shakespeare* (Macmillan, 1945, 18/-) by John Palmer. It will interest members of the Fellowship to read this study by a novelist and dramatic critic, who spent some eighteen years as an official of the League of Nations, in conjunction—and contrast—with the study of the Historical Plays by Dr. E. M. W. Tillyard which was briefly reviewed in the News-Letter for May, 1945. The comparison will, we think,

*Prefixed to Greene's *Menaphon*.

demonstrate that orthodox scholars and critics, however accomplished, are all of them addicted to reading into the Plays their own personal views and experiences, as well as their own special knowledge, and framing their interpretations accordingly. The late John Palmer (he died towards the close of 1945) has in this book made admirable studies, very much in the manner of Mr. H. Granville Barker's *Prefaces*, of Marcus Brutus, Richard of Gloucester, Richard of Bordeaux, Henry of Monmouth and Caius Marcius Coriolanus. His conclusion is that Shakespeare's attitude was one of ironic detachment, that he was impartial because he was indifferent. He had, says Palmer, no great interest in public affairs as such; his interest was in persons, their thoughts, feelings and behaviour. Faulconbridge in *King John* is "the vehicle of Shakespeare's genial contempt for the grandiloquent impostures of public life"; and Shakespeare liked Richard III best "because he was the least a humbug." The reader will, however, be quick to contrast this very personal attitude—obviously the fruit of long years at Geneva—with Dr. Tillyard's laborious argument that the two historical tetralogies are a purposeful and planned exposition of the course of English History by a philosophical student amply endowed with learning and possessed of a definite political doctrine.

Two items of interpretative criticism from the essay on *Julius Caesar*. The author holds that Ben Jonson gave the true version of what Shakespeare originally wrote about Caesar not doing wrong except with just cause (Act III, sc. 1) and that this was then purposely altered by the editors of the First Folio on account of the criticism; and that the double announcement of Portia's death (Act IV, sc. 3) is intentional. In the second instance, Brutus, who knows it already, is acting the part of the stoic politician for the benefit of his followers.

J. J. D.

Recent Publications

Parts Added to the Mirror for Magistrates. Edited by Lily B. Campbell. (Cambridge University Press, 42s.)

The author suggests that the influence of *The Mirror* on Shakespeare yet remains to be explored. Readers will remember, however, that Dr. E. M. W. Tillyard in his *Shakespeare's History Plays* has examined that question; v. News-Letter, May, 1945.

The Shakespeares and the Old Faith. By J. H. de Groot, Columbia University Press. (Obtainable through Oxford University Press, 20s.)

In addition to much other matter, this book deals with the Will of John Shakespeare—a very interesting document.

Sir Christopher Hatton: Queen Elizabeth's Favourite. By E. St. John Brooks. (Cape, 18s.)

Sources for a Biography of Shakespeare. By Sir E. K. Chambers. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, London; Cumberlege, 6s.)

Founded on lectures delivered to advanced students at Oxford before the war. Contains guidance about authentic sources and hints about "subjectivity"—including the author's own.

Shakespeare's Imagination. By Edward A. Armstrong. (Lindsay Drummond, 10/6.)

Shakespeare and Contemporary Plays

BY REAR-ADMIRAL H. H. HOLLAND, C.B.

(continued from March, 1946—p. 6.)

MEASURE FOR MEASURE (1588).

In II *Tamburlaine* (1587) there are twelve references to a treaty of peace signed by Sigismund, King of Hungary, which he most treacherously breaks. In *Measure for Measure* (i.2), we have:—

Heaven grant us its peace; but not the King of Hungary's—

OTHELLO (1588-89).

Alphonsus, King of Arragon was written by Greene about 1587, and the scene takes place near Naples. In the prologue and epilogue Venus and nine Muses appear, playing musical instruments. Venus, in the epilogue, being *drawn up in a chair*, as if to heaven. The Clown, in *Othello* (iii.1), addressing some musicians, says:—

"Why, masters, have your instruments been in Naples that they speak in the nose thus?"—
and later:—

"put up your pipes, go *vanish into air*."

Soliman and Perseda is ascribed to Kyd, and written, according to Dr. Boas, either in 1588 or a few years later. This play and *Othello* have both the same anger motif about a death-bed gift, only to be given to a prospective spouse, and eventually lost; but it is difficult to say which author copied the other.

AS YOU LIKE IT (1589-90).

There are several similarities to other plays; but they are either very slight, or it is doubtful which was the original. The hanging of verses on trees is common to Lyly's *Love's Metamorphoses* (1588) and Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (1591). Rosalind's reference to the Lord in the epilogue does, however, recall the appearance of Machiavelli, in that capacity, in Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* (1589), and Rosalind's declared ability (in her assumed disguise):—"to set her before your eyes, human as she is, and without any danger"—is reminiscent of Friar Bacon's achievements in that line.

MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR (DECEMBER, 1593).

This play has more play-references than any other. I have previously pointed out that "kissing the keeper's daughter," and the Latin grammar scene, are references to *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*; and that "let the sky rain potatoes" is a skit on Marlowe's "as sure as heaven rained manna for the Jews," in *Jew of Malta*. The scene in *Friar Bacon* where the *Brazen Head* says:—

"Time is, Time was, Time is passed, and is then broken to pieces by a hammer"—

is thus epitomized by Falstaff—"Time wears, lift up your head and mince!"

The unusual circumstances of a woman being knighted, as suggested by Mrs. Ford (ii.1), occurs in *Orlando Furioso*, Angelica being the knight in question. The beating scene of "a woman with a great beard" also occurs in *Orlando Furioso*. The scene where Robin refers to himself as a dwarf and Mrs. Page calls him a courtier, is inspired by Nano, the dwarf at the Scottish court, in Greene's *James the Fourth* (1591), where the Queen is followed by Nano in all her wanderings*. The scene about the gentleman and his coat-of-arms is borrowed from *George-a-Greene, Pinner of Wakefield* (1593) where the Pinner claims to be a gentleman, and Jenkins describes his arms as the picture of April, with a rook on one fist and a horn on the other.

When Falstaff says he will be thrown into Etna (iii.5), he is referring to the doom of *Radagon* in *Looking Glass For London and England* by Greene and Lodge (1590). He is swallowed up in a flame of fire and Magus compares the accident to those that occur in the hill of Sicily. (i.2. Etna.) Mrs. Ford's "What tempest threw this whale ashore at Windsor" refers to the same play, where the whale that casts Jonas up actually appears on the stage! Anne Page's remark that she would rather be set quick in the earth may refer to the fate of Aaron in *Titus Andronicus*, though nothing about being stoned to death (bowled to death with turnips) occurs in the play as handed down to us.

There are certain similarities of plot in *Merry Wives* and Lyly's *Mother Bombe* (1590). There is a wise woman in both, whose advice is asked, on occasion; there is cozenage in connection with a horse; and there are obstacles to the marriage of a young couple who are eventually married in disguise. Falstaff's pinching by Fairies goes back to Lyly's *Endimion*. In his *Woman of The Moon* (1591) the planets are discontented with *Nature* over her fashioning of *Pandora*; and *Mars* stirs her to strife and makes her bloody-minded. When Nym says he will incense Page to deal with poison, and possess him with yellowness, Pistol calls him "the Mars of Malcontents." (i.3.)

In Peele's *Old Wives' Tale* (1592 or 93) occurs the following rhyme:—

There is an Englishman, conquer him that can,
Come for his lady bright, to prove himself a knight,
And win his love in fight.

* Though it is no part of the purpose of this paper, is not the line (iii.2. 4)—"lead (?) mine eyes or eye your master's heels"—a misprint for "hele mine eyes"—i.e., cover them or hoodwink? It seems that a typical Elizabethan pun has been lost through the misprint.

And in *Merry Wives* (ii.1) in Falstaff's letter to Mrs. Page:—

"Thine own true knight, by day or night, or any kind of light, with all his might, for thee to fight."

2 HENRY IV. (1595-96).

The "jades of Asia," "Hiren," and "fair Calipolis," are allusions to *Tamburlaine*, *Mahomet and Hiren*, and *Battle of Alcazar*, facts noted by all commentators. There was a play by Peele, *David and Bethsabe*, written before 1594, in which Achitophel appeared. It may be referred to by Falstaff when he describes *Master Dombledon* as "a whoreson Achitophel." Similarly a lost play, *Hester and Ahasuerus*, probably had Haman as one of the characters, and is possibly being quoted when Falstaff says, "O base Assyrian knight, what is thy news?" Haman was from Agagi, apparently a part of the Assyrian Empire.

HENRY V. (1596-97).

And so I come to my last play, where the scene of Pistol being forcibly made to eat a leek (V.1) appears to be taken from *The Pinner of Wakefield* where the Pinner makes Mannering eat the seals of his "Commission to obtain victuals."

(Concluded.)

The Stratford Monument Again

I.

By H. CUTNER.

Like Mr. J. Shera Atkinson, whose excellent article in the last News-Letter I read with great interest, I find it impossible here to deal with this most important problem in detail. There are, however, one or two points which may profitably be discussed, even if briefly.

Mr. Atkinson follows Mr. M. H. Spielmann in claiming that "Dugdale and his assistants were careless and inaccurate" in making the drawings for the "Antiquities of Warkickshire," and there is no doubt that Dugdale allowed some to pass which were quite wrong. On the other hand, Mrs. C. Carmichael Stopes, who was at least on the "orthodox" side, and should be on this point with Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Spielmann, categorically declares that she considered "Dugdale and his draughtsmen wonderfully careful for their period." Moreover, there was a second edition of the "Antiquities" which was revised, corrected and expanded, *the illustrations checked*, and added to by Dr. Thomas, who was also a Warwickshire man, residing very near Stratford." (My italics.) He allowed Dugdale's representation of the monument to pass. I want the reader to bear these points in mind.

We do not know who first put up the Stratford monument or why. But supposing it was the citizens of Stratford—they did so because William Shakes-

peare was a notable citizen, or a successful business man, or a famous poet. Stratford in those days was not at all likely to have also a famous sculptor any more than now. The monument could only have been designed by a local mason, who would have been most unlikely to produce a work of art—or even a likeness. But it is obvious that if William Shakespeare had to be represented by his fellow-citizens as a business man, and as he was well known as a dealer in grain, what more suitable representation could be thought of than with his hands on a sack of malt? That is exactly what Dugdale's own drawing shows.

But Dugdale himself says clearly that the monument was "for William Shakespeare the famous poet." For him, the monument was for a poet, and *not* for a grain dealer. Now, just as the symbol for a maltster would naturally be a sack of grain, so the symbol for a famous poet would be one hand holding a pen, and the other a piece of paper. Surely Dugdale, however poor an artist he might have been, could not possibly have made a mistake here. He is out to draw a *poet* with pen and paper, and he draws him merely with a sack of grain. I utterly refuse to believe he could have made so gross an error unless the monument in front of him represented a man exactly as he drew it—a drawing which was actually passed by another editor, who checked the illustration, and who, like Dugdale, was a Warwickshire man, who must have known that William Shakespeare was a poet and not a maltster.

One of the things which has quite convinced me that the monument which Dugdale drew was altered is the way in which the beard and moustache are cut on the present monument. The style, as Greenwood pointed out, was unknown in 1616, and may well have been in fashion much later. When the change was made it is impossible to say; obviously only when the people who put up the original monument had long passed away, and when no one in Stratford was much concerned one way or the other. I think that it was this second monument which was "restored" by John Hall in 1748. The present *bust*—in my opinion—was barely touched by Hall, it had already been quietly substituted for the maltster. How much was "restored" by Hall it is quite impossible to say.

II.

Comments on Mr. Cutner's Article.

The Editor has kindly invited my remarks on Mr. Cutner's interesting article.

The evidence is all against Mrs. Stopes' view that Dugdale and his draughtsmen were careful "for their period," unless that qualification means that they were not careful by our standards. A characteristic of the period was carelessness in matters of the kind in question, and Dugdale and his assistants were flagrant offenders.

As regards Dr. William Thomas's (second) edition of Dugdale, published in 1730, Dr. Thomas clearly did not concern himself with the inaccuracies in Dugdale's engraving of the monument. The

engraving of the monument by George Vertue in 1723, seven years before Dr. Thomas, and 25 years before the alleged reconstruction of the monument in 1748, shows the monument almost as it is to-day (except for the head, for which he substituted a head copied from the Chandos portrait!) so the monument could not in 1730 have agreed with Dugdale's original engraving.

As regards the sack shown by Dugdale, Vertue correctly shows, not a sack, but a cushion, and, resting on it, in the hands of the figure, a pen and a sheet of paper as they appear now.

Mr. Cutner's conjecture that the monument may have been put up by the citizens of Stratford is inherently improbable. There is no evidence that Stratford thought highly of William Shakspeare. His statement that the monument could only have been designed by a local mason is unsupported, and conflicts with Dugdale's generally accepted attribution of it to Garaert Janssen, of Southwark. It contains detail which reappears constantly in other monuments by Garaert Janssen and his three brothers.

As regards the style of the moustache and beard, there are instances of the same fashion contemporary with Janssen's bust. See, for example, the portrait of Maurice, Prince of Orange, who died in 1625, of which a copy appears in Mr. Spielmann's book to which I referred in the March 1946 News-Letter.

I do not think there is any warrant for the suggestion that the present bust was substituted, before the 1748 "restoration," for the original one, and it appears quite improbable.

In my article in the News-Letter last March, on page 8, a printer's error (at the point to which the footnote is appended) makes the meaning obscure. I wrote "Y and Y," but the printer put only "S and T."

J. SHERA ATKINSON.

"Shakespeare's London"

A Topographical Argument

There is little London topography in the Shakespeare plays: less than most people suppose. Most of what there is now was inserted by Theobald in his edition of Shakespeare (1733). Thus "Ely House" is given as the scene of Act II, Scene I of *Richard II*, because it is known as a matter of history that John of Gaunt, "time-honoured Lancaster," died there. The incident of the strawberries being requisitioned from its garden by Richard III derives from Holinshed and More. (Happily the chapel of the old palace has not sustained much damage in the recent war.)

This is not what one would expect if Shakspeare of Stratford had written the plays. He must have

been a man about town. He probably walked much, and would get to know not only the highways but the byways of the city. There is hardly a Shakespeare's London as there is a Dickens' London. Books are written about it; they might as well be called simply "The London of Queen Elizabeth." There are more place-names in one play of Jonson—*Bartholomew Fair*—than in the whole Shakespeare canon. This is easily understood on the theory of Oxford's authorship. An earl would not walk; his means of conveyance would be the back of a horse or inside of a coach. You cannot explore a city this way. Thackeray's London is vague, like Shakespeare's. He was a gentleman of hansom cabs; Dickens's London is definite; he explored it on foot from his boyhood on, partly because he sought economy and exercise.

Is not the silence of John Stow remarkable—from the orthodox standpoint? Stow was a tailor to begin with; therefore much of the same social rank as the Stratford man. If he had heard of phenomenal literary genius on the part of the son of a Stratford burgess, surely he would have been agog with interest. *The Survey of London* (1598) is a fairly long book, and he might have mentioned this remarkable writer in dealing with Shoreditch or Southwark, where, surprisingly, he makes no allusions to the theatres. Stow also wrote *Summarie of Englyshe Chronicle* (1565); *Chronicles of England* (1580), and *Annals of England* (1592). I doubt if any living person has read them through. Here is an interesting passage I found in the last book:

Milliners or fraberdashers had not then any gloves, embroidered or trimmed with gold or silk, neither gold nor embroidered girdles and hangers, neither could they make any costly wash or perfume until about the 14th or 15th year of the Queen the rt. hon. Edward de Vere Earl of Oxford, came from Italy and brought back with him gloves, sweet bagges, a perfumed leather jerkin and other pleasant things, and that year the Queen had a pair of perfumed gloves trimmed only with four tufts or roses of coloured silk. The Queen took such pleasure in these gloves that she was pictured with the gloves upon her hands, and for many years after it was called the Earl of Oxford's perfume.

Now let us turn to the Shakespeare plays. "Give me your gloves, I'll wear them for your sake," says Portia to Bassanio. "These gloves the Count sent me, they are an excellent perfume," says Hero. "Gloves as sweet as damask roses," sings Autolycus.

Stow referred to "many a weary mile's travel" undergone in his literary labours. It is sad that he was not apparently rewarded by a sight of the writer who was not "of an age but for all time." I draw two conclusions: (1) that interest in authorship was less then than it is now; (2) that if Stow heard anything about the matter it was not of a surprising character. It would have been very surprising to hear that the Stratford man was the writer. Stow cannot be called in evidence for him.

W. KENT.