

The Shakespeare Fellowship News-Letter

MARCH, 1947

*

President: REAR-ADMIRAL H. H. HOLLAND, C.B.

EDITORIAL NOTES

The Annual General Meeting

There was an average attendance at the Annual General Meeting on the 14th September, 1946.

The Hon. Secretary, reviewing the activities of the Fellowship in the first post-war season, said that the most interesting of the meetings had been the one at which Canon Demant had told them of his personal recollections of the late Mr. J. T. Looney. Four Fellowship "Brains Trusts" had been held; one of these, at Kingsway Hall, Holborn, had aroused the interest of an audience of about one hundred and fifty in the authorship of the seventeenth Earl of Oxford. The ten meetings had all been the subject of notice in the News-Letter.

The Hon. Treasurer in a brief statement explained that owing to the exceptional number of meetings in the past session the expenditure had been comparatively heavy and had exceeded the amount of the receipts during the same period. It had been due to the generous donations of two members that we had been able to print and circulate the paper on "Italian Art in the Poems and Plays of Shakespeare." The number of paying members, he said, was now about 70 and figures were then given for the various items of income and expenditure.

Rear-Admiral H. H. Holland, C.B., was elected to the vacant Presidency. By his own express desire he was to hold office for one year only.

The Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Arthur Long, Mrs. E. Turner Clark (U.S.A.) and Professor Abel Lefranc (Paris), were re-elected and Canon V. A. Demant, Litt.D., Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral, (who was then in the United States), was elected *in absentia*.

Mr. J. J. Dwyer accepted re-election to the posts of Hon. Editor of the News-Letter and Hon. Treasurer, but again expressed his strong desire that he should be relieved of the latter post in the near future.

Mr. T. L. Adamson who was re-elected to the Hon. Secretaryship intimated that he would not be available for longer than twelve months in that position. He mentioned this in order to give ample time for the choice of a successor.

Messrs. J. Shera Atkinson, W. Kent and Dr. H. M. M. Woodward were re-elected as members of the Committee, the Hon. Secretary and Hon. Treasurer being members *ex officio*. As it was improbable that the President would be able to attend ordinary Committee meetings, Mr. T. L. Adamson was elected Chairman of the Committee.

Abstracts and Brief Chronicles

Who Wrote "The Tempest"?

On Saturday October 19, 1946, at 33 Portman Square, W.1, Miss Katharine Eggar, A.R.A.M., read a Paper on this important and much-discussed question. The lecturer explained that the Paper was originally undertaken in an attempt to persuade the late J. T. Looney that he was mistaken in his conclusion that *The Tempest* was written by another hand, after the death of Oxford in 1604. Looney's catalogue of objections and difficulties, contained in Appendix I to *Shakespeare Identified* (pp. 503-30) was fully and clearly summarised and Miss Eggar then addressed herself to the formidable task of proving the Oxford authorship. The line taken was psychological interpretation and there was no examination of possible sources written or published before or after June 1604. The play, in her opinion, came into existence in special and indeed unique circumstances and did not therefore fit into any scheme of classification. It was written to order, the last work of an ailing and tired man, suffering from a double depression caused by the death of the Great Queen and the difficulties brought upon him by the piratical publication of *Hamlet*. At this unpropitious moment he was suddenly ordered by the new king to produce a play with a masque for the entertainment of the Court. James I had been amused by *Cynthia's Revels* and wanted something more or less in that vein. Moreover, he had brought with him to London a crowd of uncultured Scottish nobles and their followers who were all of them wholly unacquainted with the literary atmosphere of Elizabeth's Court and on whom a comedy of urban manners and subtle word-play would have been wasted. Oxford therefore watered down his own style and intentionally produced something which was admittedly unlike his other plays, but which he deemed suitable to the new audience. On the other hand the elements of magic, of classical mythology and of a certain mystical philosophy were all such as to commend the work to the bookish and pedantic King. The lecturer put forward this interpretation explicitly as her personal interpretation of the play, which she asked the audience "to take on trust."

In the latter part of her lecture, Miss Eggar stated that at the first Court performance the part of Prospero must have been played by Oxford himself. In this play he speaks to us with his own voice, especially in the Epilogue. Miranda was played by

his daughter, Susan, (afterwards Countess of Montgomery), and the delicate restraint of the scenes between Ferdinand and Miranda was doubtless intended to be a lesson in manners to the new courtiers from the North. That Prospero's words were Oxford's farewell to the Stage and to the World there could be no doubt, and that is why *The Tempest* had always held so high a place in the general estimation. It was for this reason and because it had been expressly commanded by James I that it was given the place of honour in the Poet's collected works, the First Folio.

The discussion was opened by Mr. H. Cutner who paid tribute to the literary charm of the Paper but could not accept the argument. He pointed out that there had been far back in the nineteenth century a chain of critics and commentators who had given reasons for dating the play about 1610 or 1611. He then spoke of the various allegorical interpretations that had been put forward and indicated that he was disposed more or less to agree with them.

Mr. J. J. Dwyer observed that there were two other well-known attributions of the authorship, viz. to Raleigh and to Derby. It was unfortunate that there was nobody there to present the case for Raleigh of which a good deal, he believed,* had been formerly heard in Fellowship discussions. He, the speaker, was inclined, on *a priori* grounds even, to reject the attribution to Raleigh. He felt sure than any play written by Raleigh would have been far less colourless, far more pungent, far more characteristic of the personality and experience of that famous adventurer. It would almost certainly have been patriotic, pugnacious, Protestant, and very anti-Spanish.

Mr. Dwyer then dwelt upon the peculiar metrical defects of *The Tempest* and declared that to him it was obviously written by somebody very different from Oxford, by somebody who had not started as a poet, who had had no practice, as Oxford had had, in lyric and elegiac verse, by a writer, in short, who was quite regardless both of melody and prosody and—to judge by the scores of almost unscannable lines—not very capable of either. It was as different from the voice of Oxford as that of Browning from Tennyson. The play in his opinion was not unique but clearly belonged to that "late" group of dramas—neither Comedies nor Tragedies—about lost children, shipwrecks and banishments followed by reunion and reconciliation, which were commonly called the Romances. He himself was inclined to believe that this group which had many striking features in common—*The Tempest*, *Cymbeline*; most of *A Winter's Tale*, and *Pericles*—was the work of Derby, although there were difficulties about that. In any case, no real evidence had been adduced against Looney's powerful argument and the Lecturer's case was, in her own words, "a parcel of speculation," prompted by sympathetic imagination.

Mr. J. Spera Atkinson, while expressing his appre-

* Raleigh has also been suggested as the "Rival Poet" of the Sonnets.

ciation of the Paper, pointed out that even though it was founded on conjecture one should remember that, in the absence of clear evidence, a valuable method of approach to a problem is to make a conjecture and then examine how far it can be fitted to the known facts. On the whole, however, he concurred with the view of Mr. Dwyer. The discussion was continued by Dr. Watkin, by a visitor, and by Mr. T. L. Adamson who did not consider that Oxford could have changed his style in so marked a manner. None of the speakers found himself able to accept the Oxfordian authorship.

The suggested Raleigh authorship was hardly discussed at all but it was pointed out that there were extant at the end of the sixteenth century many narratives of discovery, adventure, shipwreck and the like which could have served as possible sources. Some of these were: Eden's *Historye of Travaile in the East and West Indies*, 1577, (in which Setebos is to be found); the description in Ariosto of "the great tempest," translated by Harrington, 1591; Raleigh's *Discovery of the Empire of Guiana*, 1596; Hakluyt's "Voyages," 1598; Brereton's *Briefe and True Relation of the Discovery of the North Part of Virginia*, 1602 and "A Prosperous Voyage in the Discovery of the North Part of Virginia" by Captain G. Weymouth, 1605.

By far the most important, however, was Silvester Jourdain's pamphlet: *A Discovery of the Bermudas*, otherwise called the "Isle of Divels," published in 1610, which had always been regarded as the documentary basis of the play.

Correction

The News-Letter for September, 1946, (p. 3 col. 2), contains a list of names of distinguished French scholars and men-of-letters who do not (or did not) hold the orthodox Stratfordian belief. In it will be found that of Professor Georges Connes, author of *Le Mystère Shakespérien*. M. Connes now writes to disclaim such unorthodoxy, and we must of course accept his assurance.

Lecture by Miss Marjorie Bowen

On Saturday, November 9th, 1946, a large company assembled at the City Literary Institute, Stukely Street, Drury Lane, where the Concert Hall had been very kindly placed at the disposal of the Fellowship by the Principal of the Institute, Mr. T. G. Williams, M.A., F.R. HIST. SOC. The occasion was exceptional as Mrs. Arthur Long (Marjorie Bowen) had consented to give a talk entitled, "Why I Believe that the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford wrote the plays of Shakespeare." With the Lecturer on the platform were Rear-Admiral H. H. Holland, C.B., President of the Fellowship, Mr. T. L. Adamson and Mr. William Kent.

Mrs. Long, who explicitly disclaimed all specialist study or research, began by paying a tribute to the late J. T. Looney, the discoverer of Oxford as Shakespeare, and to those who since 1922 had carried on the active work of the Fellowship. Her own position had always been that of a disciple.

but from the first she had been struck by two remarkable facts: that there was an enormous gap between what was known of William Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon and the vast range of reading, knowledge and experience exhibited in the Plays; and, secondly, that no attempt whatsoever to deal with the problem was ever made by orthodox and academic scholars. Not only Baconian but Oxfordian and all other queries and arguments were simply ignored or met with a blank denial that there was any case to answer. Such an attitude was, in her opinion, discreditable to English scholarship. Far more was to be expected, and would doubtless be forthcoming, from the alert intellectual activity devoted to the subject in the U.S.A.

Mrs. Long, after reading a short encyclopedia biography of Shakespeare, with "perhaps" "probably" and "presumably" in every line of it, proceeded to refute the common idea that there was a certain snobbery in refusing to believe in the authorship of the youth from Warwickshire and in "preferring a Lord Chancellor or a nobleman of high lineage." Passing in review the remarkable pronouncements of Alexander Pope, (who sensed but did not investigate the mystery), of Dr. Samuel Johnson, of Coleridge, of Landor and others, Mrs. Long showed how her own methods as an historical novelist had led her to probe into historical mysteries and how she had met with success through disregarding the conventional statements and repetitions of historians. Those methods had convinced her of the truth of *Shakespeare Identified*.

Looney had not begun by looking for evidence that Oxford was Shakespeare. He began by looking for somebody whose character and experience corresponded with the multiple indications in the Plays and the Sonnets. Obviously, it had to be a poet, and among the Elizabethan poets he had discovered Oxford, *of whom he had no previous knowledge*. The more he found out about Oxford, the more clearly he saw that Oxford, and nobody else, fulfilled the requisite conditions. The demonstration was complete and fascinating and had convinced and converted her.

The Lecturer quoted the opinion of psychologists and psychiatrists as to the virtual impossibility of the received Stratfordian story and reminded her hearers that while no confirmation of it had ever been produced by all the Shakespearian research, hundreds of facts had been unearthed, and were still being unearthed, which every one of them helped to corroborate Looney's discovery.

In conclusion, Mrs. Long referred to the striking material proof provided by Mr. C. W. Barrett's infra-red ray photographs of the Ashbourne Portrait. These had revealed the fact that underneath the likeness of "Shakespeare" lay a portrait of Oxford by Cornelius Ketel, the Dutch portrait painter, and in the top left-hand corner of the picture was the scutcheon of Elizabeth Trentham, Oxford's second wife, carefully covered over with paint. The actual portraits of Shakespeare were really disguised and transformed portraits of the Earl of Oxford.

Mrs. Long's address was heard with close attention by the large audience and loudly applauded at its close.

Admiral H. H. Holland in moving a Vote of Thanks to the Lecturer pointed out that the chronological interval between Edward de Vere (1550-1604) and W. Shakspeare (1564-1616) made all the difference in understanding the numerous allusions to contemporary events and so forth that abound in the Plays. Orthodox scholars had looked in the wrong places—fifteen years or more too late—and consequently had failed to find them. People who said, "we have the plays, so it does not matter," were completely mistaken; through not understanding the illusions, they had *not* got the plays.

The Vote of Thanks was gracefully seconded from the audience by Mrs. M. H. Robins who then and there announced her adhesion to the Fellowship.

Shakespeare in East Anglia

On Saturday, December 15th, 1946, at 33 Portman Square, W.1, Mr. Percy Allen gave a talk on *Cymbeline*. Taking as the basis of his talk the late Canon Rendall's pamphlet, *Shakespeare in East Anglia*, Mr. Allen adopted the main opinions therein set forth, viz., that the nucleus of the play was a short and early work of Oxford, probably written in 1578, on the occasion of the Royal Progress in Essex in that year, and was to be identified with *An history of the crewelties of a Stepmother*. This was one of the plays performed at Court by the Lord Chamberlain's Company and the St. Paul's Boys at that time, as pointed out by Mrs. E. T. Clark.

Mr. Allen then spoke of the effectiveness of *Cymbeline* as a stage-play, although it was so full of absurdities, and he agreed that it was closely akin to *The Tempest*, *A Winter's Tale*, and *Pericles*. He then indicated some of the numerous passages which were clearly imitative of more celebrated passages in undoubted Oxford plays, and said that the reviser, who had expanded the Oxford nucleus into the play as we have it, had obviously imitated passages from *Anthony and Cleopatra*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Macbeth* and so forth.

Mr. Allen laid great stress on the geographical setting of the play, insisting that all the scenes were laid in the Long Melford and Lavenham region, "the Oxford Country" which he knew well. He wholly denied that Wales, the mountains, and Milford Haven (so often mentioned in the text), had any real meaning. Posthumus Leonatus was Oxford and Imogen was Anne Cecil.

As regards authorship, it was his positive opinion that the expanded version as it appears in the Folio was wholly the work of Fletcher.

The discussion, to which Messrs. H. Cutner, W. Kent and J. J. Dwyer contributed, touched upon the origin of the names *Cymbeline*, *Cassibelan* and *Iachimo*; the imitative passages; the geographical question, e.g., *Cambria*, *Milford Haven* and the disguised names *Morgan* and *Cadwal*, and the possibility of the full-length version having been written

by Derby. On the point of the imitations, everybody appeared to be in agreement. Nobody, including the Lecturer, said anything at all about Fletcher.

Shakespeare's London

Mr. William Kent's lecture to the Shakespeare Fellowship with the above title on 10th January, 1947, covered a wide range, but, in view of the limitations of space, our report must be restricted to one aspect.

He opened by remarking that the most-quoted passage from the plays that has been applied to London is to be found in *Twelfth Night*.

"I pray you let us satisfy our eyes

With the memorials and the things of fame
That do renown this City."

Yet this applied to that mythical country of Illyria. It was, however, appropriate that this should be. It had been asserted by orthodox and heterodox alike that the author of the plays had a great knowledge of Italy, but nobody had ever claimed that he had a remarkable knowledge of London life. In this field Ben Jonson and Beaumont and Fletcher were superior. If the Earl of Oxford was more familiar with foreign countries than with the great City, he was not the only nobleman who had this propensity. In the eighteenth century the Earl of Burlington, a connoisseur of the arts, greatly admired a church in Rome. He was told it was a copy of St. Stephen's Walbrook, which he had not seen. The story goes that when he again reached London he hastened to the Church and viewed it by candlelight. Oxford, no doubt, did most of his travelling in London on horseback or by coach. London was not to be known this way. It was desirable to go on foot. The Stratford Shakespeare must have so proceeded, and this comparatively small interest in the metropolis did not fit what we may presume was his character. There are allusions to London buildings in the plays, e.g., Baynard's Castle, Crosby Hall, Ely Place, but they are all derived from Holinshed, Hall or Sir Thomas More. There was nothing to suggest special interest or knowledge on the part of the author.

It was a surprise to some to know that there is no reference directly connecting Shakespeare with "The Mermaid," and it is remarkable that Beaumont's lines about the tavern were addressed to Jonson. "When half-gods go the gods arrive," wrote Emerson. Why did Beaumont want to address the half-god, if the greater haunted that famous tavern? Even the Boar's Head was not actually mentioned by name, though there seemed to be an allusion to it in *Henry IV*, "Doth the old boar feed in the old frank?" asks Prince Hal, and Bardolph replies: "At the old place, my lord, in Eastcheap." One would not expect the Lord Great Chamberlain to be a great haunter of taverns.

Where did Shakespeare live? According to Malone, on Bankside in 1596, but he gave no authority, and it has been suggested that this was said in view of the proximity of the Globe Theatre which he forgot was not erected until the end of 1598. There was, however, great excitement when

in March, 1910, Professor C. W. Wallace of Nebraska University published a long article in *Harper's Magazine*. In the Public Record Office he had found papers in the case of Mountjoy v. Bellot. They included a deposition of William Shakspear of Stratford-on-Avon, Gentleman, of the age of 48 years or thereabouts. It appeared that Shakspear had assisted in negotiating a marriage between Bellott, an apprentice, and his master's daughter, and that in 1604 he had lived in a house at the corner of Monkwell Street and Silver Street, Cripplegate. On this Professor Wallace listed eight plays which Shakespeare must have written there, though half of them, on orthodox shewing, had been produced earlier, and waxed eloquent about the kindly compliment he had paid his landlord in introducing his name into *Henry V*! Yet Montjoy was the official title of the French Herald, and is in Holinshed! Professor Wallace further romanced as follows:

"Those who, with Tolstoi, charge Shakespeare with being an aristocrat devoid of sympathy with democratic ideals, and having no community with common clay, may pause for a moment of enlightenment from the daily life of the poet during these days when he was writing the very plays of supposed aristocratic unsympathy. That Shakespeare lived with a hard working family, shared in their daily life and even lent his help with the hope of making two young people happy, makes him as the world would gladly know him an unpretentious, sympathetic, thoroughly human man."

With regard to the possibility of Oxford having been buried in Westminster Abbey, Mr. Kent cited the case of Major André, hanged by order of Washington as a British spy during the War of American Independence. Forty years later his body was disinterred and re-buried at Westminster. In Colonel Chester's volume dealing with the Abbey registers there was no record of the burial. If this fact was omitted from the records in 1820 it was hardly likely that two hundred years earlier anyone would have troubled to record the removal of the body of De Vere. His son, the 18th Earl was buried in the Abbey, and it was likely that the more important father would have been similarly honoured.

Mr. Kent concluded by quoting a passage from his *London for Shakespeare Lovers* in which, referring to George Eliot, he wrote as follows:

"She wrote as large a proportion of her work in London, as did Shakespeare, and yet only in her last novel, *Daniel Deronda* does it appear. Dickens, on the other hand, introduces it into almost every book. George Eliot, like Shakespeare, lived more in the mind. She hated crowds. Shakespeare was fond of good fellowship doubtless, but it was the felicity of the tavern chair that Jonson enjoyed, rather than the teeming streets. He liked London, but not too much of it. He who made Prospero say when contemplating retirement to Milan that 'every third thought shall be my grave,' felt he could have too much of men."

When Mr. Kent wrote that he was an orthodox Stratfordian and he was surprised now to find how well it fitted Oxford. Thomas Looney wrote, "For he who was supposed to be sitting in 'idle cell' had already spoken of himself, in an early lyric as one

'That never am less idle lo!
Than when I am alone.'

In this matter Oxford was like George Eliot and Ben Jonson was like Dickens.

"That the theories of the Oxford, Derby, and Rutland advocates have been torn to tatters again and again," was a note by the Editor in the issue of *Baconiana* for October, 1946. Mr. Kent addressed a letter to the Editor commenting on this and other matters, but publication was refused.

NOTE.—The church of St. Stephen, Walbrook, was damaged by bombs but has been restored and is now open. The City Corporation, in 1923, placed a plaque on the Coopers' Arms, which was on the site of the "Shakespeare house." The tavern and the plaque have been entirely destroyed.

"Brains Trust"

On Wednesday October 30, 1946, a second external "Brains Trust" was provided by the Fellowship, this time at the Community Centre, Clifton Gardens, Maida Vale. The "Trustees" who were: Miss Katharine Eggar, A.R.A.M., and Messrs. T. L. Adamson, H. Cutner, and W. Kent, had a comparatively easy task in answering the questions put to them.

Queen Elizabeth and Her Turk

We are indebted to Mr. W. Ringland Robinson, a valued member of the Fellowship, for the explanation of this curious phrase, well known to all Oxfordians. In the course of an interesting letter to the Hon. Editor, Mr. Robinson stated that he had recently met with the name, "Bridge (Brigg) of Turk" both in Scott's *Old Mortality* and in *The Lady of the Lake* (Canto I, stanza 6), and that he had then found in a glossary the following:

"Turk—probably so called from the Gaelic *torc*, a wild boar: pronounced Turk."

Admiral Holland, consulted by the Hon. Editor, then drew attention to a passage in the article on Celtic Literature (Ency. Brit. 9th Ed., Vol. 5, p. 322), dealing with the story of Kilhwch and Olwen, a "mixed romance," i.e., both Welsh and Irish. Kilhwch seeks to get Olwen for his wife and has first to perform certain tasks, one of which is to fetch the comb and scissors which were between the ears of Twrch Trwyth. Now Twrch Trwyth is, in the Irish form, Torc Triath, the King Boar. According to all the Gaelic dictionaries (enquiry has been duly made), *torc* means boar. We thus get Trwyth the Boar, as in Andrew Lang's "Lilac Fairy Book" dealing with this and other stories from the Mabinogion.

Admiral Holland was quick to see that the pronunciation of Trwyth is very close to the English

word *Truth*, and so this typically Elizabethan piece of word-play is revealed. As soon as the Queen heard of this story, Oxford, whose device was the *Boar*, and whose motto was *Truth*, became her Turk.

The Portraits of Shakespeare

On February 8th last, Mr. H. Cutner gave a very interesting address on "Shakespeare's Portraits" before the Shakespeare Fellowship. It produced a stimulating discussion in which, among others, Mr. W. Kent (who was in the chair), Mr. Percy Allen, and Mr. J. S. Atkinson, took part. The following is a summary of the address:—

The one distinguishing feature of all, or almost all, the painted portraits of Shakespeare is the high forehead. The Jansen, the Flower, the Chandos, and other well-known portraits, displayed this superb forehead, culminating in the Felton Portrait, where it appears almost as a monstrosity. Mr. John Corbin, in his "New Portrait of Shakespeare," accepted it as the authentic symbol of intellectual power, while Mr. Malcom Saloman, in his Introduction to "Shakespeare in Pictorial Art," enthusiastically tells us that he "feels" the Bard must have looked exactly like that. Fortunately for most of us, the great *orthodox* expert on the portraits is Mr. M. H. Spielmann, and he roundly declares that ALL the portraits of Shakespeare except two are "frauds"—that is, they were not painted in Shakespeare's lifetime, but made up by unknown artists long afterwards. Mr. John Corbin relates how a famous factory, run by two artists, used to turn out as many "authentic" portraits, with full genealogies, as a market could be found for, and an entertaining account it is. Let us, therefore, leave the fraudulent portraits for the time being, and turn to those Mr. Spielmann considers the genuine ones. They are the Droeshout Engraving prefixed to the First Folio, and the Stratford Monument.

There appears to be no doubt that a monument was erected to the memory of William Shakespeare sometime between 1616 and 1623, but the real question is: was it to the memory of a poet, or a worthy citizen? If to a poet, then it is very strange that we have no evidence that his contemporaries in Stratford ever referred to him as a Poet, or as the "Sweet Swan of Avon," or ever invited any company of players to perform his plays there during his lifetime. Did they not know, then, that, at the request of the great Queen Elizabeth herself, their fellow-citizen had written, "The Merry Wives of Windsor" in two weeks? It seems incredible that if the people who put up the monument knew him only as a maltster, they could have put in one hand a pen and in the other some paper—the well-known symbols of a poet. What does contemporary evidence prove?

We have luckily the actual drawing made by the great antiquarian, William Dugdale, of the monument, with his own pencilled notes in the margin—and it is quite a good drawing, and proves his skill as a draughtsman. He had it engraved for his great work, "The Antiquities of Warwickshire." as

"Turk."

the Monument in Stratford Church of William Shakespeare the Poet. Though he must have known that the symbols of a poet were a pen and paper, he actually drew an oldish-looking man, hugging a sack of corn to his breast—which is exactly the kind of monument the maltster's friends would have put up. We have contemporary evidence also that it must have been a very good likeness, for in Gustavus Silenus' work on Cryptography published in 1624, the title-page shows a cryptic drawing, obviously representing Bacon handing a paper to an oldish man looking almost exactly like the worthy citizen of the Monument; *and carrying a spear*. The only way Spielmann can do away with the evidence that the present monument is not the one originally put up is by discrediting Dugdale—and in this he signally fails, for other editions of the "Antiquities," edited by Warwickshire men reproduced the same engraving. There can be no reasonable doubt that a new monument was put up, perhaps 100 years later, and some of the evidence for that is given by Greenwood in his small book on the problem.

As for the Droeshout print, it is the work of a very immature artist and engraver. It is not a mask, and is certainly not anything like the old man shown by Dugdale. But when compared with the famous Welbeck portrait of Edward de Vere, it has extraordinary points of resemblance. It proves that Droeshout undoubtedly had that portrait in front of him—though he tried to show an older and more sedate man, a Great Bard, in fact. Capt. B. R. Saunders, M.C., is now making some exact measurements of the painting and the engraving, and so far his investigations confirm the fact that it is Edward de Vere who is behind the Droeshout Engraving.

The lecturer then dealt with some of the actual technical difficulties in copperplate engraving. One thing, he said, emerges clearly. Behind the portraits is the seventeenth Earl of Oxford. Even in the Ashbourne portrait of Shakespeare we have the Earl, and in the Hampton Court portrait of Shakespeare he is carrying the Sword of State! More and more is it being recognised that the great mind behind the Plays is Edward de Vere.

Personal

With this issue the present Editor relinquishes the charge of the Shakespeare Fellowship News-Letter and hereby announces his resignation of his membership.

THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP. (Founded 1922)

President: REAR-ADMIRAL H. H. HOLLAND, C.B.

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).

Old and New

Let a man be born ten years sooner or ten years later, his whole aspect and performance shall be different.

GOETHE.

Shakespearean criticism will always change as the world changes.

T. S. ELIOT.

A new chronology of Shakespeare's work requires to be constructed.

A. S. CAIRNCROSS.

The worst of folk is that they are so unable to understand the poet's mind. I describe something which is the result of the impression of a hundred sights and scenes woven into one, and first one localises it here and then another localises it there, and they pin me down to this spot and this meaning till they make me almost sorry I had written at all.

TENNYSON.

Much Ado About Nothing and The Shepherd's Calendar

By

REAR-ADMIRAL H. H. HOLLAND

It has been observed frequently by orthodox students that Shakespeare makes no references at any time to Spenser. The explanation is that they have not known where to look for them: orthodoxy's greatest handicap is its dates.

The Shepherd's Calendar with E. K. as its commentator was published in the winter of 1579-80 the poem being written in monthly "Æglogues" [Eclogues].

Much Ado About Nothing I believe to have been written in 1581. Let the play and poem speak for themselves, the play first.

Preface

Outcast (1)

Beatrice: "I am sunburnt, I may sit in a corner" (II.1.295). Glossaries define sunburnt as meaning unattractive through loss of complexion but I doubt the correctness of this.

In the preface E. K. grants that Spenser's words are, "something hard and of most men unused," and then adds, "how could it be that walking in the sun, although for other causes he walked, yet he needs must be sunburnt." Sunburnt most certainly does not refer to Spenser's weather-beaten complexion. It seems to be derived from the proverb: "Out of God's blessing into the sun," and means outcast or debased.

In Beatrice's case it might be described best as being a Cinderella, and Shakespeare had E. K.'s preface in mind when he uses the word. E. K. possibly coined this meaning of sunburnt as a corollary to "Into the sun." (Incidentally Shakespeare only uses this meaning of sunburnt in *Troilus and Cressida* besides *Much Ado*).

January

(2)

Beatrice: He (Benedick) is sooner caught than the pestilence and the taker runs presently mad . . .

Leonato: You will never run mad, niece.

Beatrice: No! not till a warm January. (I.1.86-94).

By the context Leonato evidently means that she will not catch Benedick. Colin Clout complains to the "Gods of love that such rage as winter's reigneth in his heart," that "his life-blood freezeth with unkindly cold," and that his "lustful leaf is dry and sere." He puts it down, as stated in the argument, to the "sad season of the year," to the same reasons as cause the "Frosty ground" and the "Frozen trees."

Beatrice means that it will have to be a warm January for Benedick to become sufficiently amorous for her to catch him.

February

(3)

Benedick: O she misused me past the endurance of a block.

An oak with one green leaf on it would have answered her (II.1.220).

In Thenot's Fable of the Oak and the Briar, the oak had no leaves and the briar addressed it thus:

"Why standest there (quoth he) thou brutish block?

Nor for fruit nor for shadows serves thy stock;

. . . . So spake the bold briar with great disdain:

Little him answered the oak again"
Benedick has this fable in his mind.

(4)

Don Pedro: You have lost the heart of Signior Benedick.

Beatrice: Indeed my lord he lent it me once (II.1.255).

Whether there is a proverb involved in this I don't know, but compare Thenot's remark, "Thou art a fool of thy love to boast, All that is lent to love will be lost."

(5)

Benedick: "But that I will . . . hang my bugle in an invisible baldrick all women shall pardon me." (I.1.223).

The meaning is obscure but Cuddie makes a similar reference:

"But Phyllis is mine for many days.

I won her with a girdle of gelt,

Embossed with bugle about the belt."

Perhaps Benedick means that he has no intention of winning a woman that way (with a double meaning of "bugle" the bead and bugle-horn).

March

(6)

Let us now consider Benedick's character. He proclaims himself indifferent to women and that he intends to remain a bachelor. (I.1.248). Describing Thomalin in the Argument, E. K. says he was: "some secret friend who scorned love and his knights so long till at length himself was entangled and unawares wounded with the dart of some beautiful regard which is Cupid's arrow."

(7)

"He (Benedick) challenged Cupid at the flight.

and my Uncies' fool reading the challenge subscribed for Cupid and challenged him at the bird-bolt." (I.1.38).

The Fool apparently made a laughing stock of him by stipulating on Cupid's behalf for a trivial weapon, but it was the weapon that Thomalin used when having seen "the little God" in "an Ivy Tod," he fought a duel with him, eventually using "pumice stones" to throw at him when his bolts were exhausted.

(8)

Beatrice (addressing Margaret): "Yes light o' love with your heels." (III.4.43).

Thomalin was finally wounded by Cupid in the heel and E. K. says: "By wounding in the heel is meant lustful love" (and he gives certain anatomical reasons). Consequently, he says, "Spenser made the Shepherd boy of purpose wounded by love in the heel." Beatrice had evidently summed up Margaret all right.

(9)

Beatrice: "I had rather hear my dog bark at a crow than a man swear he loves me." (I.1.121).

Willy then tells Thomalin a story how his father once caught Love "entangled in a fowling-net which he for carrion crows had set." Beatrice suggests that she would rather have caught the crow.

(10)

Claudio and Don Pedro (talking about Beatrice): "She is exceeding wise in everything but loving Benedick." (II.3.156).

The characters in each Eclogue have a poetic emblem and Willy's emblem is: "To be wise and eke to love is granted scarce to gods above." (Actually this is quoted more exactly in *Troilus and Cressida* which, as *Agamemnon and Ulysses*, was probably written in 1580). The original is a Latin maxim of Publius Syrus.

April

(11)

When Claudio falls in love with Hero, Benedick—talking about her, says: "Would you buy her that you inquire after her?" (I.1.164).

This somewhat cynical suggestion has its counterpart in Hobbinol's remark:

Sicker I hold him for a greater fon (fool)

That loves the thing he cannot purchase.

May

(12)

When Benedick eavesdrops in the orchard, Claudio says: "We'll fit the kid-fox with a penny-worth." (II.3.42).

Latest commentators change "kid" to "hid" as they do not recognise the allusion. It is really one of those antithetical double nouns of which Shakespeare is so fond, such as uncle-father and giant-dwarf and means that though Benedick thinks he is being cunning as a fox he is really going to prove himself as credulous as a kid: and pennyworth refers to peddling.

Piers tells the fable of the Fox and the Kid, wherein the fox disguised as a pedlar gets into the kid's home while his mother is away and carries him off. Claudio has this fable in his mind.

(13)

Dogberry: "They that touch pitch will be defiled." (III.3.54).

This Biblical proverb is quoted by Piers, "who touches pitch must needs be defiled."

September

(14)

At the sepulchre after Claudio's ceremony at Hero's tomb, Don Pedro says: "Masters, put your torches out. *The wolves have preyed.* (V.3.24).

What is he referring to? Certainly Hero must be the prey. By this time Don Pedro knows that the plot was hatched by Don John and carried out by Borachio with Margaret an accessory (even if an unwilling one), to the act. These three therefore are the wolves and Don Pedro also knows by now that the deception was due to Margaret dressing up in Hero's garments. It seems evident, therefore, that when he talks of wolves he has the wolf in sheep's clothing in his mind.

This Fable is related to Hobbinol by Diggon in the September Eclogue of the *Shepherd's Calendar* and is the last parallel that I have come across.

No doubt when Don Pedro said preyed he had a double and bitterly sarcastic meaning also. Recall his and Claudio's part in the transaction and their belated atonement at the sepulchre, he says, so far as sound is concerned, "*The wolves have preyed.*"

In giving these fourteen parallels I do not suggest for one moment that Shakespeare did not already know the proverbs and the fables concerned. What I do suggest is that *The Shepherd's Calendar* recalled them to his mind and that he deliberately refers to them as a mark of appreciation of Spenser's poem and as evidence that he had read it carefully.

Orthodox Ineptitude

By W. KENT.

"Let knowledge grow from more to more," wrote Tennyson. Its increase must needs bring confusion to the ranks of those unwilling to learn. This is abundantly evident in the case of the Shakespeare controversy.

For some time past I have baited Southwark worthies over their hero. Annually on "Shakespeare Day" (at the end of April), the author of the plays is claimed to have been a Southwarkian. Each successive mayor, with not the slightest suspicion of Shakespearean erudition, passes on the myth. In *The South London Press* I challenged the Mayor, Aldermen, Councillors and Clergy of Southwark to a debate on the issue. None of them responded. A substitute, however, was forthcoming in the person of a Camberwell man, Mr. William Margrie (founder of the London Explorers' Club), and the debate took place under the auspices of John o'London's Circle on 21st November, when the audience numbered about eighty.

Mr. Margrie, who opened, was so ill provided with matter that he had resumed his seat ten minutes before time. He quoted irrelevant passages from Tucker Brooke, a professor popular a genera-

tion ago who had never tackled the authorship question. He emphasised that there were "eye-witnesses" to the Stratford man! I pointed out that neither Stratfordian, Baconian nor Oxfordian had ever made this astonishing statement or claimed that any single person saw the plays being written—the only meaning to be attached to such a term. Margrie did not attempt any answer to my numerous questions. His defence was simply that many well-known people had subscribed to his faith. He had urged that there should be a vote taken, and I had agreed provided a majority were willing to signify their opinion. As only about eight were, no vote was taken. I am sure some of these eight would have voted for me. At any rate, as only about four present, so far as I knew, had any pre-conceived ideas on the subject, there was a great inrush of agnosticism as a result of my efforts. Amongst the audience was Canon Stevens who on "Shakespeare Day" for many years past has conducted a large party round Bankside. Long ago vainly I challenged him to debate.

On 9th November, 1946, at the Elizabethan Literary Society, Mr. F. C. Owlett (author of *The Spacious Days* and other essays), opened on "Shakespeare the Man." This was an astonishing performance even for an orthodox champion. A blind eye was turned towards all the Stratford documents, the only reference to the town being to rejoice exceedingly that our great national bard has been born in the centre of England! He was, according to Mr. Owlett, a fine fellow, a sort of Sir Galahad of the Elizabethan age. Stories were offered—new and old—as history, and we heretics were dubbed liars, traitors, and infidels! I spoke for ten minutes expressing surprise at the cool ignoring of all the documentary evidence, and expounding the man this revealed. The President, Dr. F. S. Boas, candidly said that I was justified in demurring to myth being offered as history—referring to the stories—but with regard to the Stratford business it was an age of litigation, a stock and untenable defence. On being asked to reply, Mr. Owlett, to the amazement of the meeting, had nothing further to say! Dr. Boas urged the evidence of Beaumont as to Shakespeare, and the meeting concluded.

I looked up the last question and found that the only possible allusion to Shakespeare by Beaumont was doubtful. A poor poem was found a few years ago and there are two manuscripts, one signed "F.B." and the other "T.B." Sir Edmund Chambers cautiously said, "I see no reason why it should not be Francis Beaumont." I informed Dr. Boas of this, and pointed out the extraordinary exhibition of orthodox ineptitude in the Elizabethan Literary Society. The President and Vice-President made bad shots in the dark, the latter demurred to my statement that there was no association between Shakespeare and the Mermaid Tavern but, on challenge, could not produce any evidence, and the essayist could not make the slightest defence when attacked. Truly the defences of the Stratfordian against the attacks of the heretics are now "barren tasks too hard."