

# The Shakespeare Fellowship News-Letter

AUTUMN 1957



## CONTENTS

NOTICES		1
NEWS AND NOTES		1
HONEST DOUBT		1
REPORTS OF MEETINGS		2
THE ANNUAL DINNER		3
THE STUDY GROUP		4
ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY		4
ARTICLES :		
Shakespeare in Milan	G. Lambin	5
Editor's Note		5
Strange Omissions	H. L. Senior	6
The Forehorse to a Smock	H. H. Holland	8
BOOK REVIEWS :		
Shakespeare's Sources, by Kenneth Muir	Gwynneth Bowen	9
To a Lady. Surrey's Songs and Sonnets.		
Ed. D. Geary	Ruth Wainwright	10
Elizabethan Quintet, by Denis Meadows	Katharine Eggar	11
OBITUARY		11
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR		12

## NOTICES

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING will be held at the Newman Centre, 31, Portman Square, at 3 p.m. on Saturday, October 5th. Tea 2s.

THE NEXT MEETING will be held at the Poetry Society's Rooms, 33, Portman Square, at 3.0 p.m. on Saturday, 9th November, when Miss Katharine Eggar, A.R.A.M., will give a lecture on "What we learn of De Vere from Shakespeare's Fools and Clowns".

THE REVISED EDITION OF *Edward de Vere the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, The Real Shakespeare*, by William Kent and Others, is now on sale and copies (price 2/6d.) can be obtained from the Assistant Hon. Secretary. Besides corrections and additions, the pamphlet contains reproductions of the Welbeck and St. Albans portraits of Edward de Vere.

COPIES OF *Lord Oxford and the Shakespeare Group*, by the late Lieut-Colonel Montagu W. Douglas, C.S.I., C.I.E., can now be obtained from Mrs. K. D. Browning, 17 Warwick Gardens, London, W.14. The price has been reduced from 8/6d. to 5s. (5/9d. post free), or 2 copies for 10s. post free.

## NEWS AND NOTES

Mr. John Addy, a new member of the Fellowship, gave a lecture on the de Vere theory to a small Group at Carshalton, on 28th May. He was able to report: "I think many, if not most, were really quite convinced. As the chairman so delightfully put it 'convinced . . . against our Will'."

These small meetings do a great deal to spread our cause, and we were glad to know that a talk was given to some of the students at Edinburgh University, on de Vere, by a fellow student connected with one of our keenest country members. Although great interest was aroused, those concerned do not wish their names mentioned. Yet, we feel that such talks are really valuable and worthy of notice.

On 9th July, in the Home Service of the B.B.C., Hugh Sykes Davis told the story of Delia Bacon, the American lady who, exactly one hundred years ago published her theories about the authorship of Shakespeare's plays. Her part was dramatised in a feature called "The Consul and the Gifted Woman".

It is to be hoped that this is only the beginning of other broadcasts on the Authorship question.

## HONEST DOUBT

The following extracts are taken from an article entitled "Who Wrote Shakespeare?" by F. Murray-Todd, Professor of English in the University of Tasmania, which appeared in the issue for 16th March of *The A.B.C. Weekly* (the Australian equivalent of the *Radio Times*) and was brought to our notice by an Australian member, Mr. Terence Goodall.

After a gallant attempt to defend the case for William Shakespeare (or Shaksper) of Stratford, Professor Murray-Todd says:

"If the whole thing was a hoax it was an exceedingly skilful one.

"He was certainly and quite properly accused of plagiarism, but no one seems to have suspected him of being a complete impostor for centuries after his death.

"Yet all this does not amount to absolute proof; we have nothing more than a very strong probability. We do not even have that internal corroboration which other literary works often supply. Shakespeare never talks about himself in his plays; plays are hardly the appropriate place for that sort of self-revelation. . . .

"So it is possible that Bacon wrote Shakespeare, or that Derby wrote him or that Oxford wrote him; or that Mr. Hoffman's Marlowe wrote him. . . .

"Still we do have the very strong presumption that they (the plays) were written by the man who his contemporaries thought did write them. The first job of the objectors is surely to prove, not that so-and-so could have written them, but that William Shakespeare could not have.

"Until they can do that, we should go on in our old blind way, wishing that we had the sort of evidence that we can advance for Milton's authorship of *Paradise Lost* or Dickens' of *Oliver Twist*, but content for the moment with the sort of evidence that the author's age can be expected to supply, noting its inconclusiveness by strict test, but trusting its plain purport.

"The best candidate for the authorship of Shakespeare's plays is at present William Shakespeare. At least we can say that no one is more likely to have been responsible for them".

This is a far cry from the complacent attitude of yesterday. Professor Murray-Todd is to be congratulated on having the courage of his convictions—or lack of them—but hardly on his lukewarm adherence to the "old blind way". If he has doubts, surely it is up to him, as a Professor of English, to try to resolve them, and to look into the *positive* claims of the "heretics". If the Stratfordians cannot prove that their man wrote the plays, why should the anti-Stratfordians be expected to prove that he did not, without resorting to the one really effective means of doing so? It is notoriously difficult to prove a negative. As Charles Kingsley put it: "No one has a right to say that no water-babies exist till they have seen no water-babies existing; which is quite a different thing, mind, from not seeing water-babies". Nevertheless, most of us would stoutly maintain that we do not believe in water-babies, though we may suspect that other people do. Kingsley's Professor refused to believe in water-babies even when he did see one and, as a punishment, was made to believe in a whole lot of other things which were still more fantastic.

Sir George Greenwood demonstrated long ago the high degree of *improbability* in the Stratfordian case. If he and later writers have induced even a flicker of doubt in the academic mind, the time has surely come for an impartial examination of the various alternatives. There is, after all, one way of proving a negative, familiar to us all in the form of an *alibi*, and that is to disprove its opposite by proving another affirmative which is incompatible with it. Many of us think we know who wrote the plays. Obviously we cannot all be right since we disagree so heartily with each other, but the "orthodox" argument that we must, therefore, all be wrong is quite illogical.

It is to be hoped that we (not only the Shakespeare Fellowship, but anti-Stratfordians in general) shall one day be able to present a united front to the orthodox, but negatives are not enough.

## REPORTS OF MEETINGS

### SHAKESPEARE AND THE EARL OF SOUTHAMPTON

By CAPTAIN R. RIDGILL TROUT.—6th March, 1957

The main purpose of Captain Trout's densely packed paper was to urge the importance of the South and South-west part of England as a field of possible Vere discoveries.

There lie the great houses of the interlinked families which are closely connected with a number of the Shakespeare works, and in the record of those families, perhaps in muniment rooms never, so far, suspected of holding reference to the poet, may be hidden clues which our new knowledge could interpret.

Captain Trout, with his great genealogical knowledge, traced the ancient family of the Bohuns, who held Cowdray near Midhurst since the Conquest and in very early days had been related by marriage to the de Veres and in later times to David Owen, natural son of Owen Tudor, grandfather of Henry VII, whence were traced the Tudor Earls of Pembroke.

The rise of the family of Southampton was next shown, and the creation of the Viscounty of Montague, a daughter of which house became by her marriage with the 2nd Earl, the mother of Shakespeare's Southampton—the 3rd Earl.

The properties of these combined families included the great houses of Bath, Cowdray, Battle Abbey, Tichfield, Beaulieu, Wardour and West Horsley.

In passing, Captain Trout reminded us of the Cowdray Masque of the double wedding of the Montague son and daughter by "George Gascoigne", and went on to speak of Vere's father's purchases of land in Cornwall (of which he had recently examined some twenty documents, each signed either by John or Edward).

Another vivid glimpse of the past which our lecturer had enjoyed a few years ago, was a relic of Mary Wriothesley, the sister of Shakespeare's Southampton, in the form of her husband's Sir Thomas Arundel's great leathern hat, which, surmounted with tall plumes, he was wont to wear on going into battle, and which still hangs above the entrance door of his library.

A considerable section of the paper was devoted to the vexed question of Southampton's connection with *Willobie his Avis* and *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, and also to his patronage of John Florio.

In conclusion, Raleigh's residence at Sherborne Abbey, the Commission on Atheism held at Cerne Abbas, a few miles south of that, and the supposed tavern-home of the mysterious "Avisa" were all instanced as further spots in the West Country which might prove profitable fields for the completion of the story of Oxford's association with Southampton and the important people of the South of England.

KATHARINE E. EGGAR.

## "HAVE A GO"

6th April, 1957

At this meeting members were invited to address the Fellowship on any relevant subject chosen by themselves.

Mr. Shield, Mr. Cutner, Miss N. Loosely, Miss Amphlett and Miss Bright-Ashford responded to the invitation, and Mr. J. W. Russell took the chair.

The latter began by saying how glad he was that this programme had been arranged for the spreading of interest, and the extension of work among members of the Fellowship.

Mr. Shield began by speaking on "The Pros and Cons of the Several Candidates".

Taking J. T. Looney's eighteen points of identification, he found that Oxford scored highest, then Derby, almost equal; Bacon and Marlowe a long way behind; Rutland only gaining a few points, and William of Stratford nil. He reminded the audience that Looney's points have the advantage of being absolutely free from bias, or preformed opinion.

With reference to Oxford and Derby, Mr. Shield found that, although there are many parallels between them, our information about Oxford is based on fact, whereas that about Derby is generally conjecture. He thought, however, that several authors may well have been involved in the Folio, as shown by the huge vocabulary, (pointed out by Mr. Evans, in his book *The Magic Circle*), that Shakespeare used; and also suggested by different styles and outlook, this last point having been admitted by the orthodox.

Mr. H. Cutner was the next speaker, on "Some Baconian Claims". He began by explaining that he himself was not a Baconian. Nevertheless, he said that he had not been able to find an answer to the problem of the Cyphers, alleged to have been discovered by Baconians. Especially, he instanced, the numerical cypher to be found in the verse "To the Reader", underneath the Droeshout Portrait in the Folio, beginning: "This Figure, that thou here seest put".

Mr. Cutner brought an illustration of this verse, and explained the cypher to the audience, which he did not think could be a mere coincidence. His talk certainly showed that the Baconian claims deserve closer study than they usually get in modern times.

Miss Loosely's talk on "Why I am an Oxfordian" followed next in the programme, and was full of individual touches—the high-lights of personal conviction—which never fail to arouse interest. She told of her growing doubts that William of Stratford was the author of the plays, and her final conviction that Oxford wrote them, after reading *Shakespeare Identified* by J. T. Looney, to which she had been guided by Mr. Percy Allen. And she ended by speaking of the illumination given by her discovery of the real Shakespeare, which can never be enjoyed by those who pretend that it does not matter who wrote the plays.

The subject chosen by Miss Bright-Ashford, for the next contribution was "Tortington House: the London home of the de Veres"; of which, as the Secretary of the London Society, she was able to speak with detailed knowledge.

The name of this house was taken from the Priors of Tortington, near Arundel, Sussex, to whom it belonged, together with the Church of St. Swithens, before the suppression, in the reign of Henry VII.

From the Reportorium, Newcourt, 1708, Miss Bright-Ashford took the information that this "very fair house on the north side of the church and churchyard, belonging to the said Priory . . . was granted to John, Earl of Oxford (and thence sometimes called Oxford Place). And again in 15 Eliz. it was granted to Edward, Earl of Oxford". The latter sold the house to Sir John Hart in 1589. Stow adds that it also had "a fair garden". It stood in St. Swithun's Lane, off Cannon Street, and Wallbrook House was afterwards built on its remains.

Miss Amphlett was the last to speak in the programme, and gave an amusing paper entitled "Very Important Matters Militarie"—a quotation from a book, treating on matters of arms, by Sir John Smith, whose own military career bore an unmistakable resemblance to that of Sir John Falstaff's, not to speak of the "foolish and glorious paradoxes" of his dinner-time talk.

The interesting point was made that de Vere knew this gentleman, and that we know for certain that the former was present on an occasion referred to by Lord Leicester when Sir John Smith reported to Sir Thomas Walsingham from Tilbury camp, 1588, on the mirth-provoking dealings of Sir John with his regiments.

The Chairman, in his closing remarks, thanked all the members who had made the programme a success, and it was generally felt that the time had been too short for the papers, which could have been well expanded, and which had been so entertaining and worth while.

R.M.D.W.

## THE ANNUAL DINNER

The Annual Dinner of the Shakespeare Fellowship was held at the Commonwealth Headquarters of the English Speaking Union, 37, Charles Street, Berkeley Square, London, W.1, on Friday, 12th April, 1957, the birthday of Edward de Vere.

The chair was taken by the President, Mr. Christmas Humphreys, and nearly sixty members and friends sat down to the E-shaped tables, which had been decorated by Mrs. Christmas Humphreys with wax-like magnolias.

After the toast of "The Queen", the President called on Miss Gwynneth Bowen to give the speech of the evening, "The ever-living memory of Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford".

In a scholarly speech Miss Bowen outlined the belief of "Oxfordians", that Edward de Vere wrote the bulk of the Shakespeare canon and gave line and verse for her contention. This vigorous state-

ment pleased many of the members present, especially those who do not follow the groupist theory, and hearty applause at the end of her speech showed their appreciation.

The President then called on Mr. Hector Horton, editor of *The Humanist* to propose the health of the Fellowship, and he proved in a short speech that he was not only a humanist but a humourist, in a gentle vein which pleased his hearers. His concessions to the Oxford theory made Mr. Humphreys laughingly affirm that he was "already in the bag".

Mrs. Kathleen Le Riche made a witty speech in reply, and told of many friends' reaction to the Edward de Vere theory with "Hang it all, I've seen the birthplace".

When the President proposed the health of "Our Guests" he said that they had been lured here (to the dinner) that we might catch them as members. But, he was sure, that they were good material for 'conversion', and had been chosen on that account. He went on to talk of the "Groupist Theory", and of the good work being done in the U.S.A.

The Hon. C. M. Woodhouse who replied to this speech, had an amusing story to tell of his grandfather, who had a friend who invented a machine by which he could assess the genius of a given person either alive or dead. Needless to say, this machine caused great interest, and his grandfather was extremely interested in the results which were likely to come from it. Perhaps he had helped to finance the making of it, but be that as it may, when tested out on Michele Angelo the machine recorded a top genius, and the next genius to be detected (we all held our breath) was—his grandfather. . . .

Unfortunately the machine was not brought to the dinner, or much might have been discovered; for when the President was later asked some vital point, he said, "I can only remember that the claret was very good".

This short report on a very happy evening, may give those members who were not able to be present, the urge not to miss this annual function next year.

M.H.R.

## THE STUDY GROUP

The last six meetings of the Study Group have been devoted to a study of Shakespeare's plays themselves, with reference to dates of performances, and printed editions, sources, and connections with Oxford's life and ideas.

The plays chosen were: *A Midsummer Night's Dream*; *The Merry Wives of Windsor*; *Timon of Athens*; *Richard III*; *Richard II*; *Henry IV*, parts 1 and 2.

*The Merry Wives of Windsor* was studied with special reference to J. T. Looney's article in *The Golden Hind* for 1922, with its fascinating detective work in connection with the leading characters;

whose financial position, as well as personal relationships, he found to correspond exactly with that of Oxford, Anne Cecil, and Sidney in early life.

*Timon of Athens* was chosen for the November discussion, because many members had seen it performed recently at "The Old Vic", and it was found to be full of probable Oxfordian connections.

The historical plays of *Richard III*, *Richard II* and *Henry IV* repaid careful study, and it was hoped that *Henry V* would follow, but owing to other events of the Fellowship taking place in April, it was postponed.

During the summer the Study Group does not have regular meetings, but a delightful day was spent at Egham in June, by kind invitation of Miss Amphlett, when members brought notes on various subjects for discussion.

In studying the plays themselves, many interesting textual problems arose, and were elucidated by Miss Bowen, and the work of past Oxfordians was compared and noted. There still remains a vast field of study along these lines, which includes, of course, the work of orthodox critics, and of recent findings by all those who have written on the authorship question.

R.M.D.W.

## ADDITION TO THE LIBRARY

Nine bound volumes of the *East Anglian Magazine* have been bought for the library, by some members of the Committee, from Captain R. Ridgill Trout.

The first four, dating from 1935-39, contain interesting articles and correspondence, starting with F. Lingard Ranson's challenging article, "Shakespeare was an East Anglian." This brought answers, and further contributions from Roy Stokes—a Baconian, Mr. Percy Allen and others.

After the war, the Magazine was reduced in size, but the last five volumes contain beautiful photographs of places such as Castle Hedingham, Lavenham and Wivenhoe, with articles on the same.

### FURTHER ADDITIONS

*Bacon-Shakespeare.* An Essay (Anon).

*Ben Jonson and the First Folio.* W. Landsowne Goldsworthy.

*Lord Oxford and the Shakespeare Group.* Col. M. Douglas.

*Shakespeare's Histories.* Introduced by E. Dowden.

*The Elizabethan Love Sonnet.* J. W. Lever.

*Shakespearean Players and Performances.* A. C. Sprague.

## SHAKESPEARE IN MILAN

By G. LAMBIN

(cf., the last paragraph of *Journey Through Shakespeare's Italy*, p. 4 of the *News-Letter*, Spring 1957.)

Whether Father Patrick Hely (or O'Healy) was first known to Oxford, Derby, or any other, in Italy or anywhere else, by direct contact or hearsay or written documents, is in fact of very little importance. In my French article on *Shakespeare à Milan* I suggested that "Friar Patrick" in *T.G.V.* was an echo of the probable passage through Milan of the newly enthroned Bishop of Mayo, in July 1576, coming from Rome and on his way by land to Paris (incidentally when Oxford was already back in England).

But what matters a great deal is that "Friar Patrick" was a Franciscan friar, indubitably—whether meant for Friar Hely in person, or another Milanese friar under the name of their recently martyred visitor, as you will. What matters is that when Sylvia pretends that she is going to confess to "Friar Patrick" in his cell (IV.iii.43 and V.i.5), then she must have repaired to the Franciscan monastery at the north-eastern corner of the Piazza S. Ambrogio. There she has appointed the devoted Sir Eglamour to meet her. There, imagining that they have been detected, she shouts to him: "Go on, good Eglamour—Out at the postern by the abbey wall" (V.i.9)—which indubitably again refers to the postern or "pusterla" of S. Ambrogio (the only "pusterla" in Milan at the time), and to the contiguous wall of the Cistercian abbey of the same name just on the opposite side of the narrow "piazza". These are topographical facts, minute but exact ones, which no plan of the time reveals, though the "pusterla" itself was certainly known to a few residents as a secret means of passage through the inner ramparts.

Add to these facts the fact that the "North Gate" (III.i.258 and 370), that is to say the "Porta Comasina", through which Valentine had to hurry into exile, was the very one to be gone through if one wanted to reach the nearest point of the Milanese frontier: the bridge at Trezzo. Add to this the several other facts—that the wood reputed to be infested with robbers (cf., Fynes Moryson) had its "western end" (V.iii.9) turned towards Milan, "not three leagues off" (V.i.12), "upon the rising of the mountain-foot—that leads towards Mantua" (V.ii.45-46).

Add to this the excellent knowledge of the "port" of Milan, and of its outer "castello" dominated by the "Rochetta"—Sylvia's evident place of confinement, as it was the only tower with windows down upon the Esplanade.

Add to this again the exact and minute fact of the mock appointment given by Proteus to Thurio "at Saint Gregory's well" (IV.ii.86)—mind, not the Gregorio plague-house, but the well, or "fontanilo", beyond and behind it, providing its outer ditches with running water, though no contemporary plan again represents it.

Add to this, finally, that there is not a single indication of place, however insignificant, that does not exactly correspond to the Milanese topography of the time, and we may quite safely and honestly conclude that no one could have written *T.G.V.* without a perfect and intimate knowledge, certainly gathered on the very spot, of Milan, its surroundings, and its several ways of access.

Stratfordians, in their blind aloofness and wishful thinking, will, of course, either ignore the whole of it or feebly pretend that "Shakespeare may have heard about it all". But could Oxfordians—unless wishfully thinking in their turn—now do the same? Or would it not be fairer and safer on their part, discarding blind faith if need be, to acknowledge that someone else than Shakespeare or Oxford was the main or single author of *T.G.V.*? I propose Derby.

### EDITOR'S NOTE

The Earl of Oxford started on his continental tour in January, 1575, and stayed for some time in Paris before going on to Italy. On 17th March, he wrote to Lord Burghley from Paris: "For fear of the inquisition . . . I dare not pass by Milan, the bishop whereof exerciseth such tyranny; therefore I take the way of Germany". However, as the following letters show, he made the return journey via Milan and Lyons in March, 1576. Summaries of both letters are to be found in the *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series*, and the documents themselves are preserved at the Record Office.

#### **Benedetto Spinola to Lord Burghley, 23rd March, 1576**

"Just now I received a letter from Venice, of 26th February, from my brother who writes to me that the most illustrious Count (the Earl of Oxford) was very well and continued in his resolution to return home and has sent his trunks of belongings by the transport to Lyons. I think he will depart as soon as the Carnival is over, although his Lordship said he meant to leave before. I think his action strange in not having had a larger supply of money: of the 1800 scudi with which he provided himself at Naples and other places in Italy he is now taking only 800 and for the other 1,000 scudi he wants to have letters of exchange for Lyons." (Translated from the Italian.)

#### **Francis Peyto to Lord Burghley, 31st March, 1576**

(He has spent some time about a piece of work, being a perfect genealogy of all the marriages and affinities between the houses of England and Scotland. . .)

"My meanyng was to have shewed the designment to my Lord of Oxford if he had passed this way visible to any English eye, as he dyd not. I alwaies desyred to know his Lordshipe both for his own sake and for my countrys sake and to that end made offer of myself in his fyrst commyng hither. But upon good . . . at this new demand I was refused to be spoken with . . . from Myllan this last of March, 1576".

## STRANGE OMISSIONS

By H. L. SENIOR

In the year 1824 there came from Missolonghi three terrible words: "Byron is Dead". England was stunned and stupefied with grief.

In 1870 Charles Dickens died and two nations went into mourning.

When Shakespeare died at Stratford-on-Avon no one seems to have taken any notice of the event.

The glib explanation is that Shakespeare's England was so much more illiterate; but was this so? On the contrary, there were more illiterates to the million of the population during Victoria's reign than during that of James I.

Even earlier, in Marlowe's time there were 1,700 students at Cambridge, and the population of the country was then only some five and a half millions. Many of these young men were the sons of poor parents and went to the University on scholarships, or as pensioners, sizars, etc., and they read plays as well as Latin and Greek.

There must have been thousands of these students who had read at least a dozen of the Shakespeare plays; yet we hear of no great demonstration of grief from the Universities at his death. I am aware I am going over old ground on this subject, but I think I may add something new to it.

Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon died in the year 1616. There were living at that time the following men of genius, and I give each man's age in that year:

Chapman 57, Dekker 46, Drayton 53, Fletcher 37, Ford 30, Jonson 44, Heywood 44, Marston 40, Massinger 33, Middleton 36, Rowley 31, Shirley 20, Tourneur 41, Webster—birth not known, but he was writing plays from 1602 to 1624

This is the greatest assembly of native genius ever known. The river of the Italian Renaissance had burst its banks and flooded London. All these men were dramatists and poets, and their ages tell us that ambition, emulation and the admiration of supreme genius had not died in them. I must confess I have not read all the works of these great authors; but those who have, say that not one Ode or Elegy or Lament for Shakespeare was written by any one of them. There was no "Lycidas", no "Adonais" for poor William of Stratford. This is surely the greatest literary omission in all history.

In part explanation it has been suggested that at the time of his death only sixteen of Shakespeare's plays had been published and therefore the greatness of his genius had not been established.

The answer to this is that those sixteen plays contained matter so superlative that every one of these dramatists must have bowed to it. They were all poets and a poet must express in words that which he feels deeply, yet nothing was drawn from them by the death of Shakespeare of Stratford.

The other explanation of this unique silence is that it was not Shakespeare of Stratford who wrote

the plays, but Shakespeare, the pseudonym of Edward de Vere the 17th Earl of Oxford, who died in 1604.

There were other geniuses at the court of James I at this time, for English music was then at its zenith, with Orlando Gibbons, William Byrd, Thomas Morley, Henry Lawes and John Milton, the poet's father. Not an elegy, not a pavane came from any of these composers concerning the death of the greatest genius the world has ever known.

Two poets are also worthy of mention in this connection—Donne 43, and Herrick 25. Donne was a wit as well as a parson and was well acquainted with the "tribe of Ben", yet he does not mention Shakespeare's death. Herrick was at Cambridge from 1613 to 1617 and he does not record the event at all. This is really strange, for Herrick wrote poems on every possible and impossible occasion, sometimes too trivial for words. We cannot account for the silence of Herrick unless we assume that he knew the plays were not written by the Stratford Shakespeare.

James I was supposed to be a learned man and one of the great patrons of letters. Many of his sayings have come down to us but he never mentions the death of Shakespeare.

Before I consider my final great omission it would be as well to examine the question of pseudonyms.

The secret of a pseudonym does not last very long as a rule. Everyone knows that Mark Twain was Samuel Clemens. Everyone knew that "The Drapier" was Dean Swift, though the Dublin police could not, or dare not prove it. "Junius" was well kept but most people thought only of John Wilkes.

Shakespeare was a natural pseudonym for Lord Oxford to assume, from his own coat-of-arms, as Miss Amphlett says in her delightful book *Who Was Shakespeare?*

At Court this name may have lasted quite a long time, but it could not have remained a secret very long at the "Mermaid", "The Dog", "The Sun", "The Triple Tun" and "The Old Devil" tavern at Temple Bar where Ben Jonson's Apollo Club made revel. I think this accounts for the silence of all the great wits on Shakespeare's death at Stratford. There was no secret for them.

Much has been written about the First Folio of 1623 yet we still do not know who authorised it. The producers were said to be Hemminge and Condell, the old actor friends of Shakespeare. Why was Edward Alleyn not associated with this work? According to tradition, Alleyn, Burbage and Henslowe were Shakespeare's earliest colleagues in the world of the theatre.

Burbage and Henslowe were dead before 1623, but Alleyn was still alive. Perhaps he was too busy establishing Dulwich College. It is quite possible that the authority for publishing the First Folio came from the Sixth Earl of Derby and that this nobleman entrusted to Ben Jonson the secret of the authorship of the plays. The two men were

on the closest terms of friendship, and it was natural that Lord Derby would wish to preserve the secret of his father-in-law, Lord Oxford.

In Jonson's famous poem on Shakespeare for the First Folio the words "Sweet Swan of Avon" may have been intended to prolong the secret. Indeed, it has been asserted that it referred to the Wiltshire Avon, but this seems rather far-fetched. We all know what an inveterate leg-puller Jonson was from some of the stories he related to Drummond of Hawthornden. "The Sweet Swan of Avon" may have belonged to this order.

The phrase "little Latin and less Greek" may not have applied to Shakespeare at all.

As John Addington Symonds says: "Ben Jonson divides with Milton the honour of being the most learned of our poets". The great Ben, when in the mood, could be very arrogant and would not hesitate to tell any of his "tribe" that they had "little Latin and less Greek". Perhaps he would have excepted Chapman.

Mr. A. J. Evans in his interesting book *Shakespeare's Magic Circle* discusses the claims of Edward de Vere and the Sixth Earl of Derby. He comes to the conclusion that Shakespeare must have been the Earl of Derby. There was a young man of twenty-two at Cambridge in the year 1630, who certainly did not think so, for he wrote Shakespeare's Epitaph and Lord Derby was very much alive at the time. This young man was none other than John Milton.

In this fascinating study it seems to me that commentators have brushed aside Milton's poem as of no account. I think it has more significance than is generally supposed and is worth a little study.

It was used in the Second Folio of 1632 and it was the first work of Milton's to be published. Milton was only a boy eight years old when Shakespeare died at Stratford. And here a strange thought arises. Milton and Shakespeare were not really divided in time, yet we know everything about Milton and nothing about Shakespeare.

The boy Milton could not have known Shakespeare or even seen him, but his father most probably knew him. It is quite certain that John Milton senior knew Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford. The elder Milton was not only a prosperous city man, but also a notable composer. Indeed, his chamber music and madrigals are still to be found in all good music libraries. The Earl of Oxford was very fond of mixing with the artistic life of his day. It is said that Elizabeth rebuked him for associating with his social inferiors in this way, and we are told that he gave the Queen a very impertinent answer. Oxford, being a born poet, music meant very much to him, and there can be no doubt that he knew all the composers of the day.

John Milton senior was the kindest, the most indulgent and the most discerning father that any poet ever had. He saw genius in his son and allowed him the means to carry out his scheme of

perfectibility until his middle thirties. The two Miltons must have had long conversations about the great poets and writers of Elizabeth's reign and the Earl of Oxford must have been frequently mentioned.

Those who have studied the life of Milton know of his great ambition to compose something "to aftertimes that men would not willingly let die".

To achieve this it meant for Milton a life of intensive study and unremitting labour. To write a great poem a man had to make himself fit for it in body and mind. He was in the middle of this exhausting process when he wrote this poem on Shakespeare. The Shakespeare of Stratford would have been more of an enigma to Milton than Mozart is to us. To Milton, the twenty-two-year-old dedicated student, it must have been a clear impossibility for any man to have written the thirty-six plays, the sonnets and the poems without at least twenty years intensive study of poetry, of the theatre and of the ways of Courts. This William of Stratford could not have had; but if we assume that Milton was writing his poem about William this lack of everything must have been the wonder of wonders. He would surely have drawn attention to it in the poem. This is perhaps the greatest omission of any I have mentioned, but I think Milton must have had in mind Lord Oxford.

In this connection, there is a significance about the first two lines of the poem:

"What needs my Shakespeare for his honoured bones

The labour of an age in piled stones".

There is a mystery about Lord Oxford's burial. His body was removed from the Hackney Church for re-interment in Westminster Abbey; but it never reached there and no one seems to know where it finally rested.

We have to remember that Milton knew Ben Jonson well and greatly admired his genius, but he was too fastidious a man to frequent the literary taverns very much. He told his nephew Phillips that they smelled of putrefaction. Nevertheless, old Ben must have told the rising, young and curious poet, all he knew about Shakespeare.

We have drawn special attention to the silence of the great public on the occasion of the death of Shakespeare of Stratford.

How very different was the case of Ben Jonson. When he died, every poet and poetaster wrote eulogies of him, and he was buried in Westminster Abbey, in spite of his quarrel with Inigo Jones and his own loss of court favour.

Why did James I make Ben Jonson Master of the Revels, when Shakespeare was undoubtedly the genius of the theatre? This office was eventually merged in that of the post of Poet Laureate, which Charles I created especially for Ben.

It cannot have been the great number of Masques that Ben Jonson wrote for the Court. His dramatic work cannot compare with that of Shakespeare. He wrote five comedies and one

tragedy that will perhaps be considered equal to Shakespeare's second best. Ben also received a yearly stipend of £100 as Master of the Revels and this was increased to £300 by Charles I. We never hear of any pension for poor William of Stratford. The answer to all this is that Shakespeare Edward de Vere died in 1604.

It has been stated thousands of times that we know little or nothing about Shakespeare; but we know one or two rather unimportant things, because of certain records. We know he made money, which is most extraordinary for a poet. We know he had shares in a theatre. We know he married Ann Hathaway when he intended to marry someone else.

Finally, we have this touching picture from Nicholas Rowe who was born fifty-eight years after Shakespeare died. He is writing of Shakespeare in retirement and he says:

"His pleasurable wit and good nature engaged him the acquaintance and entitled him to the friendship of the gentlemen of the neighbourhood".

Well, well! Who would have believed it? So that the creation of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *Lear* enabled William to join in the conversation of the nice gentlemen of Stratford-on-Avon.

This is surely the bottomless pit of Bathos.

One final question; how could the mind that created *Hamlet* and *Lear* take any interest in real estate, usury and malt dealing?

## THE FORE-HORSE TO A SMOCK

By H. H. HOLLAND

There are three points that have interested me about this very enigmatic remark in *All's Well That Ends Well*.

(1) Though it is generally recognised as a contemptuous reference to a courtier's duties, it is entirely unsuitable to the Court of the King of France.

(2) From the very first, when I started the idea that Shakespeare wrote passages in his plays which were connecting links with the previous play, I was dissatisfied with the one I suggested as the connecting link of this play with *Love's Labours Lost*.

(3) I noticed that a horse is not necessarily the equine animal, but is also a name for various wooden frames such as a clothes, vaulting, stalking and many other horses.

Now for the remark to be a reference to the Court of Queen Elizabeth only is unthinkable: the author must have some other case in his mind with a loophole for escape if rounded on by the Queen.

Considering, therefore, these first two points together, I noticed that there is in *Love's Labour Lost* a courtier, Boyet, who was in attendance on a Princess of France and who was therefore an usher to a smock and that a reference to him could be a

connecting link between the two plays. But was there any definite reference to him? The passage in *All's Well* has three contemptuous references to the horse, the smock and the unmanly sword—"no sword worn but one to dance with".

So now turn to *Love's Labour Lost* (5.2.473). Biron has been exasperated by Boyet's action in spoiling the jest that the courtiers had intended to play upon the Princess and her maids-of-honour, and so he addresses the following remark to Boyet:

"Do not you know my lady's foot by the square  
And laugh upon the apple of her eye?

And stand between her back, sir, and the fire . . .

Die when you will, a smock shall be your shroud.

You leer upon me, do you? there's an eye  
Wounds like a leaden sword".

Here we have a reference to the smock and the unmanly sword. But what about the fore horse? What about the question—Do you not keep the fire from your lady's back? Do you not stand behind her at her meals and act as what we should now call a fire-screen? Are you not in fact acting as a fire horse to a smock? One letter only, in correction of a misprint, and the passage is explained as the connecting link with *Love's Labour Lost*. Thinking of Boyet, Bertram says:

"I shall stay here the firehorse to a smock".

---

## NOTICE

Since printing the above article we have to record, with profound regret, the death of its author—Rear-Admiral H. H. Holland. An Obituary Notice appears on page 11.

We print below his last letter to the Secretary, in which he sends his good wishes to the Fellowship, for this year, 1957.

Dear Miss Bowen,

This is to thank you very much for your kind remembrance of me at Christmas and to wish you a very happy New Year.

I hope the Fellowship is flourishing, that you are having interesting lectures and that more reasons are being discovered for believing in the Oxford theory. I can do no more myself now but I shall enjoy browsing over the old *News Letters* and Oxford books and even my own note book which recalls happy remembrances.

With all good wishes to the Fellowship and yourself. Yours very sincerely,

HUBERT HOLLAND.

---



## BOOK REVIEWS

**SHAKESPEARE'S SOURCES. (I) COMEDIES AND TRAGEDIES.** By KENNETH MUIR. Methuen, 1957. Price 25s.

The purpose of this book, clearly set forth in the first paragraph of the Introduction, is: "first, to ascertain what sources Shakespeare used for the plots of his plays; secondly, to analyse the use he made of them; and, thirdly, to give illustrations, necessarily selective, of the way in which his general reading is woven into the texture of his work".

For the most part, Professor Muir's arguments are not affected by the answer we give to the question: "Who was Shakespeare?", but in the second paragraph he begs the question by saying that there is no real reason to doubt that Shakespeare (i.e., Shaksper) attended both a petty school and a grammar school, "as he somewhere acquired the equivalent knowledge"! The fact is that the book tells us a great deal about "Shakespeare's" knowledge and nothing at all about Shaksper's. It thus provides us with a very useful measuring-rod by which to test the claims of the various candidates, beginning with Shaksper himself.

It soon becomes apparent that attendance at a grammar school is a quite inadequate explanation of the knowledge Shakespeare acquired. If not, strictly speaking, a scholar (and no one is more anxious than the scholars themselves to prove that he wasn't), he was certainly a prodigious reader, and his reading was not limited to his own language. Besides "a reasonable knowledge of Latin", which he might have acquired at a grammar school, and perhaps a slight knowledge of Greek, he had "some knowledge of French, Italian, and perhaps a smattering of Spanish". Though he never disdained the help of translations, he sometimes uses words which come closer to the original than any available translation, and in some cases, there *was* no available translation.

He did not rely upon a single source for each play, but often consulted several versions of the same story, or combined in a single plot different stories, taken from different sources, with no obvious connection between them. Sometimes he seems to have worked with a book open before him, and sometimes he drew upon a well-stored memory. That is to say, his reading was not always a means to an end, but an end in itself, of which he afterwards made use as occasion served. Professor Muir is not only concerned with the sources of Shakespeare's plots, but also with verbal echoes in the plays which betray their origin, or at least bear witness to the fact that one author borrowed from the other though, apart from dates, it is often impossible to say which was the debtor.

Those of us who believe that the real Shakespeare was the 17th Earl of Oxford (1550-1604) will naturally discount some of the alleged sources as post-Shakespearean imitations like the "Bad Quartos" of the plays, as, for instance, when we are told that Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* had a "con-

siderable influence" on *Hamlet*. *Pierce Penilesse* was not published till 1592—three years after Nashe's famous allusion to "whole Hamlets, I should say handfuls, of tragical speeches". This is generally taken as referring to the 'Ur-Hamlet', a hypothetical lost source-play, but if Nashe was already familiar with Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in 1589, it obviously follows that he borrowed from it in 1592. Again, for *King Lear*, Shakespeare is supposed to have used Holinshed's *Chronicle*, *The Mirror for Magistrates*, *The Faerie Queen*, Sidney's *Arcadia*, the anonymous chronicle play of *King Lear* and a book called *The Declaration of Egregious Popishe Impostures*, by Dr. Samuel Harsnett, Chaplain to the Bishop of London. But the last two may well have been later than Shakespeare's play. *Lear* was entered in the Stationers' Register in 1594 (unless this was Shakespeare's own version), but not published till 1605; and Harsnett's book, to which Professor Muir devotes nearly fourteen pages, was published in 1603, but deals with events which took place in 1585-6 and formed the subject of an enquiry before an Ecclesiastical Commission in 1598 and 1602, when certain priests were accused of sham exorcism. Shakespeare is supposed to have borrowed freely from this book, especially for the part of Edgar, masquerading as Poor Tom; but ones suspicions are aroused when Professor Muir says:

"One of the first things that is likely to strike a reader of Harsnett's *Declaration*, is his detailed and unclerical knowledge of the theatre". and confirmed when he adds:

"Harsnett may have derived this knowledge, superfluous for a Bishop's chaplain, from his undergraduate days at Cambridge; he may have frequented the play house in London; but as Chaplain to the Bishop of London he had the job of licensing books for the press . . . and it happens that his publisher, James Roberts, had a number of plays in his list, including the Second Quarto of *Hamlet*".

Is it possible that Harsnett's description of events nearly twenty years old took colour from a stage performance, or a private reading of *King Lear* which, in its turn, may have owed something to those same events? The answer to that question depends upon the date of Shakespeare's play, but Harsnett's knowledge of the theatre is a strange coincidence.

A great deal has been written in recent years about the sources of individual plays, but this book is the first attempt at a much-needed synthesis; though it deals only with the comedies and tragedies. Professor Muir has wisely postponed a discussion of the History Plays for a second volume, "since there is so much disagreement about the materials on which Shakespeare worked". The disagreement is, of course, on the vital question of "Who borrowed from whom?"—a question whose implications have not yet been fully realized.

GWYNETH BOWEN.

**TO A LADY.** *The Songs and Sonnets of the Earl of Surrey.* Edited and introduced by Douglas Geary, F.S.A. Scot. Forbes Robertson Ltd. 8/6.

In a short preface to this collection of all Surrey's extant verse, Mr. Geary says that he has set out to rectify what he considers to be an injustice done to this poet—Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey—in comparison with the attention that has been given to his friend and contemporary, Sir Thomas Wyatt. For he says, "So much has been published and written about the latter, and so many volumes of his poetry published, when hardly anything has been written about Surrey and his verse during the past century".

Mr. Geary has also added a biographical introduction to his book, and a portrait of the poet, which give it remarkably good value.

Surrey was born in 1518. In 1532 he was married to Lady Frances Vere, daughter of the 15th Earl of Oxford, and the aunt of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl. His poems are therefore of special interest to Oxfordians, although he was executed in 1547, three years before Edward was born. We can hardly doubt the latter's deep interest in his unfortunate uncle's poetry, and sympathy with his particularly cruel fate. For he had been executed solely on the charge, framed by his bitter enemies—the Seymours, of having assumed the arms of Edward the Confessor. Had his trial been delayed a few weeks longer he would have been saved by the death of the king.

In his introduction, Mr. Geary remarks that "it is an accepted fact that Shakespeare and his contemporaries based their verse on Surrey's achievements which had been popularised by *Tottel's Miscellany* published ten years after the poet's death. In his brief span of years Surrey laid the foundations upon which the Elizabethan poets built. . . ."

For, although Wyatt was about fifteen years older than Surrey and was historically the first to experiment in the English Sonnet form, it was the latter who perfected it, and who introduced the rhyme-scheme which is that of the Shakespearean Sonnet. "Both poets used the Petrarchan model, but whereas Wyatt's are apt to read as rough translations, Surrey's have a definite poetic individuality." (For those who are interested to read more on this, J. W. Lever's *The Elizabethan Sonnet* can now be had from the S.F. Library.)

It is interesting to note that de Vere's Sonnet beginning, "Who taught thee first to sigh alas, my heart?" is in Shakespearean form. The fact that it was signed *Earl of Oxenforde* suggests that it was a youthful work, and that he had an early acquaintance with Surrey's poems. It is the only sonnet in the collection.

Surrey also introduced changes in the system of heroic verse, and the Iambic structure of the line in verses of the octo-syllabic measure. His final and most notable contribution was the introduction of blank verse, which he employed for the first time, in his translation of the *Aeneid*.

We can imagine with what delight and sympathy de Vere would have read Surrey's long poem on *Windsor*, beginning:

"So cruel prison how could betide, alas,  
As proud Windsor. . . ."

in which he describes his former happy life as a young nobleman. . . .

"The stately seats, the ladies bright of hue.

The dances short, long tales of great delight ;

. . . The wild forest, the clothed holts with green ;

With reins availed, and swiftly breathed horse,

With cry of hounds, and merry blasts between".

Incidentally, it is in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* that Slender refers to "my book of Songs and Sonnets", i.e., *Tottel's Miscellany*. An apt remark when we think of J. T. Looney's convincing identification of Slender with Sidney. (*The Golden Hind*, October, 1922. S.F. Library.)

There are many poems in *To a Lady* which show that Surrey's influence was far more than that of an accomplished craftsman and elegant versifier, although it was for these qualities and for his formal, classical beauties, that he was so much read in the eighteenth century. J. W. Lever, in the work mentioned above has some interesting things to say about the wider field of public life "with its daily contacts between man and man" that he brings into his poetry. This field of political, military and literary activity also suggests Shakespeare's wide outlook. "He could, moreover, describe nature for its own sake, as in the well-known sonnet beginning" "The soote season, that bud and bloom forth brings", "which was suggested by Petrarch's very different sonnet composed after the death of Laura "Zefiro torna"."

His "Brittle beauty, that Nature made so frail" seems to have a wider application than to the beauty of women.

In the second part of his introduction, Mr. Geary discusses Surrey's suppositious passion for the fair Geraldine. And, although he states the evidence for believing that this lady was a real person, i.e., Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald, daughter of Gerald, 9th Earl of Kildare, he also gives good reasons for doubting whether Surrey's passion for her is to be taken as a reality.

Although the latter's first experiments in the sonnet form are on the subject of romantic love, his most notable ones are concerned with more mature experiences. For instance, his sonnet on "Sardanapulus's Dishonourable Life and Miserable Death". Such achievements show that his influence on the later Elizabethans was far more than a merely technical one.

For those who, after reading this new edition of Surrey's poems, with its introduction and modernised spelling, would like to compare him again with Wyatt, and other contemporaries, *The Book of Songs and Sonnets (Tottel's Miscellany)* can be had from the Shakespeare Fellowship Library.

RUTH M. D. WAINWRIGHT.

**ELIZABETHAN QUINTET.** By DENIS MEADOWS. Longmans. Price 15s.

This handful of portraits contains three whose contacts with the 17th Earl of Oxford can be definitely traced—Sir Francis Walsingham, Dr. John Dee and Sir John Harington.

Walsingham is, of course, a figure as familiar from history books as that of the Queen herself or Sir William Cecil, but this study is a handy reminder of his share in the reign's history, although perhaps too much is made of the "Machiavellian" tradition which has been hung round him, and not enough of the greatness and uprightness of this single one of Elizabeth's ministers who dared not only to resist her interference in his private affairs, but to speak his mind frankly to her on matters of state.

The portrait of Dee is true in facts, sympathetic in presentation and fair in judgment. It is indeed so vivid that one might call it a "skrying glass" of a hitherto little-valued aspect of the period. Most welcome is a complete absence of the usual patronising comment on 16th century investigation of psychic phenomena and extension of consciousness.

After so much insight into the great scholar's mind, it is disappointing to find the author falling into the trap—the word-play must be excused—of taking the merry Sir John Harington's scheme for hydraulic drainage as a coarse joke, instead of the revolution in sanitary engineering which it was. Otherwise, the portrait of this intimate member of the Queen's household (some ten years Oxford's junior but a kindred spirit) is made very lively, though it is a little unfair to make so much of his unescapable expenditure on Court dress and not to mention his sensible country tweeds, of which his dreary Royal Godmother so expressly approved.

The paper on Father Robert Person, a less known figure to most of us than the exalted Edmund Campion, is written with great care and appreciation, and appears to give a very discerning portrait of this indefatigable Jesuit's intricate employment by his Order with regard to English affairs, many of them touching Vere's friends and relations.

The only female in this so-called "Elizabethan" quintet is the "Roaring Girl", Molly Firth, who though born in 1589 had her career in the London underworld as Cutpurse and Gangster between 1611 and 1659.

KATHARINE E. EGGAR.

### OBITUARY

Rear-Admiral H. H. Holland, C.B.

We record with deep regret the death, at his home in Tavistock, at the age of 84, of one of our most valued members, Rear-Admiral Hubert Henry Holland, C.B., who was our President from September, 1946, to October, 1955, and had been a member of the Fellowship almost since its inception. Those of us who had the privilege of working with him will well remember his keen

interest in the affairs of the Fellowship, and his able and delightfully breezy contributions to any discussion, though for some years before his death he was seldom able to come to our meetings. His two books, *Shakespeare through Oxford Glasses* (1923), and *Shakespeare, Oxford and Elizabethan Times* (1933), were and remain contributions of outstanding value to the study of the question of the authorship.

His work lay largely in the tracing of references in the plays to current events, utilising a wide knowledge of the history and personalities of the time, both in this country and abroad. He pointed out that the literary interest in hundreds of passages is dependent almost entirely on the date when they were written, and that this interest is largely stifled by a tradition which dates them considerably later than their true dates. Admiral Holland's methodical and precise presentation of his conclusions makes his books eminently readable; and though later investigations show that here and there his links with persons or events do not hold good, the books form a most valuable supplement to Thomas Looney's *Shakespeare Identified*.

The chronology which he worked out placed the original writing of many of the plays as early as the fifteen-seventies and fifteen-eighties, and it is noteworthy that some orthodox writers have in the last few years been busy 'pushing back' into the fifteen-eighties the Sonnets and a number of the plays, while not admitting that as a result they cannot be fitted into the life of William Shakespeare of Stratford.

### THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP

#### President:

CHRISTMAS HUMPHREYS, M.A., LL.B. (CANTAB.), J.P.

#### Vice-Presidents:

T. L. ADAMSON. MISS H. AMPHLETT  
J. SHERA ATKINSON, LL.B. (LOND.)  
MISS K. EGGAR, A.R.A.M. WILLIAM KENT, F.S.A.  
DR. JOHN MEZ. J. W. RUSSELL.

Hon. Secretary: MISS G. M. BOWEN,  
38 Roland Gardens, London, S.W.7.

Assistant Hon. Secretary: MISS N. LOOSELY,  
13 Pennard Mansions, London, W.12.

Hon. Treasurer: T. L. ADAMSON,  
6 Upper Cavendish Avenue, Finchley, London, N.3.

Hon. Librarian: MISS R. M. D. WAINWRIGHT,  
4 Collingham Road, London, S.W.5.

#### Joint Hon. Editors of the News-Letter:

MISS G. M. BOWEN. MISS R. M. D. WAINWRIGHT.

Annual Subscription 10/- Life Membership £5

The *News-Letter* appears each Spring and Autumn  
Back-numbers (price 6d.) can be obtained from  
the Assistant Hon. Secretary.

The Editors will be glad to receive articles not  
exceeding 2,000 words, news items, letters, etc., all of  
which will be carefully considered.

Contributions for the Spring issue should be sent to  
the Hon. Secretary not later than 1ST FEBRUARY, 1958

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

## Marlowe-Shakespeare

Sir,  
The Marlovian theory surely goes back much further than Slater's *Seven Shakespeares*, in fact to Chicago in 1895 when Wilbur Gleason Zeigler published his book *It was Marlowe: a Story of the Secret of Three Centuries*. Zeigler, like Slater, was a Group Theorist: he believed that Shakespeare's works were written by Marlowe with the assistance among others of Sir Walter Raleigh and the Earl of Rutland. Mr. Calvin Hoffman, I believe, is the first to give the entire works to Marlowe.

R. C. CHURCHILL.

## Marlowe and the Sonnets

In the interests of accuracy may I comment on a small point arising on Mrs. le Riche's interesting contribution to the Spring, 1957 *News-letter*? In reference to the line in Sonnet 81—"The earth can yield me but a common grave"—she remarks in effect that it would not fit Marlowe since in view of his humble origin he could not look for anything but a common grave, and thus the prospect could not evoke a heart-wringing complaint such as Sonnet 81.

She has, however, mistaken the meaning of "common grave", apparently regarding it as meaning a humble grave—the sort that a shoemaker's son might expect. That is not the meaning: a "common grave" meant burial in a part of the churchyard set apart for burial of paupers, unknown strangers without means, etc.—a grave of other burials and likely soon to be disturbed again, not marked with any name, so that all memory of the deceased was lost. Whoever wrote it, the phrase as used in the Sonnet was clearly not to be understood literally.

J. SHERA ATKINSON.

Cardan's *Comforte*

Sir,  
Girolamo Cardano or "Jerome Cardan", born in Milan in 1501, died in 1576, the year de Vere visited Italy. (He was in Siena 3rd January, 1576.)

Many examples have been cited of some of Cardan's work and closely linked with *Hamlet* and many other Shakespeare's plays.

It is well known to Oxfordians that *Cardanus Comforte Translated into Englishe* was "published by Commaundement of the right honourable the Earl of Oxenford".

So it might confidently be expected that echoes of "Cardan" would also be found in known work of Edward de Vere.

An example comes to mind from "Cardan":

"When I am alone", says he, "I am then, more than at any other time, in company with those I love—the Deity, and my Good Angel".

Oxfordians will not need reminding of de Vere's:

"I never am less idle, lo than when I am alone".

B. R. SAUNDERS.

## Note

Material evidence of the importance attached to Cardan's *Comfort* as one of Shakespeare's sources, is to be found at the Osler Library, McGill University, Montreal, where I once had the privilege of seeing a copy which contained a bookseller's clipping, pricing it at £163 as a "Shakespearean item of the greatest interest", because Shakespeare was supposed to have taken from it Hamlet's famous soliloquy.

G.M.B.

On going to press we have been advised of another sad loss to the Fellowship, by the death of Mr. T. M. Aitken, who died on 19th August, an old and valued member of Larchwood, Boar's Hill, Oxford. We much regret that it is too late to do more than record this notice in this number.