

two remaining in the churchyard could be alleged to be in their original position, as the others had been found built up in old erections or buried, to which facts they owed their preservation. The two at present exposed to the weather being composed of soft sandstone, were now fast losing their historical ornamentation, and as they had stood so well, it was only probable that they, too, had been buried or built up. To collect the stones and preserve them was the object he had in view, and the building in which he proposed to store them adjoined the churchyard. The stones which had been found in various places would be brought back to near their original site. The trustees he proposed to vest the building in were the heritors of the parish, the parish minister, the moderator of Meikle Presbytery, and the secretary of the Antiquarian Society of Scotland. One of the chief conditions in the deed would be that the collection should always be free to the public. In concluding, Sir George suggested that a committee of the Presbytery should meet a committee of the heritors and arrange the details of a scheme. A long discussion followed the reading of the letter. It having been agreed to consider the matter of the stones and font separately, it was unanimously agreed to appoint a committee to meet with a committee of the heritors, as suggested by Sir George, but instructions were given to the committee not to compromise the Presbytery in the slightest degree. On the motion of Mr. Fraser the Clerk was instructed to call the attention of Sir George Kinloch to the fact that no notice had been taken by him of the request of the Presbytery that the baptismal font should be restored, and to repeat the request.



Correspondence.

EXECUTIONS AT SMITHFIELD.

Will you kindly permit me to point out the inaccuracy of Mr. Lambert's letter in *THE ANTIQUARY* (vol. ii. p. 183). He says, generally, that there was no burning at Smithfield during the reign of Elizabeth. Stow's *Annals*, however, tell a different tale, for both burnings and hangings are frequently recorded as having taken place there for murder and other crimes, and there are two cases of burning for religion. Stow, under the date of the 22nd of July, 1575, says:—"Two Anabaptists were burnt at Smithfield, and died in great horror, with roaring and crying." Lingard tells us that their names were Peeters and Turvert, and mentions both the place and the manner of their execution (6th edit., vol. vi. p. 170).

It has now become an established fact, gathered from the public records and other contemporary documents, that during the reign of Elizabeth, as well as during that of her predecessor, men and even women were executed for religion; at the lowest computation some 190 Catholics were put to death for offences created by statute, and connected with the exercise and profession of their faith. It is true that they were not burnt, but the change in the manner of their death was not made from motives of humanity, but of

State policy. The hanging in many of these cases was not continued to the point of death, but these victims of the penal laws were often cut down and disembowelled by the executioner when living, and even conscious. Thus, Edward Arden, a Catholic squire of Warwickshire, was hanged, bowelled, and quartered at Smithfield, on the 20th December, 1583. Lingard (vol. vi. p. 180) says there was some pretence made of treason, but that it rested only on the evidence of a fellow-prisoner in the Tower, who, when he was on the rack, said that he had once heard Arden say he wished the Queen were in heaven. Dr. Richard Barrett, in a letter from Rheims, dated the 28th of December, 1583 (now printed in the Appendix to the *Douai Diary*), writes of Arden and his fellow-prisoners:—" . . . et alter qui vocatur Arden crudelissime in euleo sunt distenti et eodem tempore sacerdos quidam cujus nomen est Halle. Causa autem sine dubio est fides et religio in Deum et erga sedem Apostolicam summa pietas et observantia."

There is another case where religion was clearly the cause of condemnation to death. On the 4th of March, 1590, Nicholas Horner, a poor man, by occupation a tailor, was executed at Smithfield for harbouring and relieving a priest (Dodd's *Church History* by Tierney). This case is a curious one, as it shows the extreme anxiety of the authorities to hoodwink the people by the cry of treason. Though the whole offence charged against this unfortunate tailor was the fact of harbouring a priest of his own faith, yet over his gibbet was placed a placard with the words "For treason and favouring foreign invasions." There may be other cases which have escaped my notice, but at any rate these show, in opposition to Mr. Lambert's statement, that there were burnings at Smithfield in Elizabeth's reign, as well as in that of Mary; that persons were put to death there for religion, and that Lingard mentions the fact.

JOHN H. CHAPMAN, M.A., F.S.A.



DREWSTEIGNTON CROMLECH.

Having for the last twenty-five years carefully studied the "Rude Stone Remains" on the eastern side of Dartmoor, I read with interest Mr. Crossing's remarks upon the damage that had been done to these relics, contained in *THE ANTIQUARY* (vol. ii. p. 271). With respect to the fall of the "dolmen" usually known as the Spinster's Rock, or Drewsteignton Cromlech, I do not consider that the statement of the "Old Gentleman long resident in the neighbourhood" is correct. From 1855 to 1869 I resided at Chagford, about two miles from the cromlech, with which I was well acquainted. On the afternoon of Monday, January 27, 1862, I visited it, to take a photograph, and was there for about three-quarters of an hour. On Friday, January 31, the cromlech fell; and on the following Wednesday I took a photograph of the cromlech in its fallen condition, and there was not the slightest trace, at either visit, of the ground having been disturbed, except where it was broken by the accident—for such I entertain no doubt it was. A very minute examination was made at the time, of which I have the particulars. The quilt rested on the top of two upright

stones, and against the side of the third. The stones only reached from eighteen to twenty-four inches into the ground, which was of light granite gravel, and this was so saturated by the heavy rain, that the wedge-like action of the quoit against the third or northerly stone pressed it back, and the quoit in its fall crushed down the two other stones. The restoration was made from camera-lucida drawings taken by myself some time previously. A mistake has been made in the restoration of the north-easterly support, but it is not of much importance. Although, as I consider, the then tenant of Shilston Farm was free from blame as regards the cromlech, yet he has been guilty of an act which every antiquary will regard as one of great atrocity. Polwhele mentions certain rude stones as there existing, but though I have carefully examined the fields in the neighbourhood of the cromlech, I could not find a trace of them. Early in 1872 I received the following extract from the journal of my late friend, the Rev. W. Grey, and a copy of the plan alluded to:—"Wednesday, 4th July, 1838. Visited from Moreton the Druidical circles above the cromlech. The cromlech lies in a field about 110 yards to the east. There are two concentric circles of stones, the inner circle having entrances facing the cardinal points, that to the north being sixty-five paces in length and five broad. The outer circle, besides these, has avenues diverging towards north-east, south-east, south-west, and north-west. A smaller circle seems to intersect the larger, of which the avenue eastwards is very evident." The plan was made on the ground. There are the "sacred way," the "two rows of pillars," and "columnar circles" noticed by Polwhele. I examined the field on March 22, 1872, when the field had been recently ploughed, and not a trace remained. The circles and *via sacra* had given place to the plough. On making inquiries, I found that the stones had been removed prior to 1832; and that though the *via sacra* remained in 1848, the circles had been removed. A memoir relating to the cromlech and these remains, with plates and plans, by myself, appears in the *Journal of the Royal Archaeological Institute* for 1872 (vol. xxix.). This and other memoirs by myself are contained in a collection of *Archaeological Memoirs relating to the East of Dartmoor*, published by H. Eland, at Exeter, in 1876.

G. WAREING ORMEROD.

Woodway, Teignmouth.



THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF SHAKESPEARE'S NAME.

In Part I. of my recent Paper on the above subject (*ANTIQUARY*, vol. ii. p. 192), there is a glaring mistake which should not be allowed to pass uncorrected.

The Poem referred to as *A Poet's Vision and Glorie* (published in 1603), should have been "A mournfull Dittie, entituled *Elizabeths* losse, together with a welcome for King *Iames*."

In alluding to the form in which Shakespeare's name appears in this poem, I accepted that quoted by Mr. J. P. Collier, and others, but I have since found

that the name appears as *Shakspeare* in the original poem.—(*vide* Dr. Ingleby's *Allusion-Book*.)

R. A. DOUGLAS LITHGOW.

North Brink, Wisbech.

Whether "men of culture" will (as Dr. D. Lithgow says in last month's *ANTIQUARY*) continue to spell Shakspeare's name in the way that we have no evidence that he ever wrote it—"Shakespeare"—or in the way that we have proof that he did write it in the greater number of his signatures left to us—"Shaksper"—depends, in my opinion, on whether the said "men of culture" make up their minds to train themselves on manuscripts and to work faithfully at their subject, or sit in their chairs and preach exploded fallacies as gospel. So long as they imitate Dr. Lithgow's example, and resuscitate the old blunder, which Dr. Ingleby says he hoped was dead and buried,* that in a poem of 1603 (which never mentions Shakspeare's name, or alludes to him) "the poet is alluded to as Shakespeare;" so long as they swallow as fact a statement which I have declared† to be "sheer nonsense," that the *f* of Shakspeare's third signature to his will is the contraction for *es*; so long, no doubt, will they continue to spell *Shaksper*—"Shakespeare."

But as soon as they can persuade themselves that first-hand evidence is better than second-hand—that a man's own signatures, with which no publisher or printer can have tampered—are far better evidence of how he spelt his own name than the printed spellings which, in an age so full of conceits as the Elizabethan, both publisher and printer would be likely, nay certain, to turn into the most eye-catching form—"Shaksper" into "Shake-speare"—then the men of culture will, I apprehend, like men of common sense, spell Shakspeare's name as he himself wrote it in the majority of instances he has left us, and that is SHAKSPERE.

I take three instances of men inquiring into this matter:—1. The late Sir Frederic Madden, the best palæographer of his day, a man trained on MSS., the head of the MS. Department in the British Museum. He went carefully into the evidence, and had no hesitation in deciding on the spelling "Shaksper." The heads of the Printed Book Department in the Museum wisely and rightly adopted his opinion. 2. Myself. I went into the inquiry unprejudiced, but resolute to find out what Shaksper wrote *himself*, not caring one farthing how his printers and friends spelt his name, so that I could get at *his own spelling*. The evidence of course obliged me to spell SHAKSPERE. It would have been simple dishonesty for me, after having studied my master's own signatures, to spell *Shakspeare*. 3. Messrs. Marcus Ward & Co. They tell me they didn't know how the poet's name ought to be spelt, but they saw the only honest way to ascertain was to get a facsimile of the plainest of his signatures, and adopt that. They found, somewhat to their surprise, that there *wasn't one that spelt the name Shakespeare*; that there were at least three that spelt it SHAKSPERE; and therefore of these three they facsimiled the best, that on the Blackfriars conveyance, and have always used it since.

I believe that all "men of culture," as soon as they

* *Academy*, Dec. 24, 1880, p. 459.

† *Forewords to "Hamlet,"* Qo. ii. 1604, p. xix.