ng, so it on of the ich gave d attrache claim ieringsett, 3, and he er-known ord Saye fordshire, which is is slightly two facts e general , in the h generaproduced, age, only members ilege was ige which ling and y part of But in Complete Fiennes, father of and also a n his will, 16 Febraaid Denys of Oxford oundacion for suche aunted to death that n whiche id College ermoost as f the said iennes was ence from he did not

New College modernized.

AVIDSON.

IND

uture Lord d Cooke, Cooke, of his second wife. As material on Cecil's early life is scanty it may perhaps be worth while to draw attention to the fact that a month earlier, on 21 November, a dispensation had been obtained from the Archbishop of Canterbury's Faculty Office in respect of this marriage. The relevant entry in the office's register is calendared thus:

Nov. 21 Wm Cecile & Mildred Cooke, of gentle birth, London diocese. Dispensation for marriage in any church, chapel or oratory without banns & within the prohibited time.<sup>2</sup> 7s 2d.<sup>3</sup> J. GEORGE.

Oxford

<sup>1</sup> D. S. Chambers, Faculty Office Registers, 1534-1549 (Oxford, 1966), 265. There is also a brief entry, with date 17 Nov., in J. L. Chester and G. J. Armytage: Allegations for Marriage Licenses . . . 1543-1869 (Harleian Soc. Publications, No. 24), 5. <sup>2</sup> Advent was a prohibited season, Chambers, p. xi

xvi.

This is only a portion of the fee paid, see Chambers, p. lxii.

## AN ALLEGED EARLY DRAFT OF "LEICESTER'S COMMONWEALTH"

THE great many extant manuscripts associated with the so-called Leicester's Commonwealth (The Copy of a Letter Written by a Master of Art of Cambridge, 1584, STC 19399) have long been assumed to have been made from the first edition as that text became scarce through the activities of the Elizabethan port-searchers. One among them, however—the "Letter of Estate", Record Office, MS., Domestic Elizabeth, Addenda, vol. xxviii, no. 113, fols. 369-388 (CSP Dom. Add., 1580-1625, pp. 136-138)—has been singled out for special treatment; John H. Pollen, S.J., wrote (in Catholic Record Society, xxi, 1919, 57) that it was an earlier draft of the Commonwealth, "the earliest recension at present recognized". Based upon Pollen's comparison of brief analogous passages, scholars since 1919 have accepted this judgement; T. W. Baldwin, for example, has built a case for a 1583 dating of Kyd's Spanish Tragedy largely upon this alleged relationship (On the Literary Genetics of Shakspere's Plays, Urbana, 1959, 185-199).

Pollen's comparisons, however, do not accurately reflect the relationship between the two works, and a more careful examination demonstrates that the manuscript is actually later than the printed text, and that

it is at least partially independent of it; that is, it is a part of the great body of traditional anti-Dudley materials and only very tenuously connected to the Commonwealth. I shall merely summarize a few of the more salient discrepancies here; a fuller discussion is being prepared for an appendix to my edition of the Commonwealth.

The most notable inconsistency occurs in discussion of the Earl of Leicester's son, Robert Lord Denbigh, who died on 19 July 1584. In the Commonwealth, which was being put into final form by Charles Arundell and his lay Catholic friends in Paris at about that time, no knowledge of the boy's death is indicated. He is spoken of as afflicted with the "falling sickness" in retribution for his father's sins (p. 39); the question of his legitimacy is referred to future litigation between himself and Sir Philip Sidney over inheritance of the family estates (p. 27); Leicester is charged with plotting a future marriage between Denbigh and the Lady Arabella Stuart (p. 105). In the "Letter of Estate", however, a long passage, which could not have been interpolated at a later date, attributes the boy's death to God's providential care for England's welfare (fol. 382v).

Concerning the fall of the Duke of Norfolk, the manuscript alludes only briefly to Leicester's role in urging the Duke to participate in the Marian intrigue, but dwells at length upon his devices to bring the already convicted Duke to the block two years later, ending with an almost martyrological account of Norfolk's scaffold eloquence (fols. 371v-374). Commonwealth spends all of its time on the intrigues of 1569 whereby the younger man was first induced to join the plan and ends with his fateful flight (acting upon Dudley's advice) into his home county, "which was the last and final complement of al Leycesters former devices" (pp. 163-165). The "poisoning" of the Earl of Essex is treated altogether differently: in the one, the focus is upon the Court's grief at such a loss (fols. 376-377v), in the other, upon proving Leicester's instigation of the crime itself (pp. 28-32); and the manuscript goes on to recount at length Essex's widow Lettice Knollys's insufferable pride upon becoming Leicester's wife (fols. 378-379v), while the Commonwealth accords her only passing contemptuous mention.

These are only a few examples of many,

but I do not wish to be tedious. There are many other such difficulties, arguing different sources for and divergent interests behind each, some of which, in accumula-tion, indicate that the "Letter" is posterior and some of which merely show that it would have made an extraordinarily bad "source" anyway (Lord Denbigh, to instance only one, is spoken of as "the yonge earle of denbigh"). The manuscript does, however, bear some relationship to the first edition; its title, for example, reflects the Commonwealth's running-title, "A Letter of State of a Scholar of Cambridge", and it starts out by setting up the Commonwealth's dialogue form, although it soon drops that device and goes into continuous narrative. Our judgement must unfortunately be that this manuscript is, like many others, merely a part of the large unsorted mass of manuscripts posterior to and ultimately deriving from the Commonwealth's first edition. There are as yet, save for the books from which its succession arguments are borrowed, no known extant sources for Leicester's Commonwealth.

DWIGHT C. PECK.

Norman, Oklahoma.

## JOHN, DUKE OF BEDFORD, IN "THE MIRROR FOR MAGISTRATES", TRAGEDY 30

THE Tudor Mirror for Magistrates1 attracts notice for many and varied reasons. This article draws attention to a point of interest to historians of the fifteenth-century Anglo-French war, namely the eulogy in Tragedy 30 of Henry V's brother, John, Duke of Bedford, and suggests the probability that this eulogy was derived less from the chronicles upon which the Mirror poems are normally based2 than from traditions handed down across the generations in the family of one of Bedford's captains.

In the years following Henry's death Bedford was the sustaining pillar of the English cause in France, acting as Regent in the name of his young nephew, Henry

<sup>1</sup> Lily B. Campbell, The Mirror for Magistrates (Cambridge, 1938). Cited as Mirror.

<sup>2</sup> The chroniclers referred to in the Mirror Prose Links are Hall, Fabyan and Thomas More (Mirror, p. 10; Prose Links 4 (p. 110) and 20 (p. 267)); but the authors relied chiefly on Hall (Mirror, p. 10).

VI. He died in September 1435 with the doom of the cause to which for thirteen years he had devoted all his powers sounding in his ears.3 Within twenty years of his death not a vestige was left of Henry V's Anglo-French Dual Monarchy. Edward III's Calais alone remained of all the English possessions in France. One is tempted to feel that although Bedford left a name for integrity and valour it was a name writ on sand, making no lasting impact on his country or his countrymen.

For a time it is true Bedford's name echoed on. Several references in the Boke of Noblesse show that Bedford's example was still thought worth quoting in the 1450s, especially his control of the army, his wise ordinances, and his insistence on regular payment of the soldiers' wages as the only way of safeguarding the people from plunder. But this was written by William Worcester, man of business to Sir John Fastolf, Bedford's Maitre d'Hotel and companion in arms, and does not prove any general interest in Bedford. After this he disappears from view. There was no national Bedford myth such as crystallized round the name of Henry V or of Talbot. He lay in his tomb at Rouen apparently forgotten. How very surprising then it is suddenly to find, some hundred and fifty years after his death, a warm personal and factual eulogy of Bedford occupying several stanzas in one of the *Mirror*'s Tragedies"

Tragedy 30, added in 1587, is entitled "How the valiant knight Sir Nicholas Burdet, Chiefe Butler of Normandy, was slayne at Pontoise, Anno 1441". It is an account of the military career of Nicholas Burdet, a Warwickshire squire who served with distinction in the French war under Henry V, Bedford, and the later English commanders. It is rather strange that

Burdet's career material for t battle of a mic many of the I does not rea "tragedy" as each story is "with how g punished in gr and how fraile perity is found highly to favo story of the gi Mirror tragedy greatest of th seemed to be chance shot ha his fame as h Orleans in 142 this and the n of Scotland, t to pass over th the reign of F such as "the lo . . Also the (and surely a tains) "whose marcial, there better omitted edition give n to the story

knight though Round Burd of the tragedy forces in Fr century throug due to the cri abundantly clea His death rath as the true "tr the Mirror wei temporary rel later sixteenth to be designed the contempo namely the da rivalries among the need for go army at the m last committee

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Bedford's sense of personal dedication to the continuance of his brother's work in France is, I think, expressed in the setting of his portrait in his Book of Hours (B.M. Add. Ms. 18850 fol. 256 b). There Bedford kneels before St. George, but I am convinced that for Bedford St. George, clad in the sovereign's Garter robes, figured Henry V. My reasons for believing this are set forth in detail in an article published some years ago. (Benedicta J. H. Rowe. "Notes on . . . the Bedford Book of Hours", Journal of the British Archaeological Association. Third Series, xxv (1962), 61-65.)

<sup>4</sup> Boke of Noblesse, ed. J. Gough Nichols (1860), 31-2, 47, 72.

<sup>5</sup> See below, pp. 299-300.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Mirror, p. 478 <sup>7</sup> Mirror, p. 462 <sup>8</sup> Mirror, p. 154

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Mirror, p. 13-<sup>9</sup> See especially 299-300). <sup>10</sup> Lily B. Cam-Marino, Californi