

Quarterly

LIBRARY

UN: C 0

JUL 15 1947

The Shakespeare Fellowship was founded in London in 1922 under the presidency of Sir George Greenwood. SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

VOL. VIII

SUMMER, 1947

No. 2

The Fellowship's General Meeting Highly Successful

Achievements Reviewed and Progressive Plans Outlined

ON THURSDAY AFTERNOON, May 29th, a General Meeting of THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP was held at the Fifth Avenue residence of our Vice-President, Mr. James Stewart Cushman. Some seventy-five members and guests attended. While most of these were residents of New York and its suburbs, Philadelphia was well represented; Mrs. Chie Greene Holden traveled all the way from Denver, Colorado to meet her confreres; there were four or five visitors from the British Isles, including two representatives of the British Broadcasting Corporation; and to cover the affair from the news angle, the *Chicago Tribune* sent on by air one of its best-known feature writers, Mr. John Kelley-Cock.

Mr. Cushman opened the meeting with a few graceful words of welcome, followed by a tribute to the memory of our late and sincerely lamented American organizer and senior Vice-President, Mrs. Eva Turner Clark. He then introduced Dr. Bénézet, President of The Fellowship, who took the chair.

The President's Message

Dr. Bénézet's address presented a general picture of the development of the Oxford-Shakespeare movement, the essential realism and logic of its approach to the greatest of literary mysteries, and the outstanding success of our research workers in uncovering documentary proof for the 17th Earl of Oxford as the true "Shakespeare." By way of contrast, he mentioned the silly and misleading "extracadabra of the Baconians, who, despite their many wild and whirling claims, still manage to convince themselves adequately. He ended with a plea for widening of THE FELLOWSHIP's scope and

called for serious and unremitting cooperation in the task of building up our financial resources to a point where full advantage can be taken of our strong technical position in the field of scientifically conceived research. Members were urged to get behind our Publication Fund and to let no false modesty stand in the way of efforts to enlist the practical aid of any educational foundation that can be interested in supporting our work.

Gelett Burgess in Rare Form

The next speaker was Mr. Gelett Burgess, distinguished author and pioneer Oxfordian, who now heads that lusty young organization, The New Shakespeare Society of Philadelphia. Many people who know Mr. Burgess as one of America's most original humorists, or as a novelist, short story writer and essayist with forty volumes to his credit, overlook the fact that he is a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and essentially of a scientific cast of mind. That is the reason why the documentation and logic of the evidence for Lord Oxford as the Bard appeals to him so strongly. Having strayed into literature through the portals of engineering and architecture, Mr. Burgess has retained a healthful skepticism and a respect for demonstrable truth in fields where it is most needed. Like Shakespeare, he has added several words to the English language—"blurb" being one of his most popular contributions—and it is not above his capacity to coin a new one to define the misleading compilations of fiction and conjecture now passing for "biography" in Stratfordia.

Emphasizing Dr. Bénézet's call for vigorous

support of the Treasurer in his efforts to create an adequate financial endowment, Mr. Burgess declared that he could think of no worthier or more rewarding cause in the whole realm of historical research.

He then briefly sketched the development of The New Shakespeare Society of Philadelphia in introducing his colleague, Mr. Wainwright Churchill III, who as Vice-President of the group, read a witty and interesting statement of the aims, purposes and first seasonal activities of the Society.

Philadelphia Points the Way

"We are planning a series of six lectures on topics pertinent to the Shakespeare authorship question for next season," said Mr. Churchill. "Besides these lectures, we are organizing a study group from among interested members, to meet twice a month, in order to make thorough analyses of certain plays. In addition, we shall arrange talks on each Shakespeare production that is given in Philadelphia currently."

The constructive plans and accomplishments of The New Shakespeare Society elicited hearty applause. Two of Mr. Churchill's Philadelphia colleagues at the meeting were Mr. Karl Zimmer, Treasurer, and Dr. Abraham Feldman of the English Department of the University of Maryland. Mr. Burgess, be it noted, resides in New York, and is a Philadelphian by adoption.

The Hampton Court Portrait Discoveries

An illustrated talk with stereopticon slides, covering *New X-ray and Infra-red Oxford Evidence in Famous Paintings of "Shakespeare,"* by Mr. Charles Wisner Barrell was the final event of the afternoon.

The lecturer chiefly concentrated upon his recently completed dispositive studies of the ancient and mystifying "Shakespeare" portrait which has been in Hampton Court Palace as part of the collection owned by the British Royal Family since the days of William IV. It was the first showing of this research material before a representative New York audience. And the under-surface evidence for the 17th Earl of Oxford as the original sitter for the Hampton Court painting which the tools of modern science disclosed, proved eminently convincing to the overwhelming majority of the audience. As a complete presentation of the evidence, fully illustrated from every angle, will be published as soon as proper arrange-

ments can be made, we will not attempt to go into details at this time. The news story written by Mr. Astley-Cock for the *Chicago Daily Tribune* and printed in that widely-circulated newspaper on Friday, May 30th, devoted particular attention to Mr. Barrell's pictorial revelation of Lord Oxford's personality behind the long suspected surface camouflage of this royally owned "Shakespeare." The Hampton Court painting thus takes its place with the Ashbourne and "Janssen" portraits (both owned by the Folger Shakespeare Library of Washington, D. C.) as another provable original of the Elizabethan Lord Chamberlain of England. It will be remembered that an extensively illustrated article by Mr. Barrell, detailing his X-ray and infra-red explorations of the Ashbourne "Shakespeare" was published in *Scientific American Magazine* for January, 1940; with a short follow-up discussion of additional evidence in the May, 1940 issue of the same periodical. Copies are still obtainable from the publishers.

Reporter's Misleading Article

A reporter from the *New York Herald-Tribune*, in covering our General Meeting, printed a sarcastic and misleading version of the affair. Under the heading, "Bacon Has a Rival As Shakespeare," the members and guests of THE FELLOWSHIP were pictured as a choice collection of crackpots "sighing" over their "hero" and exerting misapplied energy in attacking the memory of Sir Francis Bacon. The reporter's own knowledge of the 17th Earl of Oxford, as he took pains to explain, was not obtained from THE FELLOWSHIP's spokesmen, but from a more authoritative source—the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, no less! Readers of the October, 1946, issue of the QUARTERLY, in which the *Britannica's* false and antiquated biographical sketch of Edward de Vere was exposed, can appreciate our humiliation under correction of this erudite censor. A final paragraph of his report is typical of the way in which the Oxford case as a whole was misrepresented.

"The evidence on which is based the belief that he was the author—under the name 'Shakespeare'—of the plays can best be described as tenuous. For example, on a screen was flashed a picture of De Vere, which showed he had long fingers. A portrait of Shakespeare also was shown, in which he also had long fingers. Therefore, De Vere was Shakespeare."

The adroit use of a mere fraction of the portrait evidence to mislead readers generally and belittle

...vast accumulation of the Oxford-Shakespeare
...as a whole indicates a distinguished career
...this reporter in the field of orthodox Shake-
...criticism. With two or three more articles
...this type to his credit, he should even be in
...for a chair in Stratfordian biography!

Chicago Tribune Features Meeting

On the other hand, the accurate and eminently
...account of the Oxford case and the pictorial
...of the Hampton Court painting which
...written for the *Chicago Daily Tribune* by John
...Cock is known to have stimulated the
...attention of many readers. A Master
...of Arts of Trinity College, Cambridge, and a phi-
...ologist of recognized reputation, Mr. Astley-Cock
...been a member of the *Tribune's* editorial staff
...many years. He is also a member of THE
...SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP, and was one of the
...Anglo-American journalists to recognize the
...scientifically sound approach of J. Thomas Looney
...and his colleagues to the now demonstrable solu-
...of the Shakespeare authorship mystery. With
...sincere and understanding cooperation of such
...constructive critics and publicists as John Astley-
...Cock on our side, Oxford-Shakespeare proponents
...need not worry particularly over the petty falsifica-
...that may creep into print from time to time
...in connection with the presentation of our argu-
...ments.

Mr. Burgess Answers N. Y. Herald-Tribune

The nimble-witted Mr. Burgess, however, de-
...ded that the *New York Herald-Tribune's* account
...of our General Meeting should not be allowed to
...pass unanswered. Sharpening his favorite goose-
...pen, he sat down and indited a vigorous letter
...in protest to the editor which finally took form
...as one of the most readable and convincing briefs
...on Lord Oxford as the real Shakespeare that
...has yet appeared in print. It was published in the
...*Herald-Tribune* of Sunday, June 8th, under a four-
...column head, reading "Modern Research Sheds
...New Light on Bard of Avon."

The Editors of the QUARTERLY think so highly of
...the Burgess letter as a statement of The Fellow-
...ship's position that they have reproduced it as
...a special supplement to this issue. Additional
...copies can be had by writing to the Secretary and
...enclosing postage to cover mailing.

Election of Officers

Prior to the General Meeting, a meeting of the
...Board of Trustees of THE FELLOWSHIP was held

on May 29th. Those present included Dr. L. P.
Bénézet, Mr. S. Mallet-Prevost, Mr. J. S. Cushman,
Mr. Charlton Ogburn and Mr. C. W. Barrell, as
voting members of the Board, together with such
Oxfordians of experience and influence as Mrs.
Elsie G. Holden, our Colorado Vice-President;
Mr. Gelett Burgess; Mrs. Frank G. Sprague; Mr.
Taber Sears; Miss Clara Van Benthuyssen; Mr.
Lewis H. Webster and Mr. Glendon Allvine. After
a general discussion of the progress of THE
FELLOWSHIP and the best means to be pursued to
improve our financial position, the Trustees pro-
ceeded to the election of officers.

To succeed Mrs. Eva Turner Clark, deceased,
as Trustee, Mr. Glendon Allvine was unanimously
chosen; and to succeed Mrs. Clark as Vice-Presi-
dent, Mr. T. Henry Foster of Ottumwa, Iowa, was
also given the unanimous vote of the Board.

Upon a resolution regularly moved, seconded
and adopted, the Secretary was then instructed to
cast a ballot for the reelection of all present execu-
tives. The officials of THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP
for the current year therefore include Dr.
Louis P. Bénézet of Hanover, New Hampshire,
President and Chairman of the Board of Trustees;
Mr. James Stewart Cushman of New York, N. Y.,
Vice-President and Trustee; Mr. Flodden Heron
of San Francisco, California, Vice-President; Mrs.
Elsie G. Holden of Denver, Colorado, Vice-Presi-
dent; Mr. T. Henry Foster of Ottumwa, Iowa,
Vice-President; Mr. Charles Wisner Barrell of
New York, N. Y., Secretary-Treasurer and Trustee;
Mr. Charlton Ogburn of New York and Washing-
ton, D. C., Counsel and Trustee; Mr. S. Mallet-
Prevost of New York, N. Y., Trustee; Mr. Frank
C. Doble of Cambridge, Massachusetts, Trustee;
Dr. John Howard Dellinger of Washington, D. C.,
Trustee, Mr. Burton Rice of Paris, Trustee and Mr.
Glendon Allvine of New York, N. Y., Trustee.

Oxford-Shakespeare Talks

ON APRIL 25TH The New Shakespeare Society
of Philadelphia took part, with the Plays and
Players Club of that city, in the opening of a
Shakespeare Festival which was signaled by a
special run of *King Lear* under the co-direction
of Mr. Fergus Reddie and Mrs. C. Paul Snyder.
The Plays and Players is one of the oldest and
most consistently talented stage groups to be found
in the United States. Their little theatre on
Delancey Place is a model of all that such a house
should be. Special guests at the Plays and Players
Club reception were Mr. Gelett Burgess, Mr.

Charles Wisner Barrell and Dr. Abraham Feldman.

During the evening of the same day, Dr. Feldman gave a lecture on "The War of Loves in *King Lear*" at the WCAU Radio Auditorium under the auspices of The New Shakespeare Society. He spoke to a capacity audience, and considerable discussion of pronounced Oxfordian tenor developed from Dr. Feldman's presentation of his study of the famous tragedy.

Two effective presentations of Oxford-Shakespeare evidence were contributed to the cause during May by Mr. Glendon Allvine, our newly elected member of the Board of Trustees.

On Sunday, May 4th, Mr. Allvine appeared before about fifty members and guests of the Young Adults Club at All Angels Parish House, 251 West 80th Street, New York. He was introduced by Mr. Daniel F. Davison, nephew and namesake of the late Daniel Frohman, the famous theatrical producer who enthusiastically espoused the claims of Edward de Vere during his latter years.

Mr. Allvine's talk aroused much interest. In the discussion following his remarks, the Assistant Rector, and a member of the Young Adults Club who had been educated in Warwickshire, both added corroborative points of view to the Allvine arguments.

In connection with his informational activities for the Motion Picture Association of America, Mr. Allvine visited Worcester, Mass., later in the month. He stayed over in that city to give a talk to the Worcester Better Films Committee, on May 16th. The subject was, "Did William of Stratford Write 'Shakespeare'?" It was an especially intelligent and progressive group that made up Mr. Allvine's Worcester audience, including the Presidents of practically every one of the Women's Community Clubs in that area of Massachusetts. While to many of the ladies present the Oxford-Shakespeare case was an entirely new story, Mr. Allvine's witty and thought-provoking handling of the authorship question was voted an emphatic success.

Dr. L. P. Bénézet gave the season's final lecture for The New Shakespeare Society of Philadelphia at the WCAU Auditorium in that city on the evening of May 24th.

His subject was "The Case for Shakspeare." It had been widely publicized in orthodox Stratfordian circles throughout the Philadelphia terri-

tory for the purpose of securing some advocate of the generally accepted authorship theory to share the platform with Dr. Bénézet and give the public an opportunity to hear an effective answer to the Oxford arguments. However, not a single one of the twenty or more well known Stratfordian professors who reside in the vicinity of Philadelphia put in an appearance. Professors of Mathematics, history and physics, on the other hand, were present and participated in the discussion that followed Dr. Bénézet's talk. Two of these openly denounced the artful dodger tactics of their English teaching colleagues in refusing to face up to the challenge of the Oxford authorship case.

Authority Admits Failure

BY COMMON CONSENT, the greatest living authority on the life of William Shakspeare, the alleged genius of Stratford-on-Avon, is Sir Edmund Chambers. He is the author of the multi-volume work called *The Elizabethan Stage*, and wrote the biography of Shakespeare for modern editions of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. In 1930 he published his final documentary life of the Bard in two volumes. Everyone who takes up this impressive looking work with knowledge of the many years of effort spent by Sir Edmund in its preparation will naturally say with the late Bernard M. Ward:

"Here at last is the best possible case that can be made out for Stratfordian orthodoxy."

But this is what we find to be the great authority's final conclusion regarding actual evidence as to the Stratford native's career as a playwright in London:

"It is no use guessing. As in so many other historical investigations, after all the careful scrutiny of clues and all the patient balancing of possibilities, the last word for a self-respecting scholarship can only be that of *nescience*."

Nescience, he it noted, is only the sixty-four dollar synonym for *ignorance*.

The smaller fry of Shakespearean lawgivers in our colleges who chug in the wake of Leviathan Chambers would do well to note his blunt confession of failure to certify William of Stratford as a dramatist, before leading more schools of undergraduates astray.

The Poet Earl of Oxford and Grays Inn

By J. J. DWYER

It is always an event when the Editors of the QUARTERLY are favored with a paper from the pen of their valued London correspondent, Mr. James J. Dwyer, until recently Editor of the British Shakespeare Fellowship NEWS-LETTER. One of the most competent and painstaking classical scholars now devoting serious attention

to the Oxford-Shakespeare evidence, we can be sure that well-grounded knowledge backs his selection of subject matter. The virtual wiping-out of the venerable buildings and historic library of Grays Inn during the wartime blitz lends a touch of poignancy to the present Dwyer contribution.

IN TUDOR TIMES London was virtually a University town: to our way of thinking, far more so than Oxford or Cambridge. In the four Inns of Court—the Middle Temple, the Inner Temple, Lincoln's Inn and Grays Inn—it possessed nearly all that the term "University" connotes. London was not merely the capital but far more completely, then, than in later times, the intellectual and social centre of the Kingdom. Thither from all the shires came the brightest and most ambitious young men, to keep the legal terms at the four Inns. It was not merely to study law, for many of them would not need to practise, but to acquire a general education, to sharpen their wits on one another by association and competition, and to learn right conduct by imitation of their elders and betters. For "the termers,"¹ as they were often styled, were the sons of the nobility and gentry, and social training was as much desired as intellectual.

At the two Universities it was different. The youths who were sent to Oxford and Cambridge were for the most part destined to be clerics or schoolmasters, a staid and sober brood; typical of these were men like Roger Ascham, Nicholas Dall, Gabriel Harvey.

Whence came this distinctively English institution, the Inns of Court? In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the schools of law in London were all in the hands of ecclesiastics; the King's judges had been generally bishops. But later in the thirteenth century the clergy were completely withdrawn from the temporal courts and eventually Edward I directed that students "apt and eager" should be brought from the provinces and located in proximity to the King's Court of Com-

mon Pleas at Westminster. The inns which received them were thus "the earliest settled places for students of the law" and were the germ of what Coke afterwards called "the English juridical university." There the apt and eager students not only read Law and Divinity but acquired the accomplishments of a liberal education, "so that these hostels, being nurseries or seminaries of the court, were therefore called Inns of Court." Sir John Fortescue, Henry the Sixth's famous Lord Chief Justice, in his great work, *De Laudibus Legum Angliæ* (circa 1468) described the Inns as "a sort of academy or gymnasium, fit for persons of their station; where they learn singing and all kinds of music, dancing, and such other accomplishments and diversions, which are called revels, as are suitable to their quality. . . ." So that "Knights, Barons, and the greatest nobility of the Kingdom often place their children in those Inns of Court;" not so much to make the laws their study, much less to live by the profession, having large patrimonies of their own, "but to form their manners and to preserve them from the contagion of vice. . . . The manner and method how the laws are professed and studied in those places is pleasant and excellently well adapted for proficiency." Fortescue says also that "in the greater Inns a student cannot be maintained under 28 pounds p.a. (500 pounds now). For this reason, the students are sons of persons of quality, those of inferior rank not being able to bear the expense." From all of which it is obvious that the son of a Stratford-on-Avon tradesman could have had no possibility of access to any such society.

There were also ten subsidiary or inferior Inns called Inns of Chancery (*Hospitia Cancellariae*). Together with the four original *Hospitia Curiae* they constituted, as Stowe says in *Survey of London* (1598) "a whole university, as it were, of students,

¹The four legal terms are *Hilary* (Jan.) *Easter* (April), *Trinity* (June) and *Michaelmas* (Oct.). The names are taken from well-known Feasts in the Calendar of the Church.

practisers or pleaders and judges of the laws of this realm."

The recreation at the Inns took the form not of athletics but of "revels," i.e. music, masques, speeches and plays. The latter were encouraged in order to cultivate the literary and forensic powers of the students. Very similar indeed were the entertainments habitually produced at the Court of the Sovereign. Elizabeth, and the Stuarts, (who like her had a passion for these things) constantly attended the revels at the Inns of Court and indeed sometimes invited the lawyers to witness similar shows at the royal palaces. The revels held at Grays Inn at Christmas 1594 lasted for a fortnight and were revived at Shrovetide for the entertainment of the Queen. It is on record that on one occasion, at the Palace of Greenwich, when the Grays Inn masquers were presented to her, the Queen "gave them her hand to kiss with most gracious words of commendation to them particularly and in general of Grays Inn, as an house that she was much beholden to, for that it did always study for some sports to present unto her." It is no marvel that the Inns of Court long remained centres of loyalty and attachment to the Crown. Their studies and their diversions alike were courtly. What there was of Renaissance atmosphere in England was to be found there and in the houses of some of the great nobles, not in the Universities whose ways were still medieval and semi-monastic. Their numbers, too, were not insignificant. We hear of eighty gentlemen of Grays Inn at this time, so that in scale the London Inns of Court would equal the larger Italian Courts, Florence or Ferrara.

Grays Inn was founded about the same time as the other three. Situated to the north of High Holborn, it takes its name from the Lord Grey, or Gray, de Wilton who in the fourteenth century had let the manor house there belonging to him with its appurtenances to tenants as an *hospitium* i.e. an "Inn or hostel for the reception of Students." Like the other Inns it soon produced a crop of distinguished men, prominent among them Sir William Gascoigne, (1350-1419) the fearless Chief Justice. Everybody knows the story alluded to in 2 *Henry IV*, I. ii. 62-63, and though it has been denied,² it rests upon a strong tradition that Gascoigne did actually commit the Prince of Wales to prison for attempting to take a prisoner from the bar of the Kings Bench. Others of note

were Thomas Cromwell; Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, second husband of Mary, younger sister of Henry VIII and widow of Louis XII of France; Thomas Wriothesley, first Earl of Southampton, Henry the Eighth's last Lord Chancellor, and Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, Lord Chancellor under Philip and Mary, who became a member of Grays Inn after receiving the Great Seal.

The reign of Elizabeth was the golden age of Grays Inn. Besides a good proportion of the judges there were in particular three men of importance who did all in their power to promote the interests and increase the prestige of their beloved Inn: Sir Gilbert Gerrard, who became Attorney-General and Master of the Rolls; Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, the father of Francis Bacon³; and Sir William Cecil, later Lord Burghley, and Lord High Treasurer, who was to be the father-in-law of the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford. Sir Nicholas Bacon had been Attorney to the Court of Wards,⁴ of which Cecil as Chief Minister of the Crown became the Master, and both men used the position to introduce into Grays Inn all the most prominent youths of rank or promise with whom they came into contact. Burghley brought in his own sons, Thomas (afterwards Earl of Exeter) and Robert (afterwards Earl of Salisbury) who succeeded his father as Secretary of State to James I. There too went Edward de Vere in 1567, after his sojourn at Cambridge. Others at Grays Inn at that time were Sir Francis Walsingham, Elizabeth's Secretary of State; Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Deputy of Ireland; Lord Howard of Effingham who commanded the English fleet against the Armada; John Whitgift, for twenty years Archbishop of Canterbury and the principal agent in the Elizabethan religious settlement; Thomas Howard, fourth Duke of Norfolk, whose aspiration to the hand of Mary Stuart cost him his life; Thomas Percy, seventh Earl of Northumberland; Lord Strange, later fourth Earl of Derby. Equally interesting to students of the Shakespeare Question are Sir Philip Sidney; his nephew, William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke; his son-in-law, Roger Manners, fifth Earl of Rutland, who has been put forward as a possible Shakespeare; and Henry

3. Francis was admitted at the age of sixteen, and after his two years in France, became a permanent resident in 1579 or 1580.

4. Wards were orphan heirs to great estates who were in the guardianship of the Crown during their minority. Their property and interests were the care of a special court.

2. The improbable part of the story is that the Prince struck the Judge.

Wriothesley, third Earl of Southampton, to whom *Titus & Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* were dedicated. Some people believe, with much reason, that these brilliant youths were the originals of various characters in the Comedies, honey-tongued Boyet, and Valentine, perhaps, or Bassanio, Gratiano and Mercutio. Certainly they were a lively society, these students of Grays Inn, patrons of witty men of letters, the main purchasers of books, a permanent audience for plays; they were cultivated but not continual plodders; most of them had some Latin and all of them some Law; they knew, too, all the latest gossip, and the ways of the Court and the Town; when they lost their voices it was not with singing anthems and they were clearly resolved that for themselves at any rate, there should always be cakes and ale. It was well, too, that they should sow their wild oats quickly and acquire betimes a proper and fitting gravity, for they were the men who, when they ultimately returned to the shires or took up their inheritance, were, as Lords Lieutenant, Sheriffs and Justices of the Peace, to have the real governance of the country.

To this flourishing institution enter young Lord Oxford, at the age of seventeen, a most acute and genial,³ stuffed with Ovid and Seneca and Plautus. An apt and eager pupil, the heir to great estates, he had every reason to gain acquaintance with Law. All wealth was then in land and some understanding of the Law of Real Property was absolutely necessary for every owner if he was not to be at the mercy of his stewards and bailiffs—let alone other people's lawyers. Nor was the land confined to matters of estate management. The Earl was bound by his position to take a large part in the administration of local government which in England was based largely on Law and not, as elsewhere, on feudal custom or caprice. The reasons therefore for entering a young Earl as a student in one of the Inns of Court were abundant and obvious and there need be no more mystery about his knowledge of Law than about his knowledge of Latin. Nor indeed need there be any great wonder that he introduced it afterwards into what he wrote. The genius that absorbed and produced everything could retain at the most inexpressible period of life and afterwards re-emerge at will even the most arid technicalities of procedure. He did not have to practise—still less

to be a future Lord Chancellor! The things that we learn between fifteen and twenty are the things which we never forget; and so Grays Inn and its legal studies were part, and a large part, of the impressions that remained graven on the wax.

In the opening lines of *Love's Labour's Lost* the note is struck at once:

You three, Biron, Dumain and Longaville,
Have sworn for three years' term to live with me,
My fellow-scholars and to keep those statutes
That are recorded in this schedule here . . .

And though his main purpose in that sparkling play may be to make fun of Euphuism he is ready at all times not only to exhibit his virtuosity in fitting the technical jargon of the law to quite unlikely themes but also to parody any other kind of jargon, formal logic, pedantical reasonings, quilllets and quiddities. Listen again: "He came saw and overcame; he came, one; saw, two; overcame, three; who came? the King; Why did he come? to see: why did he see? to overcome." Boyet and Maria, a graceless pair, are witty about common of pasture and so on. Later on he will make Touchstone supply a marvellous explanation: "It is a figure of rhetoric that drink being poured out of a cup into a glass, by filling the one doth empty the other," and Feste will make searching trial of Malvolia's sanity by interrogating him on the doctrine of metempsychosis. He must have heard plenty of that kind of fun before he began to practise it himself nor is it necessary to twist Fuller's words to invent imaginary suppers in the squalid taverns of London. The lawyer-scholars and lawyer-poets could "anatomise" and supply all that and the real *noctes cenaequae deum* were at the Inns of Court, not The Mermaid Tavern. Without having to wrest any texts we can easily "behold" the keen encounter of wits in the hours of relaxation. Consider the wording of the question: "What is the opinion of Pythagoras concerning wild-fowl?" We see the supper table in Hall, the poised head, the balanced wine-glass, the flickering smile, the amused attention of the company.

But the best of it all is the First and Second Gravediggers on suicide and the consequent denial of Christian burial. It is a parody of a celebrated legal conundrum. The case of Sir James Hales, of Grays Inn, must have been constantly discussed or re-told by his fellow members. Hales was a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas who held a leasehold estate as joint-tenant with his wife.

³ *Acute juvenal*, a phrase used by Don Adriano in *Love's Labour's Lost*.

Eventually he went out of his mind and drowned himself in a shallow stream near Canterbury. The Coroner's jury returned the usual verdict of *felonia de se*, the effect of which would ordinarily be the forfeiture of the lease. Counsel appearing on behalf of the widow who claimed succession argued that no forfeiture had been incurred because the criminal act had not been committed by the *dead* man. The act had been committed, he said, when Hales was *alive*: only a living man could be punished or penalized for his acts: a dead man could not be; still less his innocent widow. In his Law Report, Plowden has preserved the gist of the ingenious argument: "Sir James Hales was dead and how came he to his death? It may be answered, by drowning. And who drowned him? Sir James Hales. And *when* did he drown him? In his life-time: so that Sir James Hales being alive caused Sir James to die and the act of the living was the death of a dead man." And "then, after this offence, it is reasonable to punish the living man who committed the offence and not the dead man."

This masterpiece of forensic reasoning was not lost on the Grays Inn Student and when he came to write *Hamlet* he gave us this: (Act V. Sc. 1.)

First Clown

Is she to be buried in Christian burial that willfully seeks her own salvation?

Second Clown

I tell thee she is . . . the crowner hath sat on her and finds it Christian burial.

First Clown

How can that be, unless she drowned herself in her own defence?

Second Clown

Why, 'tis found so.

First Clown

It must be *se offendendo*; it cannot be else. For here lies the point: if I drown myself wittingly it argues an act; and an act hath three branches: it is, to act, to do, and to perform: argal, she drowned herself wittingly.

Second Clown

Nay, but hear you, Goodman delver—

First Clown

Give me leave. Here lies the water; good; here stands the man; good; if the man go to this water and drown himself, it is will he, nill he, he goes; mark you that? But if the water come to him, and drown him, he drowns not himself, argal, he that is not guilty of his own death shortens not his own life.

Second Clown

But is this law?

First Clown

Ay, marry, is't; crowner's quest law.

A writer who was well known to Oxford—and for a variety of reasons—was George Gascoigne, a lineal descendant in the sixth generation from Henry the Fourth's intrepid Chief Justice. George Gascoigne (1525-1577) had been called to the Bar at Grays Inn but abandoned the Law for Poetry and the Drama. He is one of the most exciting of the Elizabethans, and an important contributor to the theatricals of his Inn. There he had produced in 1566 a version of the *Phoenissae* of Euripides which, under the name of *Iocasta*, became a sign-post of English tragedy in blank verse. What brings him closer to Oxford, however, is the production of *Supposes*, his version of the *I Suppositi* of Ariosto. *Supposes*, which has always been regarded as the basis of *The Taming of the Shrew*, was included with *Iocasta* in the unauthorized collection, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowes*, printed in 1573 during Gascoigne's absence in the Netherlands. Whether F.I. stands for *Fortunatus Infelix* (and therefore for Sir Christopher Hatton) is a question that has nothing to do with Grays Inn though much to do with a full understanding of *Twelfth Night*.⁶ But it is interesting that Gascoigne, whose strange career has not a few points of resemblance⁷ with that of Oxford, should also have been a close friend of George Whetstone whose *Promos and Cassandra* (1578) was an earlier treatment of the sombre medieval legend immortalized by Oxford in *Measure for Measure*. Gascoigne died in Whetstone's house at Stamford, Lincolnshire, in 1577 and it is noteworthy that he, likewise, should have been praised in Webb's *Discourse of English Poetry* and that Gabriel Harvey should have lauded his "commendable conceit and endeavour" but bemoaned "his decayed and blasted estate."

On the evening of Holy Innocents Day, i.e. December 28, 1594, in the course of the revels already mentioned, there was a performance of the *Comedy of Errors*, and the errors were not confined to the stage. A party of guests from the Inner Temple was apparently too numerous for the accommodation provided for them and after

6. See the forged letter—Act II Sc. 5. 175.

7. Marital troubles, financial improvidence, and his work published apparently without his knowledge or consent. He was for a time M.P. for Midhurst, Sussex, but was charged with insolvency, manslaughter and atheism.

some disturbance withdrew in anger. The tumult was sufficient to warrant an inquiry into its causes, whereupon it was conveniently discovered that the trouble was due to the machinations of a sorcerer. At more harmonious proceedings, a few days later, Burghley and Sir Robert Cecil, Sir Nicholas Bacon and Francis, Southampton, Shrewsbury and Essex were all present: but Oxford, who is not mentioned, is known to have been living in the outskirts of London at this time. Likely enough, he was the "sorcerer" who attracted the overflow audience.

And what does Oxford-Shakespeare tell us himself in the plays? In *2 Henry IV* we meet with Justice Shallow⁸ of Clements Inn, which was one of the Inns of Chancery. Shallow has a good deal to say about himself. He "must to the Inns of Court, where they still talk of mad Shallow or lusty Shallow"—he was a very devil of a fellow, once upon a time. There were not four or five such swinge-bucklers in all the Inns of Court as he and his companions. He recalls the fight he had with one Sampson Stockfish, a fruiterer, behind Grays Inn. "O the mad days that I have spent! . . . O the days that we have seen!"

Shallow is not just a comic character like a score of others in Shakespeare; he has a particular importance. Anyone who reads with attention Shallow's talk in this play notices at once that it sounds very like that of Polonius. He uses exactly the same tone. Each of them is fond of relating the exploits of his lusty youth. Polonius when a young man was accounted a good actor; he did enact Julius Caesar once and he was killed in the Capitol. Shallow too has the trick of repeating his own words: "let me see, let me see, let me see; very singular good, well said, very well said;" and the sudden sharp touch of authority: "peace, fellow, peace: stand aside: know you where you are?" But he is no fool and in particular he is a connoisseur of good phrases:⁹ "Better accommodated! it is good; yea, indeed, is it: good phrases we surely and ever were very commendable. Accommodated! It comes of *accommodo*: very good, a good phrase!" This is exactly like Polo-

nus: "that's an ill phrase, a vile phrase; beautified is a vile phrase!" And again, Polonius, with the players: "that's good: mabled queen is good." Both use the same expletive—not a very common one in Shakespeare—"by the mass!" The resemblance between Shallow and Polonius is unmistakable.

The significance of this resemblance lies in the fact that Polonius is Burghley. Oxford caricatured his former guardian and father-in-law in *2 Henry IV* and more openly still in *Hamlet*. One of the subtlest touches in Shakespeare is the way Hamlet himself has caught from Polonius the habit of repeating his words: "Very like, very like;" "words, words, words"; "except my life, except my life, except my life." For my own part, I do not doubt that Oxford himself had caught the trick from Burghley, for he had heard Burghley's conversation almost every day from the age of twelve (when he became a ward) to that of twenty-one (when he married Burghley's daughter). It is therefore no accident that the Shallow of *2 Henry IV*, who is the Lord Treasurer again in another guise, has been made to talk of Clements Inn and Grays Inn. It is another piece of autobiography and, as such, part of the evidence for the "Oxford Case."

The tale of Grays Inn does not of course end with Shakespeare; Bacon, Bancroft, Williams, Cavendish, Camden and many famous men were to follow; but the foregoing may perhaps be regarded as a contribution to the discussion of the long-standing question: "Where did Shakespeare get his education?" He got a great deal of it as a termer at Grays Inn.

88 Kingscourt Road, London, S.W. 15, England.

Know the Facts of Oxford's Life

Falsely conceived opinions of the poet-dramatist Earl of Oxford are still current. This is because such reference works as the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and the *Dictionary of National Biography* feature the malicious gossip and outright lies circulated by Oxford's enemies. It is as though Dr. Sam Johnson's opinion of George Washington's career still passed as historically sound.

Learn the truth about the greatest, least known of the fabulous Elizabethans.

Provide yourself with Captain Ward's documentary life of *The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford*, still obtainable from the Secretary at \$5.50, post-paid.

⁸ He appears also in *The Merry Wives*, but the character is far less developed in that play.

⁹ Sir Thomas More, answering his opponent, Coverdale, wrote: "Brevity is the soul of wit and the essence of wit. The immortal epigram was apparently handed down and often quoted in those centres of discussion and content, the Inns of Court; and so Shakespeare, with some irony, puts the first half of it into the mouth of the long-winded old Counsellor.



BROOKE HOUSE, HACKNEY, in north London, last residence of Edward de Vere, the poet-dramatist Earl of Oxford. From a 1761 illustration in Robinson's *History and Antiquities of Hackney*. Known as King's Place during Lord Oxford's occupancy, from 1596 to his death here in 1604.

After purchase by Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke (1608-9) it was called Brooke House. Although damaged in the bombing of London, the most ancient part of the structure, shown above, remains largely intact. The greatest of all English literary associations centers here.

The Wreckful Siege of Battering Days

THE LOST TREASURES OF LONDON by William Kent (1947) Published by Phoenix House, Ltd., 38 William IV Street, London. 12 s. 6 d.

Written by one of the best known of British Oxfordians and a prominent member of THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP of London, this is the first book to assess comprehensively the destruction of the architectural, artistic, literary and historical treasures of London during the terrible bombing attacks from 1940 to 1945. The appalling record, calmly and succinctly set down by our talented colleague, William Kent, is one that should be read by everyone interested in the fate of Anglo-Saxon civilization. Mr. Kent is perhaps the best of the surviving historians of Britain's metropolis. We say "surviving" not without reason, for he was personally bombed out of three places of residence and lost most of his own literary and art treasures—including unpublished manuscripts—in the general holocaust. Yet he maintains his aplomb, good humor and optimistic hope for the future. Only a truly great city inspires hatred and love in maximum measure. London answers that description on both counts. *Considerably more than one-third of the town's built-up acreage was destroyed in the Nazi fury.* But that it will rise again is the assurance of this fine and undaunted

humanist. We trust his optimism is justified. For the task and expense of replacing the lost treasures of London would seem to us to require the cooperation of all English-speaking peoples. Students of the life of Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, will be happy to learn that the ancient manor house on the Upper Clapton Road, Hackney, where the poet Earl resided during his final decade, was not destroyed, although it suffered bombing damage. For many years prior to the war, it had been used as a private sanitarium. But the persistent publicity given this romantic building by Oxford-Shakespeare writers finally induced the owners to turn over the property to the London County Council as an historical monument. Fortunately, the older parts of the structure, which Oxford and his family occupied, are the least injured. "Demolition work has been reduced to a minimum," says Mr. Kent. "The buildings of the inner courtyard can be repaired and made even more representative of a large medieval house." This is good news to Oxfordians who believe that within these walls some of the latest Shakespeare plays, such as *Coriolanus*, and many of the *Sonnets* were written. It is to be hoped that the characterless name of "Brooke House" will now be dropped in favor of King's Place, which it bore when the great Earl of Oxford lived here.

Dr. Smart's Man of Stratford Outsmarts Credulity

By LOUIS P. BÉNÉZET, A.M., Pd.D.

COMMENTARIES on Dr. Smart's effort to reconcile the Stratford-on-Avon background of William Shakspeare with the masterly scholarship of the Shakspearean works, though published in 1928, are always timely. Smart is now held up by his orthodox colleagues as the great answerer of all skepticism. The fact that his arguments are basically conjectural makes no difference, seemingly. Their bold, smoothly balanced style is considered absolutely conclusive of their essential soundness. For instance, in his recent valuable work on Shakespeare's History Plays, *Dr. E. M. W. Tillyard*, attributes the Stratford man's fitness for the expression of the great educational purposes and deeply-grounded political philosophy inherent in the plays to Dr. Smart's all-embracing claims for Stratford-on-Avon as a nursery of such enlightenment. But the Doctor's notable failure to put William Shakspeare personally on the rolls of said nursery is completely overlooked. So is his inadmissible habit of using the plays themselves to prove otherwise uncertified assertions about the learning of their alleged author. In each case, we have the strange phenomenon of a non sequitur swallowing its own tail—perfect examples of Stratfordian lacklogic. Dr. Bénézet exposes the major error in such reasoning.

SHAKESPEARE—TRUTH AND TRADITION, by John Semple Smart, M.A., D.Litt., Lecturer on English Literature in the University of Glasgow, was written several years after the appearance of Mr. Looney's *Shakespeare Identified*, yet it completely ignores the Oxford theory. Designed principally to discredit the Baconians, it does not stop in time. Having riddled the Bacon story, Dr. Smart continues his commentary, jotting down various facts that have struck him as having escaped all Shakespeare critics hitherto, and concludes by contributing some really valuable testimony to the rapidly accumulating mass of facts that add up to make the Oxford case so conclusive and satisfying.

By rejecting the Stratford man's authorship, says Dr. Smart, waxing sarcastic, the Baconians have eliminated something wildly improbable—the development of the ignorant and untutored rustic into the great poetic genius. But they have substi-

tuted another story which is more improbable still: that the author of *The Advancement of Learning* and the *Essays* should also have composed *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Merchant of Venice*. These last two show the same imaginative glow, the same playful wit, the same sweetness harmony and grace, totally foreign to the ponderous logic and humorless reasoning of the Lord Chancellor.

He is right. However, he should have asked himself whether the imagination, wit, sweetness and grace are also evident in the only poem that everyone agrees was composed by the Stratford man: ending with "And curst be he yt moves my bones."

He then attacks other writers who, unable to "marry" the works to either Bacon or Shakspeare, are still looking for a "Great Unknown", who, using "Shakespeare" as a *nom de plume* "is even more mysterious, elusive and phantasmal." His book is written to reconcile to each other the apparent paradoxes that, 1) the great poet was a great ignoramus, 2) the great visionary cared only for cash, 3) the wonderful man of letters was indifferent to the fate of his own works, and 4) the great creative genius plagiarized at every turn from the writings of all other men.

There is not space to review the whole of Dr. Smart's book. First he maintains that Stratford in the 16th century was a center of learning; that even its joiners and tinkers were able to read and write, as proved by the fact Shakespeare has Quince, Snug and Bottom write a play. A knowledge of Latin was widespread in the town, for an inscription in that language was carved upon Shakspeare's monument for all the village folks to read. Even the women of Stratford were literate, as proved by quotations from the plays. Maria the maid, in *Twelfth Night*, can write a hand like Olivia's! (The only women in the village who were unable to sign their names would appear, from this line of reasoning, to have been Judith Shakspeare and her mother.)

The boys of Stratford were globe-trotters, as proved by the lines in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* beginning: "Home-keeping youth have ever homely wits." In 1580, says Dr. Smart, William S., aged 16, "was completing his course at the Grammar

School at Stratford. The question of his future must have seriously occupied his father's mind. Clever boys from Stratford went up to Oxford."

The next chapter, "Things Which Never Were," is devoted to demolishing all the old traditions about deer-stealing, killing calves, "Justice Clodpate," holding horses, serving as prompter's assistant, etc. Dr. Smart reminds us that while brother poets were always rubbing it in that Gabriel Harvey's father was a rope-maker and that B. Jonson has once been a bricklayer, there exists not a single slur upon Shakespeare's origin. Even Greene says no more than that he "is a mere actor who has trod the boards in the plays of better men." Hence Shakespeare had no disreputable, plebeian past; otherwise contemporary writers would have twitted him with it.

Follows "The Strange Conspiracy," a chapter dealing with the plot to conceal the fact that Bacon wrote the plays. Dr. Smart asks how Lord Verulam managed to bribe Jonson, Heminge, Condell *et al* to foist the authorship of the plays on Shakspeare, and how it happened that Bacon failed to edit and proof-read the First Folio. Dr. Smart also wonders how Bacon dared sign, to *Venus and Adonis*, the name "of a real and living man who was well known in London as a member of the company of actors led by Richard Burbage." At this point it is necessary to remind our author that Mrs. Stopes, in her *Burbage and Shakspeare*, confesses that nowhere in the list of actors taking part in plays at Court in the 80 years life of the Burbage company can be found any name like Shakespeare. Also that not once does the name occur in the *Diary* of Philip Henslowe, filled with names of actors and practically all the other playwrights of the time.

Dr. Smart is as logical as are most of the Stratfordian scholars. He proves that a Stratford man wrote the plays by proving that its inhabitants were all well educated, as proved by the plays written by an inhabitant of Stratford! He keenly picks out unsound assumptions in the Bacon claims while blandly assuming that Shakspeare, at 16, completed the course at the Stratford Grammar School, though he is aware, as Saintsbury has written, that we do not know that William Shakspeare ever set foot inside this or any other school, during his life.

Dr. Smart is careful, like Professor Lewis in *The Shakespeare Documents*, to spell the name "Shakespeare," invariably, although among the plays published without the author's consent before

the appearance of the First Folio (and generally pirated) it is frequently written "Shake-Speare," while the Stratford man's name is never so spelled. (Geo. H. Cowling, in *A Preface to Shakspeare*, proves that in Stratford it was pronounced "Shacksper.")

Our author shows how preposterous it is to attribute the works of Shakespeare, full of the milk of human kindness and breathing generosity and contempt for money in every act, to the "wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind," the man who was convicted of taking bribes as a judge. He is right. But then he fails to call attention to the fact that it is even more preposterous to attribute such works to the man who sued Philip Rogers for two shillings, who refused to repay the 40 shillings borrowed by his wife from the poor shepherd, and who threatened an insolvent debtor with jail, though the man's wife and children were dependent on his labor.

Next Dr. Smart tells us that London audiences of Elizabethan times were ever so much more cultured and better educated than patrons of modern theatres. Today the French of *Henry Vth*, the Italian quotations, the many phrases in Latin and references to classical mythology and Greek tragedies pass completely over the heads of the auditors. But the Stratford youth, originating from the Elizabethan bourgeoisie, understood that group's wide knowledge of languages, both classical and modern. So, for their especial delectation, he filled his plays with many obscure foreign words and phrases which quite escape the comprehension of modern audiences! It is time to insert: (raucous laughter!)

Remember how the critics, following the lead of Malone, insist that it must have been some other author's *Hamlet*, not Shakespeare's that Henslowe produced on June 9th, 1594, because of the small "gate", which was only eight shillings, where boisterous comedies sometimes drew three or four pounds. Had it been Shakespeare's play, say these experts, the "Standing Room Only" sign would have been displayed!

Now we come to Dr. Smart's main contribution to the Oxford theory. It will be remembered that after he puts his hero through full preparation for the university, in spite of the fact that the greatest claim for his formal schooling, that of Rowe (1709), is that he "was bred in a Grammar School" but removed "at an early age" through his father's poverty, Dr. Smart hinted that he might have been among the "clever boys" who "went up to Oxford."

Now he comes out boldly to insist upon this. He tells how Dr. Venn of Cambridge, compiling his list of the university's alumni, discovered that there had been some students who were listed neither among those matriculated nor graduated. Their names are to be found only in the Admissions Register of some college. Shakespeare's name, says Smart, is found neither among those of men matriculated nor graduated from Oxford. But, *throughout his plays he shows marks of erudition which could have come only from university training.* Therefore, the only answer is that he was enrolled for a time, at some college of Oxford.

The Admission Register of Shakspeare's particular college has not been found. Like the roll of students for the Stratford Grammar School it has unfortunately (or, shall we say conveniently) disappeared. Joseph Foster's list of former Oxford students is compiled entirely from the Matriculation Registers. Mr. Foster, unlike Dr. Venn, did not take the trouble to search through the records of the individual colleges.

It cannot be proved that William Shakspeare did not enter Oxford in 1581 at an unidentified college, argues Smart; that he did not leave there in November, 1582 to marry Ann Hathway, that in consequence of his marriage he did not return as a junior master to Stratford Grammar School. *These assumptions cannot be disproved, therefore we are perfectly justified,* continues this special pleader, *in view of the university erudition found throughout the plays, in assuming that they are true!* There is not in existence any statement signed by Shakespeare himself "that he had no academic experience." Ben Jonson's contemptuous "small Latin and lesse Greek," while it admits that Shakespeare had some Greek, (which we know was not taught at the Stratford Grammar School), is only in comparison to Jonson's "heights" of erudition. Therefore we are justified in saying that the Stratford man went to Oxford. He must have been there, says Dr. Smart. And he proceeds to fill thirty pages with proofs of the university learning found in the plays.

Neilson and Thorndike in *The Facts About Shakespeare*, after listing the scores and scores of authors and hundreds of books which the author of the plays had read, remind us that "only a fraction" of an author's reading leaves any trace in his written works. In similar fashion Dr. Smart confesses that while no one could guess, from reading Gray's *Elegy* or Wordsworth's poetry that these men were wonderfully well-read scholars,

Shakespeare's plays "are obviously the work of a man who had a very copious command of expressive language, a noble style and an exquisite refinement of taste, and none of it to be obtained without an adequate acquaintance with other men's works." "We cannot expect to find the whole compass (of his reading) represented" in his plays, says Smart. He then fills three pages with Shakespeare quotations from Ovid, the untranslated works as well as those included in Golding's translation. He shows the direct acquaintance of the author with several of the plays of Plautus, the imitation of devices of the Roman stage used in several of his comedies. He quotes line after line from Juvenal as found in *Hamlet*.

It is the *Tenth Satire* that Hamlet is reading when Polonius interrupts him. His knowledge of the Italian tongue and his free use of foreign words and phrases: "Monsieur," "Signior," "Cavaliere," "Varletto," "Cristofero," show daily usage and easy familiarity.

Dr. Smart next refutes and ridicules the "Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare," in which Richard Farmer endeavors to belittle the poet's erudition. Then he effectively answers those critics who make much of Shakespeare's anachronisms: a Homeric hero quoting Aristotle, clocks striking in ancient Rome, cannon in Macbeth's time, etc., by quoting many still more glaring errors made by other famous and supposedly well educated writers. Scott, for instance, pictures Cedric, Ivanhoe's father, who was 10 years old in 1066, as a man of 45 or thereabouts in 1190. Smart reminds us that Shakespeare shows that he knows better than to assign cannon to Macbeth's time, when in *Henry IVth* he speaks of the use of gunpowder as an innovation in war.

Next Dr. Smart shows other indications of Shakespeare's acquaintance with university procedure. Tranio, in *Taming of the Shrew*, lists practically the whole curriculum: Aristotle, Ovid, Logic, Rhetoric, Music, Poetry, Mathematics, Metaphysics, etc. *Love's Labour's Lost* could only be the work of a university-trained man, who dares ridicule such training only because he knows it so well. Shakespeare shows a keen knowledge of Logic, a subject seldom taught in grammar schools, but always in the universities. Again he dares to burlesque it. The Jester in *Twelfth Night* asks whether this simple syllogism will serve. Falstaff shouts "I deny your major!" The clowns make ready use of deductive arguments "and clinch

them triumphantly with *ergo* after blundering into obvious fallacies."

The reference to Polonius as "enacting" Julius Caesar "in the university" is very suggestive. In Christ Church, Oxford University, a play called *Caesar Interfectus* was played in 1582. It was never printed nor sold, yet Shakespeare seems to have seen it.

Dr. Smart scorns "a school of Shakespearian critics" that "seeks to minimize everything that could show his linguistic attainments or extensive reading." When he copies Plautus in *Comedy of Errors* they are sure that there "must have been" an English translation which we never have heard about. His knowledge of Ovid is laid to his owning a copy of Golding's translation. If he quotes Montaigne's Essays it could only have been from the English version by John Florio; if he shows his familiarity with Ariosto he could have gotten it only through Harington,—even though it can be demonstrated that he knew *Orlando Furioso* in the original. "A succession of Shakespearian scholars have traced one of Shakespeare's translations from Ovid: 'At lovers' perjuries, they say, Jove laughs,' to a version in English by Marlowe which never existed."

Dr. Smart is right. Until the Bacon theory began to threaten, there never was any question about Shakespeare's erudition. It was all attributed to his "native genius." But a genius is not born with a knowledge of Latin; and Shakespeare is as familiar with the untranslated *Fasti* of Ovid as with the *Metamorphoses*, translated by Arthur Golding, Oxford's uncle. In *Othello*, where the handkerchief given by him to Desdemona is spoken of, we read:

"A sibyl that had numbered in the world
The sun to course two hundred compasses,
In her prophetic fury sewed the work."

This is taken directly from *Orlando Furioso* (canto 46, stanza 80). The phrase "furor profetico" is missed in Harington's translation, yet Shakespeare has it. Incidentally, *Othello* was written and played before Harington's work appeared, as Cairncross has proved.

Dr. Smart calls attention to the inconsistency of those critics who in one breath say that Shakespeare was not clever and well educated, but an "untutored genius", and in the next that he had wonderful originality and creative power. "The greatest authors," says this group, "owe nothing to the writings of others; everything comes to them by inspiration; the greater their genius, the smaller

their debt to their predecessors. The more we discount the education they have received, the more we exalt their creative power. But experience shows that the man who is destined by Nature to write books begins by reading them. . . . The power to interest others is inseparable from a lively interest and curiosity of his own, which impels him to seek familiarity with other men's minds."

Dr. Smart is right. The wonderful erudition of Shakespeare is only too evident "not only by the Latinized vocabulary and the use of Latin words in a sense which is uncommon in English and could have been derived only from a direct knowledge of Latin idiom; and not only by the frequent use of Latin in such plays as *Love's Labour's Lost*, and the occurrence of French and Latin words and phrases; but still more by Shakespeare's mastery of the English language itself. He has it under most perfect control; his diction is copious, rich and flowing, his range of expression wide and comprehensive."

Dr. Smart has unerringly detected the university-trained man behind the sham "untutored genius," able to describe lands he had never seen and to speak tongues he had never heard, by the mere power of inspiration. But, *he has sent him to the wrong university.*

There are many passages in the plays which point unmistakably to Cambridge as our poet's alma mater, rather than Oxford.

In *Titus Andronicus* (V, ii) we read "Knock at his study, where, they say, he keeps." In *3 Henry VI* (IV, iii) "his followers lodge in towns about . . . While he himself keeps in the cold field." In *Love's Labour's Lost* (IV, i) Boyet says, "This Armado is a Spaniard, that keeps here in court." In *As You Like It* (I, i, 6) Orlando says, "My brother Jaques, he keeps at school."

"Keeps," in the sense of "lodges," is Cambridge University slang, used and understood there particularly—and rarely heard elsewhere.

In *Lear* (II, iv) the king, referring to the harsh treatment that he has endured at the hands of Goneril, says to his second daughter, "No. Rejoice . . . 'Tis not in thee, to grudge my pleasures, to cut off my train, to scant my sizes."

The word "sizar," in Cambridge University, means a student who earns his board by purchasing the food for a group of students. The corresponding term in Oxford was "battlar" or "batteler." "Sizes," in Cambridge, was the student slang for "grub," "chow," food. It had the meaning nowhere else in the world, except in 17th

century Harvard, which was founded by scholars from Cambridge.

One other small contribution to the Oxford case is made by Dr. Smart. He points out that critics, on the basis of internal evidence, ("France . . . making war against her heir") to date *The Comedy of Errors* as written in 1591, is to display a gross ignorance of French history. In 1589 Henri IV was king of France. After the death of Alençon (Anjou), younger brother of Henri III, in 1584, the young king of Navarre became heir to the throne. The Guises and other powerful Catholic leaders, however, never accepted him, and for over two years waged open war upon Navarre and his supporters. This war began in 1585 and continued through most of 1587. Dr. Smart, very correctly, points out that this is the date that dates *The Comedy of Errors*, which, therefore, was written, not in 1591, but surely four and possibly six years previously.

It is the ever-retreating dates of the early Shakespeare plays that are sounding the death knell of the Stratford myth.

Finally, a small piece of evidence on chronology has passed practically unnoticed. In *The Shakespeare Documents* (p. 139) appears a line of testimony in the litigation between the Shakespeares of Stratford and their relative John Lambert. It accuses the court that John, Mary and William Shakespeare have been ready to turn over the rural premises of Wilmcote to Lambert and guarantee the title and that they still are. It is dated September 26th, 1588. Of course father John and son William may have been in close touch with each other, even though the younger man had "run from his Master" in London. But this sounds very much as if William were sitting right at his father's elbow in his native town. Of course, Dr. Smart would point out, that since Shakespeare plays had appeared in London at this time, William must have been there, and the communication with his father must have been by telepathy. But "I deny his major."

Seeing is Disbelieving

A recent issue of *Stratford-upon-Avon Scene*, successor to the Hon. E. P. Ray's lively and excellent *Shakespeare Pictorial*, has been forwarded by Mrs. Dorothy Ogburn. The leading article comes straight to the point:

"Stratford-on-Avon is a tourist centre; we need visitors for our economic stability . . ."

True enough. And such a forthright statement of the case is to be commended. There are many charming nooks and plenty of quaint corners in this part of England to please the eye and divert the mind. But too persistent an aura of catchpenny humbug still haunts the "Shakespearean" exhibits to put the discriminating admirer of the plays and poems entirely at ease.

Yet it is perhaps a good thing to visit Stratford—once. Just as it is worth while to wade through a standardized biography of the Bard.

For never after will the seeker of the true poet, and the real creative atmosphere in which his works were produced, have the same childlike belief with which he started to read—or came to see.

Sir George Greenwood

AMONG SKEPTICS of the standardized belief in William Shakspeare of Stratford-on-Avon as the immortal genius of English literature, the late Sir George Greenwood, first President of THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP, takes unquestioned precedence.

Sir George was not only one of the keenest and best-read Shakespearean scholars that has ever lived, but one of the leading barristers of Great Britain, and for many years a Member of Parliament. When his great anti-Stratfordian work, *The Shakespeare Problem Restated* appeared in 1908, it literally rocked the foundations of the whole orthodox Shakespearean edifice like the explosion of a ton of TNT. The complacent little professors, who had so long sent forth their synthetic compilations of fabulous fancy and approved guesswork on the alleged genius of the Avonside, floundered and stuttered under the impact of Greenwood's hammering attack. As the *Manchester Guardian* said at the time:

"On the destructive side his book is so strong, that merely to call it the ablest extant argument against the Stratford-born actor as the author of the poems and plays does not give the full measure of its strength."

Finally rallying their disconcerted forces, the professional Stratfordians issued their "answers" to the Greenwood exposé. But none of these has ever altered the tremendous effect of Greenwood's work on open-minded seekers of fact as opposed to approved assumption. In the end, those who profit by maintenance of the Stratford myths, decided that if they could not openly argue

Greenwood out of the court of public opinion, they could at least ignore his bill of particulars. And there the situation has come to rest. *The Shakespeare Problem Restated* is rarely so much as mentioned by Stratfordians these days. It has gone out of print, and is so hard to come by that few readers of the present day know it at first hand. But modern Shakespearean research owes it a great debt.

In the opening pages of "*Shakespeare*" Identified, Mr. Looney pays high tribute to the Greenwood classic. And in 1922 when Colonel B. R. Ward, at the suggestion of John Galsworthy and other admirers of the Oxfordian masterpiece, set about organizing THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP for further research into Lord Oxford's career along the lines laid down by Mr. Looney, he had little difficulty in persuading Sir George Greenwood to accept the Presidency of our group.

Physician, Heal Thyself

Professor Bergen Evans of the English Department of Northwestern University has written an opus in demolishment of popular fallacy and vulgar error entitled *The Natural History of Nonsense*.

After reading some of the material, as it appeared in a magazine, a member of THE FELLOWSHIP wrote Professor Evans to express her appreciation of his labors on behalf of truth. "But," she added, "I'll bet you yourself still believe in the most popular fallacy of all: viz., that the runaway butcher's apprentice of Stratford-on-Avon wrote *Hamlet* and the *Sonnets*—although the real author was identified by J. Thomas Looney nearly thirty years ago."

A few days later she received a note of acknowledgment from Professor Evans, ending with this squelcher:

"I must confess that such is the levity of my mind, that I never could bring myself to read a book written by a person with a name like Looney."

Granting the levity of the Evans mind, we can only say that it is a lucky thing it is being exercised in the teaching of English. For if it had to be devoted to Spanish, the Professor might be actually forced by curricular exigencies to read something by or about the medieval court poet, Alvaro de Luna, High Constable of Castile, whose family, some say, were the Iberian ancestors of the Looneys of the Isle of Man—from whom the great J. Thomas sprang.

THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP

QUARTERLY

—A Continuation of the NEWS-LETTER—

VOL. VIII SUMMER, 1947 No. 2

President

Louis P. Bénét, A.M., Pd.D.

Vice-Presidents

James Stewart Cushman Flodden W. Heron
T. Henry Foster Mrs. Elsie Greene Holden

Secretary and Treasurer

Charles Wisner Barrell

Official organ of The Shakespeare Fellowship in the U.S.A., the QUARTERLY is the only publication now printed which is devoted chiefly to the perpetuation of documentary evidence that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford (1550-1604) was the real creative personality behind the plays and poems of "Mr. William Shakespeare."

Meetings of The Shakespeare Fellowship for educational and allied purposes will occasionally be held, in which members will be asked to cooperate. Membership dues are \$2.50 per year—U.S.A. money—which sum includes one year's subscription to the QUARTERLY. Special rates of subscription to the publication which do not include membership in The Fellowship may be arranged for student groups and libraries.

The Shakespeare Fellowship executives will act as an editorial board for the publication of the QUARTERLY, which will appear four times a year, i.e., in January, April, July and October.

News items, comments by readers and articles of interest to all students of Shakespeare and of the acknowledged mystery that surrounds the authorship of his works, will be welcomed. Such material must be of reasonable brevity. No compensation can be made to writers beyond the sincere thanks of the Editorial Board. Articles and letters will express the opinions of their authors, not necessarily that of The Shakespeare Fellowship as a literary and educational corporation.

The Editors

The Shakespeare Fellowship
Quarterly

Telephone
Wickersham 2-1127

17 East 48th Street,
New York 17, N. Y.

What Do You Think?

Reactions to our Spring issue have been favorable, not to say flattering. One college instructor writes: "I marvel at the quality of historical accuracy, literary pungency and astounding variety of your Oxford-Shakespeare research. So far as real news is concerned, logical deduction from heretofore unknown or disregarded evidence for the mysterious literary nobleman and his all-revealing associations in the Shakespearean creative circle, one issue of the QUARTERLY is worth more than a whole year's supply of any publication in the so-called 'orthodox' field. Every teacher of Shakespeare in the land should be required to study the QUARTERLY regularly.

"I wonder whether your readers generally appreciate the truly epoch-making potentials of your mighty atom amid the flood of conjectural bosh that passes for Shakespearean 'research'? Your work deserves the most generous and whole-hearted support financially, and otherwise."