

The Shakespeare Fellowship News-Letter

SEPTEMBER 1954



NOTICES

The ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the Fellowship will be held at the Alpine Club, 74 South Audley Street, London, W.1., at 3 p.m. on Saturday, 9th October. Tea will be provided at 1/6d. The Committee hope there will be a large attendance. After the election of Officers, the meeting will consider a proposal to hold a WEEK END CONFERENCE, with lectures and excursions at some suitable centre in the de Vere country in the summer of 1955. Suggestions will be welcome and the Secretary would be glad to hear in advance from any members who are interested in the idea.

The first lecture of the new season, "Autobiography in *Measure for Measure*", by Gwynneth Bowen, will take place at the Poetry Society's Rooms, 33 Portman Square, at 3 p.m. on 13th November.

Members may be interested in a lecture entitled "Was Lord Oxford Shakespeare," which Mr. T. L. Adamson is to give to members of the Poetry Society at 6 p.m. on Friday, 26th November, at 33 Portman Square, W.1. Admission 2/- by payment at the door.

EDITORIAL NOTES

On 28th and 29th June there appeared in the *News Chronicle* two articles by Mr. Stanley Baron on Stratford-on-Avon. They were facetiously written and reminiscent of the pre-war book entitled *The Amazing Monument*, by Ivor Brown and George Fearon. However, scepticism was not allowed to come creeping in as regards the authorship question. The orthodox case was accepted in simple faith, aptly expressed in the opening paragraph which emanated from an unnamed "distinguished theatrical producer":—

"It always strikes me as one of the most fortunate coincidences in the history of drama. To think of all the places where Shakespeare might have been born—yet it happened here—in the pleasantest town in Warwickshire; on two railway lines; under an hour's drive from two great cities; in the middle of England and slap in the heart of the long-distance coach trade. Variation of this thankful prayer have been breathed o'er Avon for the past 200 years—in

hotels and hostelries, boarding houses, and bookshops—since the cult of the Bard began." Readers were informed that 180,000 people (20,000 of them Americans) visited the birthplace last year. They stayed on an average eight minutes.

The Editor of the *N.L.* wrote to the Editor of the *N.C.* mentioning the candid avowal some years ago by Mr. Levi Fox, Director of the Birthplace Trust, that the said birthplace was only conjectural. He also referred to his abortive challenge, in the organ of the town, to any inhabitant of Stratford to defend their hero. Of course, the letter was not published.

In the same paper there was an article by A. J. Cummings, written as though any Anti-Stratfordian book was new to him. He seemed impressed by the case against William of Stratford. The Editor of the *N.L.*, and Mr. John Russell's friend, Mr. Randolph Hughes, wrote to the Editor of *N.C.*, but the only letter published came from a Stratfordian. How weak!

"Peterborough" again

On 8th July, 1954, "Peterborough" of the *Daily Telegraph*, after commenting upon the performance of *Romeo and Juliet* at Stratford and the polyglot audiences, concluded as follows:

"Avaunt the Heretics.

"Maybe Mendelssohn's music will once more be incidental to the 'Dream', from which it has been divorced in this year's too unfantastical production.

"In any case the Stratford spell is unbroken. There was actually a queue of world-wide visitors on Saturday waiting to enter the familiar spired church where the poet's body lies.

"And though thought is free, even the Stanleyites and the Vereists, let alone the now outmoded Baconians hesitate to shout their heresies aloud in Stratford . . ."

Surprisingly, when the Editor of the *N.L.* was in Stratford on August Bank Holiday there was no queue at the "Birthplace" or the Church. The only queue was at Anne Hathaway's Cottage.

There was, of course, no justification for the triumphant concluding paragraph. Mr. R. L. Eagle took up the point for the Baconians, whilst the eager and energetic Miss Katherine Eggar wrote as follows for Oxfordians. A letter from Mr. Eagle was published but not Miss Eggar's.

"To the Editor,
Daily Telegraph

Dear Sir,

"Peterborough' seems to be trying again to tread on the tail of the 'de Vereite' coat.

"If this is in hope of a 'scrap', may I say that those who maintain that the 17th Earl of Oxford wrote under the pseudonym of "Shake-speare" have no intention of "shouting" propaganda at Stratford, or indeed anywhere. Being the champions of a courteous gentleman, we prefer quieter methods of making our cause known.

"Besides—Stratford-upon-Avon has no importance in de Vere's history (except that he was among the Court when Queen Elizabeth visited Charlcote, and presumably then met the owner, socially—not before the Bench). We are more concerned with his sojourns in places like Strasbourg, Paris, Venice, Padua, Palermo, Brill, and with Westminster as his place of burial, than with the spell-binding haunts of Bardolatry.

"All the same, we wish good luck to this year's Festival and the talented Young Stars who have looked—not on the Picture, but the Book!"

The Library

There is now a complete catalogue of the Shakespeare Fellowship Library, including the recent purchases from the Philpot collection. Copies of the catalogue can be obtained for sixpence from Miss Ruth M. D. Wainwright, 4 Collingham Road, S.W.5 (Freemantle 4419). Books can be sent by post at borrower's expense.

Sir Walter Maxwell Scott

Probably some readers of the *N.L.* noticed an announcement of the death of Sir Walter Maxwell Scott, who resided at Abbotsford and was a great grandson of "The Wizard of the North". His widow is an Oxfordian, and Sir Walter wrote to the Editor of the *N.L.* as follows, on 9th March, 1949:

"Dear Mr. Kent,

"Thank you very much indeed for the Earl of Oxford pamphlet which arrived today. Yes, I had forwarded on presumably the one you had sent to my wife. I had last year spoken to her in America about the latest 'Oxford' solution. It is all very interesting; but it will take a great deal of proof to cancel the traditions of 300 years; not to mention large financial interests . . . Many thanks again for the pamphlet."

THE ANNUAL DINNER

The Annual Dinner was held as usual at the headquarters of the English Speaking Union, Charles Street, W.1., on Friday, 23rd April, and the Chair was taken by Lt. Col. J. W. Russell.

The main toast, to the Ever-living Memory of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, was proposed by Miss Katherine Eggar, A.R.A.M., in a memorable speech. She dwelt on four features on de Vere's life across which, in Dr. Grosart's phrase, an unlifted shadow still lies, namely his extravagance, his relations with Queen Elizabeth, his disguises, and his misfortunes. Miss Eggar suggested *generosity* was a truer word than *extravagance* to apply to de Vere. For the Premier Earl of England Hereditary Lord Great Chamberlain with five hundred years of grandeur behind him, a high scale of expenditure was inevitable. His lavish assistance of friends and employees and his heavy outlay on revels for the Queen's Entertainment were two of his generousities.

Miss Eggar maintained with many cogent arguments that his relations with the Queen were those of an entertainer, not of a paramour.

On de Vere's disguises Miss Eggar pointed out that it was not only the old convention that the noble author must be anonymous; it was that he cherished privacy above most things. To be spied upon was abhorrent to his nature, and concealment of himself in print was only consistent with the secrecy of his dramatic activity at court.

Finally, his misfortunes. Among them, his beloved father's early death; the tyranny of wardship in an uncongenial guardian's severe household ending in a detested marriage with his guardian's daughter, and its consequent tragedy. Did he rise above his calamities or did he go down under them? The answer to these questions, Miss Eggar concluded, can be put into one word—Shakespeare—because the proof of his triumph over Fate and Time lies in the influence on the spirit of man which his works have had over the whole world.

(Some copies of the full text of Miss Eggar's noteworthy speech, which includes a recently discovered short manuscript poem which she believes de Vere wrote in his very early youth, are still available in pamphlet form obtainable from her at 40c Palace Street, Westminster, S.W.1. price 7½d. including postage.)

The toast of the Fellowship was proposed by Mr. John O'Leary, Editor of the *Essex Review*. Mrs. Kathleen le Riche, in reply, said that the members of the Fellowship are privileged people. We *know* what millions of other people would like to know—Who wrote Shakespeare. For those who are simply intrigued by a first class detective story, there is ample reward by the discovery of this great Personality. For those whose interests are literary, there is abundance of satisfaction in finding that the plays are filled with real people—another age comes to life. For us, the members of the Fellowship, there is in addition the excitement of the chase. Perhaps we read something in a Stratfordian book about Shakespeare and we, having read the life of Edward de Vere, see some connection. Off we go to the British Museum, the Public Records Office, an art gallery or a

village church register, and see what we see, for ourselves. We may return from our researches with some piece of information corroborating Mr. Looney's great discovery that Edward de Vere was Shakespeare. Mr. Looney's *Shakespeare Identified* provides the broad pattern of the mosaic and the pieces we find *Always Fit*.

Captain Evelyn Broadwood, M.C., the Master of the Worshipful Company of Musicians and a Governor of the Old Vic and Sadler's Wells, replying to the toast of the visitors, said that for many years he had been sure that the orthodox views on the authorship were wrong, and that he was in sympathy with the attribution of the plays and poems to the Earl of Oxford.

OTHER MEETINGS

We regret that, by an oversight, there was no mention in the last number of the *News-Letter* of Mr. F. L. Nichols' very interesting lecture on *Shakespeare—The Portrait Problem*, which took place on 14th November, 1953. Mr. Nichols reminded his audience that, some years ago, the Ashbourne portrait of Shakespeare, now at the Folgar Library, Washington, had been "x-rayed" with remarkable results. The original portrait, which had been altered in certain respects at an early date, was evidently of Lord Oxford, for, apart from the striking likeness to his known portraits, the date and age (since altered to fit Shakespeare) were consistent, and it bore the coat of arms of his second wife—now painted over. Mr. Nichols suspects that other alleged portraits of Shakespeare in particular the Grafton portrait at Rylands Library, Manchester, are also disguised portraits of Oxford.

On 20th March, 1954, Mr. T. L. Adamson gave an admirable talk on the *Mutual Influences of Elizabethan Dramatists*, showing how Oxfordian theory of authorship revolutionises the relationship between "Shakespeare" and his contemporaries, the Shakespearean drama being very much earlier than has been supposed.

On 24th April we were honoured by a visit from Professor Georges Lambin, of Paris, who spoke on *Shakespeare's Footprints in France and Italy*. The hall was full to capacity and he had an enthusiastic reception. The audience was predominantly Oxfordian and M. Lambin is a supporter of the Earl of Derby, but Oxfordians and Derbyites agree that "Shakespeare" was a traveller. Oxford and Derby both visited France and Italy at different times, but M. Lambin made a great point of the fact that Derby was in Paris in 1582, when certain events occurred which seem to be reflected in *Measure for Measure*. M. Lambin did not suggest that *Measure for Measure* was actually written at this date, which would be too early from his point of view, but it is a curious coincidence that Oxfordians have assigned it to this very year, because of events which took place at the same time in England!

SHAKE SPEARS SONNETS

Mr. G. W. Phillips has kindly presented his above named pamphlet to members of the Shakespeare Fellowship.

It is a summary of his book *Sunlight on Shakespeare's Sonnets*, in which he re-arranged the order of the Quarto, according to his belief that the principal series of Sonnets is concerned with the poet's son.

An earlier book—*The Tragic Story of Shakespeare*—explained in greater detail the theory that this boy was the child of a secret marriage with an unknown woman, who was, nevertheless, the prototype of "The Little Western Flower" of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. It is hardly possible to appreciate or to criticize this theory without a study of both these books in detail—a fascinating undertaking.

They should, however, be compared with the late Canon Rendall's *Shakespeare Sonnets and Edward De Vere*, which, in the writer's opinion, provides overwhelming evidence that the relevant series was addressed to Southampton.

On the other hand, it seems fairly certain that Shakespeare was punning on the word Sun in Sonnet 33. (The Everyman Edition of the Sonnets prints Son for Sun in line nine.) But this son is mentioned only as part of the general misfortune or disgrace alluded to in the whole Sonnet, and was most probably his son by Anne Vavasour.

Mr. Phillip's contention that "such cherubins as your sweet self" (Sonnet 114) must refer to a young child is convincing at first sight. But the first meaning of *Cherubin* is "One of an order of angels . . . distinguished by their *knowledge* from the seraphs" (whose distinctive quality is love). From Shakespeare's many references to angels we can conclude that he knew this, and that he was referring to the brightness of intellect, as well as to the beauty, of his friend. In Sonnet 82, he says "Thou art as fair in *knowledge* as in hue." And Sonnet 115 is the great one beginning "Let me not to the marriage of true minds. . . ."

Surely it is the intense joy of mutual understanding, rather than one-sided paternal love, which is the dominant theme of this series?

A study of Mrs. Stopes' *Biography of the Third Earl of Southampton* (although, of course, orthodox) should finally reveal how the personality of Henry Wriothesley fits that of the Fair Youth of the Sonnets, and would have been a source of inspiration to Shakespeare in all his monumental work.

All the books mentioned in this review can be obtained from the Fellowship Library—also those of Denis Bray and Robertson—orthodox critics on the Sonnets.

RUTH M. D. WAINWRIGHT.

TWO BOOKS ON "SHAKESPEARE"*

REVIEWED BY HERBERT CUTNER

Here are two books on the fascinating problems aroused by the plays and their author which should certainly be read by all Oxfordians. We have had the reproach levelled against us that we are far more interested in the personality of Edward de Vere than we are in the plays (whoever wrote them) but this is quite untrue. We are all, as a matter of fact, supremely grateful to the many first-class scholars who have so patiently, and often brilliantly, analysed the plays from almost every conceivable angle — history, criticism, topography, bibliography, and the rest.

In the yearly volumes of *Shakespeare Survey*, of which the latest is the seventh, will be found a number of deeply interesting articles all written by experts in their particular fields; some of the problems they raise, it appears to me, can only be answered from an Oxfordian point of view, but that they should be raised at all is something to be grateful for. For example, the article by Gladys D. Willcock on "Shakespeare and Elizabethan English," presents us with a penetrating analysis of the way English was spoken, and the way it was written, as well as the way in which it was used in the theatre. The English language was still in its formative stage, there were few settled rules in spelling and pronunciation, and there must have been a tremendous difference between the English used by the aristocracy in London and that used by the "vulgar", the ordinary people, in provincial towns and villages.

Moreover, it cannot be too strongly urged that a good deal of Elizabethan literature is unreadable, and it required creative genius to mould the language, which was for so many years in a stage of transition into literature.

For Miss Willcock, the writer of the plays was William Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon, and she makes no attempt whatever to show how he managed to manipulate the English language of the Stratford of his day into the golden beauties and magnificent poetry of the plays. He appears, in her view, to have been just born this way, in the manner of all great geniuses. She says:

"Of course, Shakespeare, as a great and original maker of poetic speech, took liberties even beyond Elizabethan amplitude. But, as is shown by the critical pointers scattered through his plays (particularly those of Elizabethan date), he was always alert and aware on the subject of language . . . There seems something 'provincial' in his emergence on the crest of the Elizabethan wave. He would have been a supremely great poet at any time . . ."

* *Shakespeare Survey* 7. Edited by Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1954. 18/- net.

The Annotator. By Alan Keen and Roger Lubbock. Putnam, Great Russell Street. London. 1954.

Miss Willcock gives no hint whatever how Shakespeare (of Stratford) managed to acquire the remarkable vocabulary found in the plays—she takes it for granted that being a genius it must have grown up with him. Or perhaps he learnt it all at the grammar school of Stratford. She would, no doubt, even argue that, as a great genius the limited vocabulary and the provincial dialect which distinguished Stratford from London, meant nothing whatever to him.

We know that Sir Walter Raleigh never lost his Devon accent—but whenever people talk of Shakespeare (of Stratford), the idea that he also had a strong Warwickshire accent, that, in fact, he must have spoken a *patois* of some kind, graced with Warwickshire provincialisms as far away from the English spoken at the court of Queen Elizabeth as the English spoken by a Highland peasant is different from that of the London of today, is never discussed. Shakespeare was a genius, and that should answer everything.

The article which will interest Oxfordians most perhaps is the one on "Shakespeare's Italy," especially those of us who have read Prof. Lambin's contributions to the Derby authorship of the plays, or heard him lecture. It may be remembered that, in quoting the Italian plays, he showed that their author must have had a first-hand acquaintance with such towns as Verona and Milan, and that he had a remarkable knowledge of out-of-the-way topography connected with them. That the Earl of Derby could have possessed this knowledge is undeniable, but so could the Earl of Oxford. The author of the above article, Mr. Mario Praz, naturally refuses to admit either of the two noblemen. He does his best—very wordily—to confuse the issue, though he has to admit that, for example, "the local colour of *The Merchant of Venice* has been declared well nigh astonishing." Even, he adds, "if Lambin has overstated the case of Shakespeare's knowledge of the topography of Milan, the mention of St. Gregory's Well near that town, in *The Two Gentlemen* seems definite enough . . ." Either then, "Shakespeare travelled to the North of Italy, or he got his information from intercourse with some Italians in London." Mr. Praz—rather sorrowfully no doubt—knows "there is no evidence for the first alternative." So he gives us a variation of the hoary old story that Shakespeare got his information about the Court of Navarre for *Love's Labour Lost* from the aristocratic gentlemen discussing it while he used to hold their horses. Mr. Praz confidently tells us, "Shakespeare may have had frequent occasion to meet Italian merchants" at the Oliphant Inn of Bankside, because he mentions "the Elephant Inn" in *Twelfth Night*. Or, he "must have come across John Florio, the apostle of Italian culture in England." Anything, or anyone, rather than admit that William Shakespeare of Stratford could not possibly have known out-of-the-way Italian topography.

It is a pity that space precludes me from dealing

with the other articles in this fine volume of *Shakespeare Survey*.

In its own way, Mr. Keen's *The Annotator* is also a fascinating account of "Shakespearean" detective work. Mr. Keen was lucky enough to obtain a copy of Hall's *Chronicles* with a large number of notes and annotations marking off passages which could have been used for incidents in the English historical plays of Shakespeare— whoever he was. He would have liked the handwriting of the unknown annotator to be proved Shakespeare's (of Stratford), of course, but this was not easy considering that we simply do not know what his handwriting was, or if he even could write at all. The well-known signatures look as if they had been traced with the utmost difficulty by an almost unlettered man—which is what one could expect from a Stratford "educated" man. But what Mr. Keen did discover in the course of his investigations was that there was an unknown "Shakeshafte" in the picture not accounted for in any Shakespearean biography.

Mr. Keen found a "William Shakeshafte" mentioned in the will of Alexander Houghton (1581) as being in his service at Lea Hall, near Preston, in Lancashire. The Houghtons and other families used to keep "players," first, no doubt, performing the old Miracle plays, and later the plays of Marlowe, Peel, and other Elizabethan dramatists. And a good deal of the evidence unearthed by Mr. Keen shows the part played by Lord Strange's Company, later known as the Earl of Derby's Players. Some of their actors have since become famous as being "Shakespeare's fellows"—Heminge Condell, Burbage, and others.

But who was this Shakeshafte? Mr. Keen tells us that "in the parish records" Shakespeare's grandfather, Richard, who lived at Snitterfield in Warwickshire, "figures indifferently as both Shakeshafte and Shakespeare"; while Shakeshafte "was a common Lancashire name." It is a pity that one cannot have these parish records photographed for it would be most illuminating to find the names "Shakeshafte and Shakespeare" in them. If there is one thing more than any other rammed home to us, it is that the name was never spelt "Shakespeare" in any record. And, of course, if Richard Shakespeare also spelt his name "Shakeshafte," it would be quite possible for his grandson to do the same in those "hidden years" which no biographer has managed to bring into the light of day.

Mr. Keen points out that John Shakespeare was a Catholic and that, as Dover Wilson says in *The Essential Shakespeare*, if William "received his education in the service of some great Catholic nobleman it would help to explain how he became an actor since the transition of singing-boy to stage-player was almost as inevitable at that period as the breaking of the male voice in adolescence."

The way Mr. Keen brings this into "Shakeshafte's" life is at least interesting. Houghton of

Lea Hall was a Protestant, but one of his brothers was a Catholic as well as his wife; and no one knows how Shakeshafte got into Lea Hall as a singing-boy. As far as I understand Mr. Keen, this proves that Shakeshafte was William Shakespeare of Stratford. In any case, there was the tradition that he had been (also) a butcher's boy, that "when he killed a calf," he used to make a speech as he was "skilled in the pseudoventriloquial diversion of throwing his voice into the dummy head of a calf" as he used to see done by "strolling players." The idea that anyone at any time is capable of "throwing his voice," whether in a dummy calf's head or anywhere else, is surely most intriguing. I wonder whether Mr. Keen has ever seen it done?

But from here we get, "it may be supposed that it was young William Shakespeare's skill in this crude mimicry" that got him a job. But why? Why should we suppose anything of the sort? Just because Mr. Keen is anxious to claim that some obscure "Shakeshafte" must be Will Shakespeare of Stratford?

All Mr. Keen's hypothetical suggestions are just hypothetical, and nothing else. There is not a shred of evidence, when tested, to prove the identity of the singing boy at Lea Hall with the youth who married Anne Hathaway; nor that he ever wrote a line of the plays; nor, for that matter, that he annotated Hall's *Chronicles*. Even if Shakeshafte had been a singing-boy, which is not certain—he might just as well have been a pantry boy—what evidence has Mr. Keen to offer that he subsequently wrote any plays? None, whatever.

But it must be confessed that *The Annotator* is an interesting book in other ways, for it contains some highly informative pedigrees, and a number of valuable appendices very well worth reading by all Shakespeare lovers.

Neither in *Shakespeare Survey*, nor in *The Annotator*, is there a line which in any way invalidates the claim we make—and which is increasingly being admitted—that the chief writer of the plays of Shakespeare was the 17th Earl of Oxford. Indeed, some of us claim they were all, in the main, written by him. It is a pity that one, at least, of the learned contributors to *Shakespeare Survey* does not tackle our claim and demolish it—if he can. The time has long gone by when it can be dismissed with a laugh and an impatient gesture.

The Baconians appear relatively silent this year, but G. Bowen, in a pamphlet published by the author, advocates by an examination of *The Tempest* the claims of the Earl of Oxford, while in *Les Langues modernes* (July-August) G. Lambin puts a case for William Stanley, which he follows up in the November number by also finding political allegory in *The Tempest*.

The Year's Work in English Studies. Vol. 32 (1953).

SHAKESPEARE À PARIS
and
MEASURE FOR MEASURE

BY S. A. VAN LUNTEREN

Among the most important monographs about "Shakespeare's" plays, which appeared during the last years, are the series published since 1951 by the French Scholar, Prof. G. Lambin, in the French periodical *Les Langues modernes*. They supply us with new exceptionally important views, the documentation of which does not leave a doubt of their correctness.

Of the same importance are three collections of quotations (briefly elucidated), edited by an American, the late Prof. William Kittle in 1930, 1935 and 1942, relating to Edward de Vere and his contemporaries.

For instance, Kittle proved already in 1935 by documentation (p. 236 and facsimile), that Oxford had been reinterred in Westminster Abbey between 1612 and 1619.

We will now confront a discovery by Lambin with one by Kittle:

In his monograph *Shakespeare à Paris* Prof. Lambin has substantiated by documentation, that many changes and additions which "Shakespeare" introduced in *Measure for Measure*—the theme of which he chiefly borrowed from Cinthio/Whetstone (1565/1578)—originated from occurrences, which were enacted at Paris and its neighbourhood from 1582-1585 in connection with the French King Henri III and his entourage. Accordingly many striking additions and new names of the dramatis personae did not generate in "Shakespeare's" imagination—nor could they have been drawn from documents unpublished or non-existing at the time—but they appear, according to Prof. Lambin, to have been drawn "à des souvenirs de faits contemporains".

Any unprejudiced reader of Prof. Lambin's discoveries is bound to acknowledge that "Shakespeare" must have been thoroughly cognisant of the mentioned Parisian occurrences during the period 1582-1585. This does not necessarily mean that "Shakespeare" should have been a witness ("a été témoin") of these occurrences at Paris, nor that he should have assisted ("a assisté") at them. The highly esteemed scholar, however, intimates, that this must have been the case.

He calls attention to the fact that "un auteur dramatique anglais" sojourned at Paris between 1582 and 1585. This cannot have been William Shakespeare, who from 1582 to 1585, at the age of 18-21, lived as an illiterate rustic in Stratford. Prof. Lambin points to William Stanley, future 6th Earl of Derby, as having been that author, who at the age of 21 lived in Paris during some months of the autumn of 1582. He left Paris that same year to continue his three years' Grand Tour on the Continent. To be sure Prof. Lambin occasionally uses the words "très probablement" and "il se peut" and concluding he asks "serait-il l'auteur de 'Measure for Measure'?"

Besides in his last marginal note he says, the Goodacre in his article about William Stanley's father, who had been ambassador at Paris in 1584-5, tells that young Stanley, under the name of "Standley of Chelsey," has been "vraisemblablement" a member of his father's suite. Whereupon Prof. Lambin remarks: "Il aurait donc assisté à tous les événements mentionnés plus hauts."

Thus on Prof. Lambin's own showing, Derby as author of *Measure for Measure* is only an eventuality.

Of course, I will not and cannot enter here into the question whether the arguments in Derby's favour brought forward by the late Prof. Abel Lefranc are convincing or not, but incidentally I want to draw attention to the statement made in 1599 by a spy, quoted anew by Prof. Lambin as external evidence of Derby's authorship, viz., that Derby was "penning comedies" which Prof. Lambin translates by "rédiger des comédies". Surely "penning" might as well mean "copying" plays, created by Oxford, Derby's father-in-law. It is doubtful if the spy was able to notice *whose* plays Derby was "penning".

Though no poetical work by Derby has come down to us—as contrasted with Oxford's—I allow that Derby *might* have been co-author, reviser or compiler (for the folio of 1632) of some of Oxford's works and that Derby was aware of French occurrences in or about Paris between 1582 and 1585. But Oxford too must have known them.

In this respect it is of moment, that Prof. Kittle from documents quoted by him (1935: pp. 48 et seqq., and 1942: pp. 38 et seqq.) has irrefutably proved, that de Vere was at the Parisian court from June, 1578-May, 1582 (except a few interruptions), as the hostage and secretary to negotiate a marriage between the Duke of Anjou and Queen Elizabeth! De Vere knew Paris and its environments, also its political world, thoroughly by year-long acquaintance.

Through his connections with French and English politicians and authors, Oxford had also a profound knowledge of the period 1582-5 and he might eventually have been informed by his future son-in-law Derby. (See *This Star of England*, by the Ogburns, page 445).

Anyhow Prof. Lambin himself writes: "La corruption morale à Paris, c. 1585, et surtout de la guerre civile, était un fait bien connu en Angleterre."

The autobiographical allusions in *Measure for Measure* to the relations between Oxford and Queen Elizabeth, Ann Cecil and Ann Vavasour, as indicated by Mr. and Mrs. Ogburn (Chapter XXVI) point to de Vere's authorship but not to Derby's.

I conclude: In *Measure for Measure* the original theme has been re-versified in view of occurrences in France during the period 1582-1585 (at which Derby *might* have assisted), but it was autobiographically coloured by experiences and vicissitudes of its author: Edward de Vere, XVIIth Earl of Oxenforde.

THE WOUNDED NAME

BY GWYNNETH BOWEN

At Christmas, 1580, Lord Oxford denounced as traitors his cousin, Lord Henry Howard and his sometime friends, Charles Arundel and Francis Southwell. He confessed to the Queen that he had been reconciled, with them, to the Church of Rome some four or five years earlier, but—according to the report of the French Ambassador—"he craved forgiveness for what he had done, saying that he now recognised that he had done wrong".

It is inevitable that we should each judge his action, to some extent, according to our own religious convictions—or lack of them; but apart from this, when a man changes his religion more than once his motives are apt to be called in question, especially if he happens to change to the dominant side at a time of religious persecution, and those who inform against their friends are liable to be held in contempt by all. Let us face the fact that this is what Oxford did in December, 1580. It is therefore very important to try to understand the circumstances in which he found himself. Then, and then only, we shall be in a position to answer the question: "Would Shakespeare, in the same circumstances, have behaved in the same way?"

The word *reconciled* is used here in a technical sense and does not imply that Oxford had been a Catholic before. He must have become one shortly after his return from Italy in 1576. His re-conversion to Protestantism took place just *before* the more rigorous enforcement of the laws against the Catholics. The first Jesuit missionaries, led by Parsons and Campion, had arrived in England six months earlier and were still at large, travelling in disguise from one Catholic household to another. They were under instructions from the Pope not to "entangle themselves in matters of state . . . except perhaps in the company of those who have been tried a long while; and even then not without serious cause"—a proviso which, as the Catholic historian, Theodore Maynard, admits was "capable of a sinister interpretation". These instructions came to the notice of those in authority, who certainly put a sinister interpretation upon them, and matters were made worse by the fact that the arrival of the Jesuits in England was followed, two or three months later, by the arrival in Ireland of armed forces sent by the Pope to the aid of Elizabeth's rebel subjects. The Queen had been excommunicated by a Bull of Pope Pius V as long ago as 1570, but up to now nothing had been done to put the Bull into effect and the position of English Catholics was somewhat ambiguous until, again in 1580, Pope Gregory XIII tried to clarify the situation by explaining that his predecessor's Bull "should in no way bind the Catholics, as things then stood, but only in the future when the public execution of the Bull could be made." A terrible choice was thus forced upon

the English Catholics. Some, no doubt, thought compromise still possible and deferred the moment of decision, but the more realistic among them soon came to the conclusion that they could no longer remain, at the same time, good Catholics and loyal subjects of Queen Elizabeth. It was as if, before the last war, the Pope had made a pronouncement implying that English Catholics must be prepared to open their arms to German and Italian invaders, if and when they came. Faced with this dilemma, Howard, Arundel and Southwell chose one course, and Oxford chose the other. Being a Catholic, he may even have been sounded as a potential conspirator, at all events, his suspicions were aroused. What was he to do? He might, of course, have remained a silent on-looker, but he could not have remained neutral: silence itself would be a kind of action.

As a result of his accusations, Howard, Arundel and Southwell were arrested and eventually sent to the Tower. Oxford, too, spent a short time in the Tower in the spring of 1581, but this was a result of his love affair with Anne Vavasour, one of the Queen's maids of honour; we have it on the authority of the Privy Council, in a letter to Sir William Gorges of June 9th, 1581, that he was "not committed thither upon any cause of treason or any criminal cause". He drew up a list of questions to be put to Howard and Arundel which, together with their replies, is preserved at the Record Office, and from these it is clear that he suspected them of being involved in an international conspiracy against the Queen to be backed by armed invasion. If, apart from these papers, there is no definite evidence of the existence of such a conspiracy at this date, it may be because he exposed it in time. But rumours there certainly were and, as a matter of fact, one important piece of corroborative evidence is extant though, as far as I know, it has never been connected with the Howard-Arundel affair. In a letter dated December, 1580, the Cardinal Secretary of State wrote to the Papal Nuncio at Paris:

"Since that guilty woman of England usurps two such noble kingdoms of Christendom and is the cause of so much injury to the Catholic faith, and the loss of so many millions of souls, there is no doubt that whoever sends her out of the world with the pious intention of doing God service, not only does not sin, but gains merit, especially having regard to the sentence pronounced against her by Pope Pius V of holy memory. And so, if those English nobles decide actually to undertake so glorious a work, your Lordship can assure them that they do not commit any sin."

The identity of the English nobles has never been discovered, but the coincidence of date is significant.

In fear for their lives, Howard and Arundel drafted counter-charges which were calculated to blacken Oxford's name and discredit him as a witness and these have left their mark upon his

reputation to this day. Many of the documents concerned are reported at considerable length in the Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, but one (S.P.D. Eliz. Vol. 151. Article 57), which might have served to show up the rest for the libels that they are, is given only in the following brief summary:

"Articles by Lord Henry Howard against the Earl of Oxford, his Atheism; his dangerous practices; attempts to murder Leicester in his way to Wanstead, and Philip Sidney in his bed; his unnatural crimes, etc. With an addition probably by Francis Southwell."

Anyone who takes the trouble to look up this document at the Record Office will find, after the list of charges, the following postscript by Lord Henry Howard:

"Add to this what particulars soever you have declared of him, and they *shall be certified*. Here is nothing in this paper but may be avowed *without danger, as hath been determined*."
(Italics mine.)

The addition by Francis Southwell is unfinished—possibly he was interrupted while writing it. There are no fresh charges against Oxford, Southwell is chiefly concerned to explain and justify to Howard some of his own answers under cross-examination. He then writes: "I hear by you Mr. Charles [Arundel] is my dear friend. In faith my Lord, it is not best. For if the Earl could get one man to aver anything, we were utterly overthrown."

This paper was obviously not intended for the authorities, but must have been passed surreptitiously from one prisoner to another. The charges against Oxford re-appear elsewhere, with certain additions and variations, in the hand of Charles Arundel, and Howard's postscript together with Southwell's addition are surely decisive evidence of collusion in bearing false witness.

Oxford seems to have been unable to prove his case against Howard and Arundel, who were eventually released. Later, when the Throckmorton plot was discovered in 1583, Howard was imprisoned once more and Arundel fled to France. How far their "back-wounding calumny" damaged Oxford's reputation at the time we do not know, but we can imagine the effect it would have had upon the mind of Shakespeare. Or, perhaps we have no need to imagine it!

As for Shakespeare's religion, that is still a matter of dispute. He has been claimed by Catholics and Protestants alike, and may well have been both at one time or another. Of one thing, however, we can be certain: he loved *mercy*—"an attribute of God himself"—and must have been appalled at the intolerance of the age in which he lived.

THE PORTRAIT OF JOHN DE VERE, THE SIXTEENTH EARL OF OXFORD

BY KATHLEEN LE RICHE

It was quite by accident that I discovered what I believe to be a Holbein portrait of John de Vere. While visiting the National Gallery last January my attention was arrested by a reproduction of the painting on the counter near the exit. The likeness to Edward de Vere was so remarkable that I went into the Holbein room (XXXI) to see the original. It was hanging, appropriately enough, next to Holbein's painting of the Duchess of Milan, which had come from the collection of Lord Lumley—Lord Oxford's cousin.

As the colouring of this "Portrait of a Man," as it was called, was exactly that of Edward de Vere, the likeness was closer than even our black and white reproduction can convey. As Holbein painted *character*, with an extraordinary truth to nature, it can be taken that this man who looks about 28 years of age, was so, during Holbein's late period in England—1538-43—the period given by the National Gallery experts as that when the portrait was painted.

Did Holbein paint the Earl of Oxford?

He painted Frances, Oxford's sister who married the Earl of Surrey, whose book of poems ("I had rather than forty shillings I had my book of *Songs and Sonnets* here.") is specifically named in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (I.i.) Holbein also painted the Earl of Surrey's father, the 3rd Duke of Norfolk, and other close relatives or friends of the de Vere family.

Lord Braybrooke, who owned the picture until recently, and to whom I wrote, replied that his pictures at Audley End "came from three main sources, I believe, Lord Howard de Walden (Sir J. Whitwell Griffin), the Nevilles of Billingbear (Berks), and (later) the Cornwallis family."

Lord Howard de Walden, was, of course, Lord Thomas Howard* (1561-1626), son of the Duke of Norfolk (Edward de Vere's first cousin) by his second wife, Margaret, daughter of Lord Audley de Walden. It was that Duke of Norfolk—Lord Thomas Howard's father—whom Edward de Vere tried to rescue from the Tower. It was the Seventeenth Earl who accompanied the Queen to Audley End on her Progress in 1578, when Gabriel Harvey wrote his famous eulogy to him. And, although the present mansion of Audley End was not erected until the early part of the seventeenth century, the older Tudor house was there, within riding distance of Castle Hedingham, the home of the de Veres. It is feasible to suppose that this picture was a gift from one friend to another, or that Holbein, the Court painter

* See B. M. Ward's *Life of the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford*, p. 163.

IS THIS JOHN DE VERE THE SIXTEENTH EARL OF OXFORD?



PORTRAIT OF A MAN

Reproduced by kind permission of The Hon. R. H. C. Neville

This picture was loaned to the National Gallery during the first half of 1954 by Lord Braybrooke, of Saffron Walden. After it had been cleaned, the experts found that it was by Holbein, painted in his late period—he died in 1543. Mrs. Kathleen Le Riche suggests that it is a portrait of John de Vere, the Sixteenth Earl of Oxford, who, in 1543, was about 31 years of age. The dress is that of a Courtier, and the hawk's hood in his hand connects him with the sport of falconry, so dear to Shakespeare. The sensitivity of all the features and the expression portray a nobleman of the refined tastes we know John de Vere had.

The resemblance to Edward de Vere, the Seventeenth Earl, is startling. The cut of the divided moustache is exactly that adopted by Edward from his middle thirties. The colouring is identical with that of the Seventeenth Earl—fair skin with a delicate pink in the cheeks; chestnut hair and beard, slightly curled; and hazel-blue eyes.

(See article on page 8.)

the time, was commissioned by one friend to paint the other.

Did Edward de Vere resemble his father?

In *All's Well*, the play which so closely resembles the private life of Edward de Vere, we read this:

The King is welcoming Bertram to Paris (where Edward de Vere's own portrait was painted), and he says:

"Youth, thou bear'st thy father's face.

Frank nature . . . rather curious than in haste
Hath well compos'd thee!"

Edward de Vere was born when his father was about 38 years of age . . . rather curious than in haste.

That he was "well compos'd" you will agree, as the French King also knew. There it was, at the French Court in Paris, that the Sixteenth Earl had drawn such admiration by killing a boar single-handed. As the king also says to Bertram,

"May'st thou his moral parts inherit too!
Welcome to Paris."

Again, in *As You Like It* the resemblance to his father is stressed, as well as the affection in which he was held:

The Duke is welcoming Orlando, and says:—

"If that you were the good Sir Rowland's son,
As you have whispered faithfully you were,
And as mine eye doth his effigies witness
Most truly limned and living in your face,
Be truly welcome hither;
I am the Duke that lov'd your father."

And what of the heart of the matter . . . the play most revealing of all, perhaps, of the life of the poet . . . *Hamlet*?

Let us look at the scene where Hamlet is chiding his mother for her choice in a second husband—and that when her first husband was dead so short a time before—just as Edward de Vere had had cause to do. He holds their pictures in his hands, and says to her:—

"Look here upon this picture, and on THIS,
The counterfeit presentment of two brothers.
See what a grace was seated in this brow:
Hyperion's curls, the front of Jove himself;
An eye like Mars, to threaten and command;
A station like the Herald Mercury
New-lighted on a heaven-kissing hill;
A combination and a form indeed,
Where every god did seem to set his seal,
To give the world assurance of a man;
This *was* your husband."

"THE FAMOUS VICTORIES OF HENRY V"

Notes and Queries of June, 1954, contains an interesting article, signed C. A. Greer, which emphasises the importance of the late B. M. Ward's article on "The Famous Victories of Henry V: its Place in Elizabethan Dramatic Literature," which

appeared in 1928 in *The Review of English Studies*, and was reprinted in pamphlet form.

The recent article adopts Ward's reasoned conclusion that *The Famous Victories* was probably written before the appearance in 1578 of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, and that the Shakespeare plays 1 and 2 Henry IV and Henry V were not only founded on and form an amplification of *The Famous Victories* but also were probably written before Holinshed appeared.

The writer of *The Famous Victories* appears to have used Hall's *Chronicle* (1548 and 1550), but the former contains much that was neither in Hall nor in Holinshed and that is repeated in 1 and 2 Henry IV and Henry V.

From internal evidence Ward showed that *The Famous Victories* was probably the work of Edward de Vere—indeed that its authorship by anyone else was improbable—and written in the latter part of 1574 or not long afterwards. These conclusions are referred to in Percy Allen's *Life Story of Edward de Vere as Shakespeare*, at pp. 48—52.

The writer of the recent article does not refer to these last-mentioned conclusions of Ward's, but he takes strong exception to the ignoring, in orthodox Shakespearean criticism since 1928, of "Ward's conclusive work". He adduces a number of additional points of similarity between *The Famous Victories* and the three *Histories* referred to, which fully confirm Ward's conclusions. Not only the general "story" and the order in which the events are portrayed, but very numerous specific details and even phrases have been taken direct from *The Famous Victories*, and occur in the same order.

This of course does not establish that Edward de Vere wrote 1 and 2 Henry IV and Henry V. But to test the importance of the matter—suppose it were established that William of Stratford wrote *The Famous Victories*? Should we not hear it proclaimed by the orthodox as conclusive proof of his authorship of those three *Histories*?

J. SHERA ATKINSON

GASCOIGNE AND DE VERE

BY DR. J. R. MEZ

Was "George Gascoigne" a pen-name used by Edward de Vere?

In the Preface to his biography *The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, 1550-1604* (London, 1926), Mr. B. M. Ward says: "I have come to the conclusion that the Earl of Oxford was the editor of an 'Anthology' entitled *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, published in 1573, and was himself the author of sixteen of the poems published in the book."

This statement made by so serious a scholar as Mr. B. M. Ward is such a startling assertion that we who are interested in the Earl of Oxford's life and work, should give it our closest attention.

Literary historians, to this day, have been convinced that *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, containing the "Posies of George Gascoigne" are the work of one sole author George Gascoigne. Several books have been written about the poet "Gascoigne", his life and work, the best known being those by W. C. Hazlitt (1869), J. W. Cunliffe (1907-1910), C. T. Prouty (1942), but none of these—with one notable exception, as we shall see later—has even suspected that the Earl of Oxford, at the age of 23, sponsored that "Gagcoigne" book and had written a considerable part of it himself. What a revolutionary discovery!

Mr. Ward had become quite doubtful also about the authorship of the rest of Gagcoigne's works. He was cautious enough not to commit himself to any dogmatic statement and couched his conclusions carefully behind the word "probably"—just as in writing de Vere's biography, he never said that this was "Shakespeare," although he knew better.

Ward first considers the question of "G.T." and his friend "H.W.", mentioned in *A Hundreth Flowres*, as editor and publisher. Ward considers it beyond question that these two initials stand for Henry Wotton and George Turberville, as had been suggested. "If a professional author", Ward continued, "who depended for his livelihood on the goodwill of the nobility, were to forget himself so far as to insult the Queen's favourite (Hatton), his persecution would be immediate and complete. I have therefore no hesitation in saying that both 'H.W.' and 'G.T.' were men of such high rank that they could with impunity publish Hatton's private love letters.

"Professor Schelling", Ward continued, "in 1891, expressed doubts as to the individuality of 'H.W.' and 'G.T.' He says: 'It seems to me not unlikely, from internal evidence, that George Gascoigne did more than inspire the two letters of 'H.W.' and 'G.T.', and that he was actually the author of both'."

To this, B. M. Ward made this significant comment: "Although I do not agree that Gascoigne probably wrote both the letters, I do agree that they are probably by the same hand, and that the initials are simply a blind."

Could anybody state more clearly than this (as long as he wishes to avoid stating a definite name), what is at the back of his mind.

1. The two initials stand for men of the highest rank (at Court).
2. Both their writings are from one and the same hand.

Whom did Mr. Ward take to be the writer? Who was at the back of the mind of the biographer of the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford? Why did he publish a reprint of Gascoigne's *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*? Was it because he was trying to find out something about the doings of George Gascoigne, or of somebody else?

To be sure, Mr. Ward did believe that there existed a poet by the name of George Gascoigne,

who might have contributed to those poems, but his faith had been shaken; Ward had become quite a sceptic about Gascoigne.

Unable to reconcile the conflicting probabilities, Mr. Ward concluded his Introduction with these significant words: "I have only now to add that the complete story of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* still remains to be told! (And this in spite of the fact that in the entire history of literature, from the *D.N.B.* to Prouty, it had never been questioned that this work was from the pen of Gascoigne. Then Ward raised new questions which had never been asked before:

"Did Elizabeth Gascoigne, the mother of Nicholas Breton, the poet, write the 'Ferenda Natura' poems? Who was 'Spræta tamen vivunt?' These questions only time may answer," he concluded.

In asking these questions Mr. Ward proved that his mind had become full of doubt regarding the true authorship of Gascoigne's works.

In any event, it is of greatest importance to realize that it was *Lord Oxford*—and not George Gascoigne, as we had been taught in the past—who had edited the poems known as Gascoigne's, and that he, at the age of 23, had contributed at least a considerable part of this book of poems.

Four years after Mr. Ward had discovered these amazing facts, there appeared in 1930 a book by an American author, William Kittle, with the challenging title: *George Gascoigne 1562-1578, or Edward de Vere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, 1550-1604* (Washington D.C., 1930)!

LEAVES FROM THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOKS

Between 1925 and 1940 the Australian scholar, Mr. Alfred Hart, had published the calculations of the average length of the Elizabethan play which persuaded him that the longer plays of Shakespeare could not have been acted in full . . . if we can believe that in retirement he wrote plays to please himself, and allowed the players to do what they liked with his work, is not the position of the arm-chair critic stronger than it seemed?

Times Literary Supplement, 7th October, 1944.

25th June, 1943. At 3.38 this morning I became after years of resistance, a convert to the Baconian theory. Alas poor Will!

4th July, 1943. Here is Mr. A. L. Rowse seeing in Shakespeare's Octavius Caesar the counterpart of Cecil defeating Essex. But where did Stratford's butcher pick up that political science which Bacon had at his finger-tips? James Agate. Ego 6.

I often think Shakespeare must have been in Italy. He was evidently fond of travelling and in the prime of his life must have been in easy circumstances and have had leisure to indulge his curiosity. He appears to have understood the

language well even better than French. He appears to have been acquainted with the topography of the country. There are none of the slips of the pen as to Verona, Padua, Mantua, or Venice that there are when he writes of Bohemia, Illyria or Epidammon. The character of the Italian gentleman is so natural. He is different from Prince Henry, Falconbridge, or to French Biron or Bertram. The manner of the servants, too, towards their masters and the way in which they offer their adieus and mingle with the conversation is so very Italian. In short, there are numerous undefinable traits of manners and characters that lead me to the conclusion that Shakespeare must have travelled in Italy.

A.A., *Notes and Queries*, 12th December, 1859.

Books in Elizabethan Times

Assuredly there were no libraries in the London of Elizabeth, such as the British Museum and the like, open to the public, to which a player, in the interval of learning his part or other stage business, could resort for study and literary reference (or, if there were, there is no record of them). The man of mystery therefore from Stratford, if he were the author of the plays he took part in or placed upon the stage, must either have had other sources of information peculiar to himself, or must have acquired all his pervading knowledge, philosophical and otherwise, by pure inspiration or, on the Dogberry theory, from the light of nature, an alternative which a plain man may surely have some hesitation in accepting without being writ down an "ass" or pronounced a candidate for Bedlam.

James Hutchinson (Middle Temple Library).
Notes and Queries, May 24th, 1902.

Halliwell Phillips regarded Stratford-on-Avon as "a bookless neighbourhood" and it was exceedingly improbable that Shakespeare ever owned a private library, even of the smallest dimensions. Yet before the age of printing Chaucer said of the Clerk of Oxenforde:

"For him was lever have at his beddes head
Twenty bookes clothed in black reed
Of Aristotle and his philosophye
Than robes riche or fithele or gay sautrye."

A few months ago Mr. Alfred Lansford told us in these pages that "The Rev. John Marshall of Bishopstone," a chapelry in the parish of Old Stratford, in 1607, left 187 books. Sir Thomas Lucy the second leaves in his will to his son and heir Thomas "all my French and Italian books." The date is August 13, 1600. If a poor Oxford scholar of 1400 could have had twenty well-bound books at his bed's head, can it be that in 1616 Shakespeare, king of poets, had no study of books in his great house? For the last twenty-six years of his life at least he had money enough to buy books. One cannot imagine a poet, philosopher, historian without them, however vast his knowledge of men and nature.

S. O. Addy, *Notes and Queries*, October 22nd, 1927.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir,

As new members of the Fellowship, we were astonished at the barrage of letters aimed across the Atlantic at the Ogburn's Oxford-Southampton relationship theory. Since it received the distinguished support of such Oxfordian scholars as Captain Ward and your own past-President Allen, it surely ought not be name-called "shocking heresy." Actually Mr. Nichols' array of arguments could be easily answered out of Ward, Allen, Ogburn and even Stopes. But we shall not do so here

In quite another and happier field, we have been collecting translations of the couplet that heads *Venus and Adonis*:

"Vilia miretur vulgus; mihi flavus Apollo
Pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua."

(Ovid.)

"Let base conceited wits admire vile things
Fair Phoebus lead me to the Muses' springs."

(Marlowe.)

"Kneel hinds to trash: me let bright Phoebus
swell

With cups full-flowing from the Muses' well."

(Jonson.)

"Let vulgar witts admire the common songes
I'll lie with Phoebus by the Muses' Springs."

(From the play *Parnassus*.)

"The vulgar let the vulgar herd admire;
To me may the golden-haired Apollo serve cups
Brimming from Castaly."

(Appleton Morgan.)

"Let the common herd admire common things,
so long as to me Apollo's self hands goblets
brimming with the waters of Castalia."

(The Ogburns.)

Perhaps your members know still other versions; or will have a try at translating the couplet themselves, as we did. The following is our own rendering:

"Let common herd from wallow drink it up;
For me—a swallow from Apollo's cup."

J. and E. DOOLEY, New York City.

Dear Sir,

Arthur Golding—No Puritan

In her excellent article on Arthur Golding's early dedications to his nephew, and pupil, Edward de Vere, and the correlating evidence in the Shakespeare plays, Miss Ruth Wainwright quotes from B. M. Ward's *Life*, the following sentence, concerning Golding's dedication of his translation of Calvin's version of the Psalms:

"It would seem to have been a last effort of his tutor to influence his pupil in the direction of Puritanism."

I believe there is a confusion of thought in many quarters concerning Puritanism and Calvinism. In fact, Louis Thorn Golding, writing the life of his ancestor, Arthur Golding, has called his book *An Elizabethan Puritan*.

For general consideration, may I quote from several sources on this question?

The Concise Oxford Dictionary: Puritan: member of the party of English Protestants who regarded reformation of Church under Elizabeth as incomplete, and sought to abolish unscriptural and corrupt ceremonies, etc.

Harmsworth's Encyclopaedia: Generally, though not necessarily, their doctrines were Calvinistic.

The Essex Review, October, 1952: gives a careful and perceptive critical study of Louis Thorn Golding's biography of Arthur Golding, by Michael Barrington. Mr. Barrington writes:

"One of the strangest nineteenth-century literary fallacies—not easily uprooted even now—was the ascribing of Puritanism to Burghley, Walsingham, Leicester, Sidney, Essex and others conspicuous for their devotion to the Church of England. But as English writers originated this extraordinary error, it is not surprising that trans-Atlantic authors have followed."

Arthur Golding who dedicated his *eight books of Caius Julius Caesar* to Sir William Cecil (later Lord Burghley) in 1565; his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to Leicester; and who completed Sidney's translation of Philip de Mornay's *Sieur Duplessis*, was not likely to have been a "Heretical Hypocrite" as Ben Jonson described the Puritans. It is quite unlikely also that Arthur Golding supported the writers of the tracts of "Martin Marprelate" attacking the Bishops, or had a hand in advocating the closing of the theatres as the Puritans did. Miss Wainwright's article gives evidence suggesting the contrary—that, in fact, Golding was urging his brilliant nephew to portray the stories, or histories on the stage.

Although, apparently, a rigid moralist and austere in his mode of thought, as well as the translator of Calvin's version of the Psalms, there seems to me no reason to suppose that Arthur Golding was a member of that offshoot of the Calvinistic doctrine, the sect nicknamed "Puritan" by a Jesuit, which sought to overthrow the established state of the Church under Elizabeth.

KATHLEEN LE RICHE.

Dear Sir,

The Shakespeare Fellowship Study Circle celebrated its fiftieth meeting on Thursday, 10th June, with a sherry party at Miss Wainwright's flat, 4 Collingham Road, S.W.5.

The Study Circle was founded in 1950 by half a dozen enthusiasts who wanted opportunities for study and discussion in addition to the regular meetings of the Fellowship. The first secretary was Mrs. M. H. Robins and the present secretary is Miss Ruth Wainwright. There are now over

twelve members and the average attendance is nine or ten. Meetings are held by invitation of various members at their own houses, when short papers are read, followed by informal discussion, and many aspects of the authorship question have been considered.

This constant interchange of ideas has been of great mutual benefit, and also very enjoyable. It occurs to me that other study circles might well be formed, particularly in the provinces where, it is to be hoped, they would eventually develop into full-grown branches of the Fellowship. All that is needed to begin with is for three or four keen Oxfordians to get together and *talk*: from my own experience, I think it is safe to say that there will be no difficulty in finding something to talk about. Formalities can be left to develop as the circle grows, in accordance with its needs.

It is possible that other study circles already exist, besides the one in London and, if so, I should be very glad to hear of them. I should also be glad to provide members wishing to start *new* study circles with the names and addresses of their neighbours.

GWYNNETH BOWEN,
Hon. Secretary.

THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP

Past Presidents:

LT.-COL. M. W. DOUGLAS, C.S.I., C.I.E.
PERCY ALLEN.

President:

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

Vice-Presidents:

T. L. ADAMSON. WILLIAM KENT, F.S.A.
J. SHEERA ATKINSON, LL.B. (LOND.)
MISS K. EGGAR, A.R.A.M. MRS. M. H. ROBINS.
CHRISTMAS HUMPHREYS, M.A., LL.B. (CANTAB.) J.P.

Hon. Secretary: MISS G. M. BOWEN,

Inglethorpe, Burlington Road, Buxton, Derbyshire

Hon. Treasurer: T. L. ADAMSON.

6 Upper Cavendish Avenue, Finchley, London, N.3

Hon. Editor of "News-Letter": W. KENT, F.S.A.

71 Union Road, S.W.4. (Macaulay 2007)

The Hon. Editor is always glad to receive MSS., newspaper-cuttings, letters, etc., for publication.

It is much regretted that Mr. Kent was still not well enough to prepare this issue of the *News-Letter* for the press. In the circumstances the Hon. Secretary and the Hon. Treasurer have jointly assumed the responsibility.