



# The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter



Volume 47: No. 3

Published by the Shakespeare-Oxford Society

Fall 2011

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

*Ren Draya: Singer and Song: The Music in Twelfth Night*.....1

*Letters to the Editor: Ren Draya, Stephanie Hughes, and Elizabeth Imlay; Richard Waugaman*.....2

*Richard Joyrich: President's Letter*.....4

*In Memoriam: Noemi Magri, Tom Hunter*.....5

*Donald P Hayes: The Silence of the Peers: Social Network Theory Proves Shakespeare was not Shakespeare*.....7

*Cheryl Eagan-Donovan: Anonymous: Shakespeare the Writer*.....11

*John Hamill: Robert Detobel's Shakespeare: The Concealed Poet*.....13

*Richard Joyrich: Joint Annual Conference and Concordia Report 2011*.....15



## Singer and Song: The Music in *Twelfth Night*

*Ren Draya*

In the Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew*, the Lord seeks to convince a poor, drunken tinker (Christopher Sly) that he is a nobleman and thus instructs his servants, “Procure me music when he wakes, to make a dulcet and a heavenly sound” (49-50). For the Elizabethan well-born, good manners included an enjoyment of songs and training in musical skills. Because we know that Edward de Vere was given musical training, the sheer number of songs in the Shakespeare plays and the more than 500 references to music point to Oxford as the author. Peter Seng, in his full-length study of the vocal songs, comments that nearly all the handbooks of nurture and education for the upper classes prescribe some training in musical skills (xii). Oxford was said to be so musical that “using the science as a recreation, your Lordship has overgone most of them that make it a profession” (Lord 4). John Farmer, organist and master of the children of the choir at Christ Church Cathedral in Dublin, dedicated his two books of madrigals to Oxford—one in 1590, the other in 1599. Farmer wrote that he was “emboldened for your Lordship’s great affection to the noble science” of music (Ogborn 720). In Shakespeare’s plays—Oxford’s plays—the songs themselves and the depth and range and sheer numbers of musical references all indicate that the author was a well-born person of learning. On the other hand, there is no proof, no documentation of any sort that the Stratford man, a commoner, received any musical education.

Here’s a statement by Edward Dent in 1934:

Continued Page 17

## Letters to the Editor

### Elizabeth I: Facts not Fantasy

Dear Editor:

As Oxfordian scholars, we women wish to make known our concern over Shakespeare authorship-related theories that rely on rumors that Queen Elizabeth gave birth to one or more illegitimate children. The history of her reign, the details of her behavior and her personality, and numerous statements by those who knew her best point to someone cautious and politically astute.

First, as a princess, Elizabeth was haunted by the issue of her sexuality from earliest childhood. Declared a bastard at age two, at fifteen she was bombarded by rumors that she'd been impregnated by Sir Thomas Seymour. Thrust into a network of political hatreds and alliances, she was compared by her inherited enemies to her mother—a woman these enemies chose to believe was guilty of the monstrous sexual indiscretions with which she'd been charged by her father. Elizabeth watched as queens in Scotland and Spain and even her surrogate mother, Catherine Parr, lost their power or their lives, if not from yielding to their sexuality or to demands that they marry, then simply to the dangers of childbirth. As a teenager, Elizabeth's first act of leadership was to demand that Protector Somerset threaten with treason anyone who publicly impugned her virtue, a demand that, following months of terrifying and humiliating interrogation of herself and her staff, he made good on.

Next, we consider Elizabeth as Queen. Because the succession was never determined, the Queen's health was a constant concern and thus remains one of the most thoroughly documented aspects of her reign.



Taking into account the differing terminologies between Elizabeth's era and today, as well as a much less sophisticated understanding of women's physiology, nothing in these accounts is consistent

with pregnancy. Nothing in her portraits or the clothing she wore is consistent with pregnancy. Often in the presence of foreign ambassadors, many of whom owed her no good will, nothing has ever been recovered from their letters home to suggest a sexual dalliance much less a pregnancy.

Elizabeth's repeated refusal to marry was based, in part, on the reasonable concern that, attitudes toward women being what they were, she would lose her political power to any man she might marry. Her 1559 letter to Parliament affirms her commitment to the nation.

Our points are meant as a defense of the historical facts. As Oxfordians are about to be inundated by a public reacting to *Anonymous*, we think it vital to stress a focused stance: that Shakespeare and Shakspeare are two separate people; that Shakespeare is Oxford; that PT theories are just that—theories being explored, not proven facts. Ours is a plea for accuracy and courtesy.

*Ren Draya, Stephanie Hughes, and Elizabeth Imlay* (with ideas contributed by a number of Oxfordian women) and read at the SOS and Shakespeare Fellowship Joint Conference, Washington, D.C., 16 October, 2011

## Freud and Shakespeare

Dear Editor:

I gave a paper recently at the annual meeting of the Division of Psychoanalysis of the American Psychological Association, in New York City. My title was "Wild Applied Analysis? Freud's Views on Shakespeare." The audience was receptive. At the annual meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association in June, in San Francisco, I've been invited to discuss a film version of *The Tempest*. The chair of that session has been supportive of my Oxfordian views. My review of James Shapiro's *Contested Will* appears in the current issue of the journal *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. It's my third Oxfordian book review that distinguished journal has published.

Best wishes,

*Richard M. Waugaman, M.D.*  
Training & Supervising Analyst Emeritus,  
Washington Psychoanalytic Institute  
Clinical Professor of Psychiatry,  
Georgetown University School of Medicine  
Reader, Folger Shakespeare Library  
email: [rwmd@comcast.net](mailto:rwmd@comcast.net)  
301-654-9771  
<http://www.oxfreudian.com>

### **The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter**

**welcomes letters from readers on  
any aspect of Shakespeare or  
Renaissance Drama.**

**Letters should be of moderate  
length and signed by the writer.**

**Send your comments to  
[drmichaelegan@comcast.net](mailto:drmichaelegan@comcast.net)**

## **The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter**

Published by the  
**Shakespeare Oxford Society**  
P.O. Box 808  
Yorktown Heights  
New York 10598

Tel: 914 962 1717  
Fax: 914 245 9713  
[sosoffice@optonline.net](mailto:sosoffice@optonline.net)  
[www.shakespeare-oxford.com](http://www.shakespeare-oxford.com)

### **Editor**

Michael Egan  
[drmichaelegan@comcast.net](mailto:drmichaelegan@comcast.net)

### **Publications Committee**

Brian Bechtold  
Jim Boyd, *chair*  
Katherine Chiljan  
Frank Davis  
Robin Fox  
John Hamill  
Ramon Jiménez  
Richard Joyrich  
Richard Smiley

### *Printed by*

Eagle Graphics, Inc  
[cbenger@eaglegraphicsprinters.com](mailto:cbenger@eaglegraphicsprinters.com)

Original research, reviews,  
commentary, reports, obituaries,  
photos and other items of interest to  
the Shakespeare Oxfordian  
community are welcome. Views  
expressed are not necessarily those  
of the SOS or its members.

© 2011 The Shakespeare Oxford  
Society, a 501(c)(3) non-profit,  
educational organization

## President's Letter Two Conferences and a Movie

Richard Joyrich  
President SOS

**W**elcome to another issue of the *Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter*. Since our last issue much has been happening in our Society and in the wider world of inquiry into the Shakespeare Authorship Question.

We have had two major authorship conferences in the last few months (see reports elsewhere in this newsletter) as well as the publication of many new books and articles. It is becoming extremely difficult to keep up with developments.

Of course, the biggest news is the new movie *Anonymous*, directed by Roland Emmerich with screenplay by John Orloff. By the time you read this, the film will have been released. Already (at the time of this writing) there have been many reviews and commentaries of the movie in advance of its release and this will only continue and expand as the movie becomes better known.

No matter what you may think of the details of the "story" presented in the movie you cannot deny that it will bring the Authorship issue before the public in an unprecedented manner.

Already, the Stratfordian "establishment" has had to face, for perhaps the first time, the necessity of trying to defend its case. It is no longer good enough for them to say there is no doubt or that everyone who questions that "Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare" is mentally aberrant. The Shakespeare Authorship Trust has already mounted a "campaign," beginning with their "60 Minutes with Shakespeare" and continuing on to their latest series of activities (covering over the name Shakespeare all over Warwickshire and in the town of Stratford to show how much of a loss it will be if people

start to believe what doubters have been saying). I think such antics will end up backfiring on them.

I think that the movie will on the whole be a good thing for the Oxfordian movement. Certainly, Stratfordians will have a field day nitpicking the liberties Emmerich has taken with history and "received wisdom," but they will not be able to stop people from finding this a great story and wanting to know more about it.

That's where all of us come in. I hope we will be ready for it. This is a great opportunity for us to reach out to people who have questions. We should take every opportunity to send in comments or letters to the editor to all the media outlets. We should try to direct people to our websites and blogs.

This is the time for us to increase the membership of our organization. You all can play a big part in this by offering your friends and acquaintances a half-price membership using our "Recruit-A-Member" program. In addition, I hope that all of you will renew your OWN membership for next year.

I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome the newest members of our Board of Trustees (elected at the Annual Meeting in Washington, DC), John Hamill and Robin Fox, and extend my thanks to departing Board members James Sherwood and Susan Width (both of who will continue to be active in helping to direct the affairs of the Society).

The Board maintains several committees which are open for all members to join. Please let me know if you would like to serve on a committee or if you have any suggestions for improving the Society.

I am happy to serve as your President for another year and I look forward (both with joy and a sense of awe) to the future of our movement. The times ahead will be both exciting and demanding. Let's all make the most of it.

## In Memoriam

### Noemi Magri

This past year has seen far too many important and influential Oxfordians shuffle off this mortal coil. I'm sorry to have to report that Noemi Magri, a wonderful researcher and diligent scholar, whom I had the great joy to meet in Mantua in 1999, passed away May 9, 2011. Her input and careful consideration was an important part of shaping the Italy chapters of "*Shakespeare*" *By Another Name*. Some of her papers were published in the 2004 book "Great Oxford," including a scholarly reconnaissance mission she undertook to find Portia's estate. The description of the estate is there in *The Merchant of Venice*, and sure enough, the author of the play wasn't making stuff up. Belmont stands to this day! May the taper beam of her work shine on like Portia's little candle.—*Mark Anderson*

#### **Ron Hess Writes:**

I add my own regrets on the death of Dr. Noemi Magri (and my praise for Mark Anderson's note, particularly its detail about her research). Noemi's insights about Shakespeare's Italy, especially the likelihood that he visited Mantua, will be sorely missed. I regret not having met her personally, yet she was always gracious and helpful when asked to confer on Shakespeare-related matters.

I especially recall Noemi's assistance to me in translating 17 of Don Juan's never-before-translated letters to the Duke of Savoy from 1574 to 78, two of which I believe have direct bearing on Oxford's travels to Genoa from either Palermo or Naples, in the midst of the great Genoese civil war of 1575, where the old nobility had been evicted by the new. Without Noemi's assistance, I might not have gotten all the trans-

lations as well done as they are, since Don Juan's archaic Castilian is difficult at times to interpret. Though I was the one who made the historical links for the letters, Noemi was very encouraging and helped me quite a bit with interpreting place names in both Italy and the Netherlands that are now obscure.

#### **From the *Gazzetta di Mantua*, 5.18.11**

Noemi Magri died on Monday, May 9. She was an extraordinary woman who dedicated her life to the English language. Many people from Mantua had her as their teacher, above all at ITIS, and many colleagues remember her with appreciation because she enabled them to revolutionize their methods of teaching English.

Her funeral will be today May 18 at 10 am at Saint Barnabas' Church in via Chiassi. Noemi, who was unmarried, lived in via Grioli, and leaves a brother, avvocato Carl'Alberto Magri.

Her parents had signalled her future; her father was a lawyer and her mother Ada, who taught French and died aged over ninety not many years ago, founded the Franco-Italian Society. Noemi, with professor Dina, was the driving force behind the Anglo-Italian Society. He was President, while she travelled the world to bring to Mantua conference delegates of the highest quality. This activity was greatest during the 1970s and '80s. Also well-known was the Special Project which provided 100 hours of refresher course in foreign languages for *il Provveditore*. It was hard work, but it spread new teaching methods and created a great leap in quality of teaching.

Noemi graduated from the Ca' Foscari in Venice, but already a joke by her teacher at her high school had put a bee in her bonnet—that Shakespeare probably never existed. Noemi became convinced that the author of *Romeo & Juliet*, *the Merchant of Venice* and *Othello* could not have been a

genial but poor theatrical groupie born in Stratford on Avon, but rather that he was the Earl of Oxford who had travelled extensively in Italy, and indeed had visited Mantua, so precise is the description of Romeo's journey from Verona to Mantua.

Noemi's studies on Shakespeare were always most accurate, and many were the international conferences which she attended.

## Tom Hunter

As many will have heard, Tom Hunter recently suffered a massive cardiac event while sitting outside of his cottage on the shores of Northern Michigan's Torch Lake, considered one of the most beautiful lakes in the world.

Although our local group, Oberon, was started in 1999 by Barbara Burris and myself and Tom joined us a little later, he became (in my opinion at least) the soul of our group. He served as our Chair for these many years and has kept us on track and helped build Oberon into a well-respected local Oxfordian group (of course I don't want to take away from all the great efforts of many others)

Tom's death is a great loss for Oberon, as well as for the Oxfordian world in general. He was very active in doing research and published many papers in Oxfordian newsletters and other media outlets. He presented many papers at our national conferences. In fact he was scheduled to give half of a presentation at the last conference in Washington, DC. Luckily (for Oxfordians) Tom Townsend was able to present both his own and Tom Hunter's parts of the presentation so his latest contribution will at least be heard. I only regret the loss of any future great work from Tom.

I can take a little comfort in the fact that Tom was able to see the movie *Anonymous* at a special preview event at the University

of Michigan, a movie poised to revitalize interest in the Authorship Question. Again, I'm just sorry that Tom will not be able to directly experience what I feel will be very interesting times ahead for all of us.

My heart and prayers go out to Tom's wife Rosey and his daughter Lisa as well as his large extended family.

Finally, I am comforted with the knowledge that at last Tom knows the truth about the origins of the Shakespeare canon, a truth we should (with Tom's example) continue to pursue for ourselves. "Now cracks a noble heart. / Goodnight sweet prince, / And flights of angels sing you to your rest" (*Hamlet*, Act V).

Online tributes can be found at <http://oberonshakespearestudygroup.blogspot.com/p/r-thomas-hunter-phd-tributes.html>.

Rest in Peace, Tom. With great sadness.

—Richard Joyrich

**MALICE AFORETHOUGHT:  
THE KILLING OF A UNIQUE GENIUS**

by Paul Altrocchi, MD

**MALICE AFORETHOUGHT:**  
The Killing of  
A Unique Genius



Paul Hemenway Altrocchi

Shakespeare authorship mystery solved. Dastardly crime of authoricide—the premeditated assassination of Edward de Vere's life story and literary creativity—described with cerebral sparkle and spine-tingling suspense which only a neurologist can properly convey! 395 pages.

To order from Xlibris  
easiest = by email: [orders@xlibris.com](mailto:orders@xlibris.com)  
Refer to book #64218.  
Or telephone 1-888-795-4274.  
Softcover: \$19.99 Hardcover: \$29.99  
Also available from Amazon.com

## The Silence of the Peers: Social Network Theory Proves Shakespeare was not Shakespeare

*Donald P. Hayes*

Professor of Sociology (Emeritus)  
Cornell University

The following paper was forwarded to me by William Ray and should be of great interest to the Oxfordian community. It was written by a Cornell University Sociology professor who died in 2006, and has apparently never been published. He applies "network theory" to the issue of there being no eulogies to William of Stratford when he died in 1616, and remarks that "This anomaly, the 'silence of his peers,' is the single most serious threat to Stratfordianism and to its first premise. There would be no Stratfordian anomaly, no threat to the orthodox position—if even one such document were found. No such document exists."

Hayes concludes that "unless a new, well-documented and far more plausible explanation can be developed for this silence of his peers, the odds that the man from Stratford grew up to become the master poet-dramatist William Shakespeare have fallen to the level of the improbable."

Hayes twice cites an article in a 2002 SON article (mine, it happens) and Diana Price's book, *Shakespeare's Unorthodox Biography*.  
—Ramon Jiménez

**O**rthodox biographies of the man baptized "Gulielmus Shaksper" in Stratford-on-Avon on 26 April, 1564, have generally downplayed and sometimes even ignored a long-known fact which came at the end of his life. Overlooking this fact is understandable since it undermines the first premise on which Stratfordianism is based: Gulielmus Shaksper grew up to become the master dramatist-poet William Shakespeare. The troublesome fact? *When Shaksper died in Stratford in 1616, none of his London dramatist or theatrical peers wrote a tribute for him, nor did any of them do so during the ensuing seven years.*

Undermining this Stratfordian first premise is this anomaly: if Shakespeare's dramatist peers commonly wrote tributes to their former colleagues upon their deaths, and if Shaksper became Shakespeare, then his peers should have written tributes for Shaksper—especially since he was so prominent. No such tributes exist. What makes their omission significant is that three months after Shaksper's death, another London poet/dramatist—Francis Beaumont—died. Far from ignoring him, other dramatists celebrated Beaumont with numerous tributes (some have survived) and they were active in his interment in the Poets' Corner of Westminster Abbey.

The Stratfordian's problem is straightforward: if Shaksper was Shakespeare, why were there no tributes? Their absence implies that they were two persons, not one. In this report, network theory and analysis are used to predict the likelihood that Shakespeare's dramatist peers would (a) know Shakespeare's identity, and (b) write tributes to him on learning of his death.

### Network Theory

Are there theoretical grounds for predicting how Shakespeare's peers would have reacted on learning that William Shaksper of Stratford had died in 1616? Modern network theory provides some basis for making such predictions. A substantial research literature on social networks has developed since the 1930's—beginning with Moreno & Jennings (1938), Bavelas (1951), and Newcomb (1961). Modern mathematical forms of network analysis have become pervasive throughout the natural and social sciences as well as in engineering. In *Social Network Analysis* (CUP1994), Wasserman and Faust described some generalizations about the

differential resources available to the *most central vs. peripheral* members of social networks. Central members, for example, are more likely to be ritually celebrated than peripheral members. By implication, the expense of honoring prominent and respected members on their retirement is expected to be greater than for lesser members, and the obligation to attend a funeral is stronger for a former prominent member than for a peripheral one. For central, prominent figures in London's network of dramatists, social network theory predicts that his surviving peers would have felt a strong obligation to write tributes—if *he was William*

*Shakespeare*. If he was not the dramatist, this theory predicts there would have been no sense of obligation—rather, to write a tribute for Shakspere would have been considered absurd.

Empirically, the network prediction is borne out: Marlowe, Jonson and even Beaumont were widely celebrated by tributes from their peers. The “silence” of those peers on Shakspere's death puts the evidence at odds with the Stratfordian's first premise. The missing tributes may yet turn up, but until then, the implication is: (a) there must have been a good reason why the surviving eleven of his peers ignored the death of the most prominent member of their community or (b) the man who died in Stratford in 1616 was not the dramatist Shakespeare. Explanations for his peers' “silence” are taken up in the Discussion.

### Conditions and Relationships

The social structure of Elizabethan and Jacobian dramatists was shaped by a variety of conditions, including two considered here: (a) the new large theaters produced a heavy demand for new or revised play

scripts; and (b) relationships between those twenty major playwrights were being shaped by both internal and external forces, including their alignments with one another, the theater companies, producers and patrons.

### Play Scripts

The large new public theaters (the Theatre, Curtain, Rose and Globe) attracted large audiences by their relatively low prices. The audience for a play was soon exhausted, which necessitated putting on several different plays a week. The demand for scripts compelled producers to look for and acquire

old and new plays, to commission plays or use a play-writing corps. The demand for scripts even attracted recent university graduates. New structural forms

developed among these dramatists, including a writing team of several dramatists working on different scenes or characters in the same play—much as contemporary teams of writers do for movies and television. The dynamic character of that structure makes it difficult to assign credit for authorship, since the question becomes entangled with matters of seniority or authority. Co-authoring took several forms, including work on another's unfinished work (e.g., Chapman on Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*—not a play). Not only did dramatists tinker with and revise their own scripts, so did the players and publishers. Playwrights would be curious as to what their friends and competitors were writing, what kinds of works were being commissioned, which plays were chosen, and audience reactions to plays, themes, plots and characters (e.g., a rise in the popularity of comedies; a decline in interest in revenge or history plays).

### Shakespeare's Social Network

To estimate Shakespeare's place within London's community of playwrights, a matrix was developed to estimate how twenty Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights were linked to one another during the period of Shakespeare's prominence. Evidence for those links comes mainly from research by Elizabethan scholars on co-authorship and from evidence of literary and social relationships. These reputed relationships are subjected to quantitative network analysis, and the mathematical centrality of each dramatist in that network is estimated—estimated because they are based on evidence which has survived four centuries of fires, negligence in the care of documents, and a lack of appreciation for documents' significance.

### Significant Losses

Alone, those conditions produce significant losses. For example, while there is surviving documentary evidence for the educational backgrounds for nearly all the others, Shakespeare's education cannot be documented—there are no records of the King's New School before the year 1700. Furthermore, nineteenth-century discoveries of forgeries in Shakespeare-related documents and evidence of deliberate destruction of important records have introduced additional biases and uncertainties into his historical record.

Finally, beyond the distortions attributable to deliberate and inadvertent loss are the numerous and unresolved disputes among Elizabethan scholars over some elementary facts about both William Shakespeare and William Shakespeare. Continuing research may turn up evidence of relationships omitted from this matrix, and some scholarly claims of a relationship may have to be deleted when confronted by stronger evidence. So long as those modifications are minor, additions to or deletions from are not likely to change the conclusion that Shake-

spere occupied a place close to the center of a dense network of peer relationships.

### Elizabethan Dramatists

To minimize bias in selection, all the major and several lesser dramatists from that era are included in our analysis—nineteen of Shakespeare's peers in all. Fifteen are known to have written or to have received tributes (Price, 2001). Several lesser ones are included because they had written a popular play, despite contemporary scholarly judgment that they were not important writers. Drayton is recognized mainly as a poet, but is included because he was a paid member of Henslowe's play-writing corps. While none of his plays have survived, Nashe is included because he is known to have been linked to several early Elizabethan dramatists and poets (not always positively). Daniel is excluded because all but one of his plays fell outside the specified period. Similarly, Massinger, Shirley and Ford were omitted because they came to this theatrical scene later. Spenser, Harvey and Watson were excluded because they did not write plays. Antony Munday, a lesser playwright, is included because he is a principal in a disputed Shakespeare play.

### Literary and Social Relationships

The primary sources for these links are reports of co-authoring based principally on the introductions to Shakespeare's and his peers' plays in the LION database; entries in the *Dictionary of Literary Biography*; scholarly introductions to Shakespeare's plays (e.g., *Riverside*, 2nd edition, 1997); membership in a playwriting corps (e.g., as reported in Henslowe's "Diary"); recent text analyses (e.g. Vickers, 2002); sharing a writing room supplied by a common patron; being jailed together for writing a controversial play, on suspicion of advocating atheism, or some officially unacceptable religious or political view; and on credible reports of links in biographies, surviving private letters and

<i>Dramatist 'Generation'</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Combined</i>
Shakespeare	0.643	0.667	0.633
Beaumont	0.462	0.365	
Chapman	0.501	0.381	
Chettle	0.667	0.594	
Dekker	0.800	0.594	
Drayton	0.571	0.463	
Fletcher	0.632	0.501	
Greene	0.751	0.543	
Heywood	0.501	0.571	0.514
Jonson	0.706	0.501	
Kyd	0.563	0.422	
Lodge	0.643	0.475	
Lyly	0.409	0.297	
Marlowe	0.692	0.475	
Marston	0.599	0.432	
Middleton	0.706	0.543	
Munday	0.563	0.632	0.576
Nashe	0.643	0.413	
Peele	0.692	0.487	
Webster	0.632	0.487	

**Table 1**

manuscripts. Relationships could be brief or lengthy; positive, neutral/ambivalent or negative (e.g., Middleton vs. Munday), and could change over time (e.g., Marlowe and Kyd). Eleven of these nineteen dramatist peers were alive on the day Shakspeare died—Beaumont, Chapman, Drayton, Fletcher, Heywood, Jonson, Lodge, Marston, Middleton, Munday, and Webster. Of those, Munday and Lodge came from the first half of the Shakespeare era, the others from the latter half. Aside from much missing information, the major obstacle in constructing a valid network is disagreement among Elizabethan scholars over important facts about these linkages.

**Calculating “Centrality”**

The table estimates the structure of London’s dramatist network, each playwright placed in accordance with his

mathematical centrality within that community; i.e., the direct and intermediary links through which news might pass about Shakspeare’s death. “Centrality” describes each dramatist relative to his peers. The equation is:  $C(i) = n / (\sum(d(i,j), j = i))$ , where  $d$  is distance between two persons, and the summation of distances is over all pairs of dramatists (Wasserman & Faust, 1994, cf. esp. Chapters 5, 12). This measure of a person’s centrality varies between 0 and 1. A person’s  $C$  measure represents not only his direct but all his indirect connections to the others. A  $C$  value of .50 represents someone twice as central in the network as one with a score of .25.

Table 1 supplies three sets of  $C$  estimates for these twenty dramatists: one for the first half of the Shakespeare era; one for the last.

**Continued page 23**



## Reviews

### ***Anonymous:* Shakespeare the Writer**

*Cheryl Eagan-Donovan*

With the release of Roland Emmerich's *Anonymous*, audiences around the world get their first glimpse of the 17th Earl of Oxford, also known as the Elizabethan poet and playwright, Edward de Vere. The most controversial thing about the film is not that it presents him as Shakespeare, but that the haphazard fictionalization of certain aspects of British history, in a story about actual people and events, will allow the Shakespeare industry to dismiss as entirely untrue what is an otherwise valid premise for the study of the canon.

As a writer who has studied Shakespeare for many years and as a filmmaker who has produced a soon-to-be-released documentary film about the life of de Vere, I am thrilled that Shakespeare the writer is now the topic of discussion every morning at my local Starbucks. Nothing pleases me more than experiences like the one I had recently, on an airplane bound for Italy, when I sat next to a young couple who had seen an advertisement in a magazine and wanted to know more about the man behind the mask in *Anonymous*. The media buzz today is palpable thanks to Sony's impressive marketing campaign. The daily postings by orthodox Shakespeare scholars in defense of their man Will Shaksper of Stratford are both amusing and revealing. It appears that the keepers of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust fear most the prospect that students will now be asking questions about the author of the plays and poems. James Shapiro, Columbia University professor and author of *Contested Will*, in

his rush to prevent the film from "encouraging students to search Shakespeare's works for 'messages that may have been included as propaganda and considered seditious'" likens *Anonymous* to Leni Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will*, and in doing so, makes an indirect yet nonetheless offensive reference to Oxfordians as Holocaust deniers.

### **Discovering de Vere**

It was my own discovery of Edward de Vere, in a history class taught by Harvard professor Donald Ostrowski, that led me to question everything I had previously been taught about Shakespeare. For students to become great writers, I reasoned, they must understand the process of writing. They must be exposed to great writing by other authors, they must learn first by imitation and then later by mining their own life experience for deeper, often subconscious, emotional truths. And finally they must commit to a lifetime of revision, the real work of writing. My own passion for writing inspired me to seek out the true author of the greatest works in the English language, and I found the definitive biography of de Vere in Mark Anderson's book *Shakespeare By Another Name*. I acquired the documentary film rights to Anderson's book and began writing my own nonfiction script.

Oxford was a man quite unlike any other. His was an extraordinary life. Rich with adventure, passion, tragedy and controversy, it was the life of a scholar, a spendthrift, a scoundrel, a venture capitalist, an athlete, and an intellectual. He was a rebel, a romantic, and a poet. He was a fatherless son, an absentee husband, a reluctant father, a capricious lover, a dandy, a courtier, a royal favorite, and an accused traitor. He was witty, temperamental, prone to jealousy, vain, and resentful. He had all the markers for genius: loss of a parent at an early age, travel to foreign lands, exposure to many languages, and access to the greatest books

and teachers of his day. "Above all," author Joseph Sobran wrote in *Alias Shakespeare*, "his brilliance made him a magnet even to other brilliant men."

Unfortunately, audiences will not see this de Vere on screen in *Anonymous*. The Earl is presented as a dolt and a madman, despite the best efforts of Rhys Ifans. Edward de Vere's legendary razor-sharp wit is nowhere to be found. Instead, the nobleman hears voices that compel him to write.

As a screenwriter, I felt quite strongly that many of the characterizations were rather flat and one-dimensional. The Queen is portrayed as simply infatuated with Oxford. As with the depiction of de Vere, there is no trace of the complex personality and fearless power that characterized Elizabeth I. Again, this cannot be attributed to the superb acting by Vanessa Redgrave as the elder monarch, and her daughter Joely Richardson as the young Elizabeth. William Cecil, Lord Burghley, was Elizabeth's most trusted advisor, and de Vere's guardian and later father-in-law. Burghley is recognized by Elizabethan scholars as a brilliant and complicated man, and the model for Polonius. In narrative terms, he is both a worthy rival and antagonist for de Vere, and also capable of being a strong ally. Burghley was truly influential in shaping the man who would become Shakespeare, but here he is reduced to a caricature of evil. In *Anonymous*, the queen is cast as a helpless pawn in the grand scheme of the Cecils' bid for control of the throne.

### No Homosexuality

The film includes plenty of costume-drama, romance-novel sex but no hint of the bisexuality and homoeroticism that can be found throughout the plays and the sonnets, and can also be found in contemporary references to de Vere's life. I had anticipated

that, at a minimum, the scenes with Essex and Southampton together in the tent in Ireland would reveal their rumored relationship, but this was not to be. In Emmerich's Elizabethan London, not even Marlowe was gay. Lord Burghley's daughter, Anne Cecil, whom de Vere married against his will, is nothing more than a nagging housewife. Much of the dialogue is pure exposition, and many of the film's plot twists are simply over the top, such as when Shaksper kills Marlowe. Suspension of disbelief becomes increasingly difficult as the story races to its explosive conclusion, the Essex Rebellion

It was quite clear to me that Orloff's original premise was to write Ben Jonson as Salieri to de Vere's Mozart, in an homage to *Amadeus*. The Jonson character steals the show literally, opening

and closing the story within the story with the Holy Grail of the play manuscripts in his possession. In his attempt to incorporate the Prince Tudor theories, the conjecture that de Vere was Elizabeth's son, and then her lover and father of Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, Emmerich has transformed Orloff's original screenplay, *Soul of the Age*, into a crash course on a hypothetical justification for the author's anonymity touted by a faction of Oxfordians. The idea that Southampton was actually the love child of Elizabeth and Oxford, has been around for a long time and is offered as a convenient explanation for the one hundred and twenty-six Sonnets by Shakespeare that seem to be passionate love poems addressed to another man.

But there is no historical evidence that any version of the Prince Tudor theories is true. Trying to compress de Vere's truly epic life story into the big screen, even without including his imaginary royal lineage and

***The film includes plenty of costume-drama, romance-novel sex but no hint of the bisexuality and homoeroticism that can be found throughout the plays and the sonnets.***

claim to the throne, is a monumental task, and the director resorts to a series of flash forwards and flashbacks, devices screen-writers generally try to avoid. The technique succeeded in confusing even the audience with whom I saw an advance screening of the film, a group of Shakespeare scholars and enthusiasts who know the chronology of de Vere's life backward and forward.

It is possible to overlook the preponderance of historical inaccuracies and inherent story structure problems because the production value is fantastic. The film looks beautiful, if dark, by candlelight, and some of the best actors in the world appear on screen, including Sir Derek Jacobi and Mark Rylance. It's truly exciting that many people who have never heard of Edward de Vere will now be exposed to a small slice of his life.

I am indebted to the director, the writer, and everyone at Sony Pictures Classics for leading the way, opening the floodgates of inquiry, and creating the opportunity for other writers to tell more of his story.

*Anonymous* makes only a brief reference to De Vere's travels, when the Earl tells Elizabeth how much he enjoyed the Italian women. My documentary, *Nothing is Truer than Truth*, focuses on the fourteen-month period when De Vere escaped the confines of life at Elizabeth's Court and traveled the Continent, making his home base in the cosmopolitan city of Venice, and gathering the material for the great canon that would become known as the works of Shakespeare.

De Vere's life story is perhaps the greatest story ever written. Above all else, he was a writer. It is not without irony that scholars who have championed de Vere as Shakespeare, after fighting for years to reveal the absurdities of the Stratford man's story, are now being asked to endorse a new myth about the life of the writer. There is a significant amount of groupthink in the Oxfordian camps these days, centering on the

premise that if *Anonymous* encourages viewers to rethink Shakespeare the writer, then it will have achieved success in spite of itself. As a writer, I must admit that I feel compelled to agree. As a filmmaker, I hope that the movie leaves audiences wanting more.

## Detobel on Shakespeare

*Shakespeare: The Concealed Poet*. (Privately printed, 2010). By Robert Detobel.

John Hamill

Robert Detobel is a German researcher, translator, publicist, and co-editor (with Dr. Uwe Laugwitz) of the German language *Neues Shakespeare Journal*. The journal which was launched in 1997 is the only one in Europe, outside of England, dedicated to the Shakespeare authorship issue. Detobel is a respected Oxfordian researcher who supports his statements and conclusions with numerous and detailed background facts.

Detobel's *Shakespeare* is a compilation of several of his more important articles (which he co-authored with K.C. Ligon, who passed away in 2009). The book is available on line at [www.elizabethanauthors.com](http://www.elizabethanauthors.com). While several of the articles in the book are also readily available on line, others have been in print for some time. Pieces such as "Authorial Rights in Shakespeare's Time," in the *The Oxfordian* 4 (2001), "Authorial Rights, Part 2" in *The Oxfordian* 5 (2002), and his article on "Francis Meres and the Earl of Oxford," which appeared in *Brief Chronicles* 1 (2009). He seems to have a limited number of hard copies available.

The book includes 11 articles arranged into Three Parts: The Subway to Shakespeare, Narrative and Legal Fictions, and The Concealed Poet. First, as Detobel explains, he looks into the prefatory material

in the First Folio and discusses how it should be understood in the context of its time. He goes into extensive detail on why the dedications written by commoners and those by nobility were quite different. Here he demonstrates how the dedications in the Folio and in Shakespeare's poetry, *Venus and Adonis*, and the *Rape of Lucrece* suggest that the author is an aristocrat. Secondly, he explains the true role of the printer James Roberts in the publication of Shakespeare's plays between 1598 and 1604, and the impact on the authorship question. Finally, he discusses the significance of Francis Meres' *Pallamis Tamia* of 1598 in which Meres provides a "Comparative Discourse." Detobel demonstrates that the "Comparative Discourse" is "a symmetrized name-dropping of ancient and English authors, in which Shakespeare's tragedies and comedies are set on a par with the hallowed classic tragedies of Seneca and the comedies of Plautus." Thus he confirms that Meres does not provide a complete list of works that had been printed by 1598, and works not mentioned does not necessarily mean that they had not been written by then.

The book includes many other articles of great relevance to the Shakespeare authorship question. Among the most impressive is his article "Shakespeare: The Lord Chamberlain," in which he proposes that the logical conclusion to the fact that the July 22, 1598 "stay" with the Stationer's Register, of the *Merchant of Venice*, by the Lord Chamberlain, could only have been authorized by the author. He further elaborates in great detail, that of the two Chamberlains that could claim this title, only one was known to be writing plays, and was also referred to at times as the Lord Chamberlain. That was Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, who was the Lord Great Chamberlain.

Another article, "Shake-scene, the Upstart Crow," discusses Robert Greene's famous invective against Shakespeare as "Shake-

scene" in a letter in *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit*. He explains in great detail again, how "Shake-scene" is not a reference to Shakespeare, but more likely to the famous actor Edward Alleyn, and that this could have been a reference to a play written by Marlowe, not Shakespeare.

The articles on the Harvey-Nashe quarrel are revealing. We see Oxford "in the midst of the famous literary quarrel raging in the first half of the 1590s between Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe, the outstanding satirist of his time, though Shakespeare is strangely absent from the *contretemps*." We witness that Oxford is "repeatedly apostrophized by both Harvey and Nashe as the dominant figure amongst the London literati of the 1580s and 90s, a prolific patron and premier poet in his own right." Thus Detobel concludes that Oxford was "the pre-eminent literary light at the teeming centre of the world of English literature for the last two decades of the sixteenth century."

While the book is hugely informative, and is a great resource for Shakespeare authorship studies, it is geared to the scholar and not the general public. It is full of supporting information and digressions, which makes it difficult reading. In addition, the fact that the book is not generally available in hard copy, might also make it less likely scholars will take it seriously, and I am afraid the information will not have the proper impact.

As J. Scheffer and R. F. Whalen exclaim in the prologue, the book "...should be read and kept handy for consultation by anyone seriously interested in the Shakespeare authorship question and the evidence for the Earl of Oxford as the great poet-dramatist." I agree.



**T**he Seventh Annual Joint Authorship Conference was held at the Washington Court Hotel in Washington, DC from Thursday, October 13, 2011 through Sunday, October 16, 2011.

#### **Marty Hyatt**

The conference began on Thursday at 1:15 PM with Marty Hyatt speaking on “Tombs, Wombs, and Doom in the Sonnets.” After noting how so many of the sonnets have words describing death and birth he focused on Sonnet 55. As appropriate for a talk given on October 13 (the feast day of St. Edward the Confessor) Marty showed how there are many parallels between this sonnet and the monument/shrine to Edward the Confessor in Westminster Abbey (directly behind the high altar) and postulated that Edward de Vere had this shrine in mind when he wrote that sonnet. Marty showed great many pictures of this shrine and other parts of the Abbey to illustrate his talk.

#### **Alan Green**

Next was a whirlwind (but very enjoyable) presentation by Alan Green on “I, Shakespeare. Unanimous? or Anonymous? The Holy Trinity Solution.” Alan quickly

described an amazingly complex cipher/encoding scheme which links the dedication of the sonnets, the monument to Shakespeare in Holy Trinity Church, the inscription on Shakespeare’s tomb, and the Enochian tables of John Dee. Details can be found in Alan’s new book (very beautifully made) and future books in a series of five that Alan has planned. Who knows where this will all lead?

#### **Earl Showerman**

Earl Showerman then gave another in his series of presentations on Greek sources for the plays of Shakespeare. This time Earl detailed parallels between *Macbeth* and the *Oresteia* trilogy of Aeschylus. Earl really shows how much this series of Greek tragedies (not translated into English or Latin at the time) influenced Shakespeare. Again, the implication is that the author needed to be able to read the plays in the original Greek, which Edward de Vere could do, but Shakspere of Stratford could not.

#### **Ren Draya**

Ren Draya analysed the music in *Twelfth Night*, detailing how its songs and music of illuminate the story and the dramatic impact

of the play. The presentation was augmented by Ren playing a selection of recorded songs from productions of this play.

### **Anonymous**

Everyone then made their way to the AMC Loews Georgetown 14 movie theater (located, unsurprisingly, in Georgetown) for a special advance showing of *Anonymous*. People seemed to like the movie very much.

### **Friday, October 14**

The day began with the Annual Meeting of the Shakespeare Fellowship.

### **Heward Wilkinson**

Following this, the presentations began with Heward Wilkinson on "Creating a New Shakespeare Criticism in Light of Oxfordian Studies." Heward dedicated his talk to the memory of Tom Hunter. This talk was about how literary criticism is important for Oxfordians, but we shouldn't concentrate only on finding biographical parallels between the plays and Oxford. Rather, we should look at the plays to reveal the author's personality and world outlook. Heward spent most of the time discussing how this can be done with *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

### **Tom Townsend**

The next presentation, given by Tom Townsend, was a joint effort with Tom Hunter, who sadly passed away a week before the Conference. Tom Townsend was able to give both parts of the talk, "Oxfordian Connections in *Romeo and Juliet*." Tom pointed out many things that we can learn from the play with Oxford as the author that Stratfordians have missed. These include a better dating of the play (based on the 1570 earthquake in Verona), how well the author knew Verona and its customs, the character of Mercutio, the use of euphuistic language, and the importance of humanism in the play.

### **Ramon Jiménez**

In his talk, "The Date of the *Merchant of Venice*," Ramon Jiménez presented evidence for a date of 1578, which is much earlier than the traditional 1595-96. Ramon showed that there was at least one play (and maybe more) from 1579 or before which seem (from their titles) to have been the *Merchant of Venice* or an earlier version. Furthermore, he showed at least five works (plays or other writings) in the 1580s which contain allusions to the plot or actual lines from the play. Stratfordians always claim that either there was an earlier "Ur-*Merchant*" by someone else, or that Shakespeare was borrowing from these writings in the 1580s. Ramon showed how much more likely it is that Shakespeare had to be the originator.

### **Roger Stritmatter**

Roger presented an expanded version of the introduction to his forthcoming book on Edward de Vere's Geneva Bible (no release date yet). The title of the book apparently will be *By Every Syllable: A Spiritual Biography of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford*.

### **Folger Library Tour**

After this introduction to the Geneva Bible those attendees who had tickets (the first 60 registrants) went to the Folger Shakespeare Library. There we divided into two groups of 30. One group toured the public exhibition and the Founder's Room while the other went to the Board Room to see an exhibit of books and documents related to de Vere. After 45 minutes the groups switched locations.

The "public tour" was with a docent who outlined the history of Henry Folger and his wife and how the Library was started and built. In the Founder's Room we saw the famous Ashbourne portrait (originally billed

Continued page 28



## **Twelfth Night Continued**

There can be no doubt that Shakespeare himself had a very considerable knowledge of music. His poems and plays are full of allusions to the art; not only does he speak of music plainly and directly, but he often mentions technical musical terms in a metaphorical sense... Shakespeare never makes a mistake, even when he alludes to theoretical details of a difficult and obscure kind.

With typical Stratfordian logic, Dent (a professor of music at Cambridge) goes on to speculate that Shakespeare must have learned some music in the Stratford grammar school. Hmm.

Here's what is not speculation: every single Shakespeare play contains some kind of mention of music. It might be a complete song, a few phrases or lyrics, an allusion to a title of a song, or a figure of speech that involves a musical instrument or a detail related to music. It is clear from the plays that the author knew a stock of songs upon which he could draw to heighten dramatic moments.

And he also knew the workings of specific musical instruments—for example, Iago's metaphor as he watches the loving reunion between the Moor and Desdemona:

Oh, you are well tuned now!  
But I'll set down the pegs that make this  
music. (*Othello*, II.i.198-9)

A lute or stringed instrument is tuned by tightening or loosening pegs attached to the strings. Iago is thus announcing himself as being in control: he plans to "set down the pegs," that is, loosen or tamper with Othello and Desdemona's strong affection for each other.

So, we have an author utterly familiar with songs and musical details. For Shakespeare and his contemporaries, music had real powers: it could exert a civilizing influ-

ence on rude folk; it could put a person into harmony with the world and with the sweet music of the spheres. Elizabethans believed that the kind of music people played or sang or enjoyed might well be a measure of their humanity and of their civilized, Christian status. In *The Merchant of Venice*, Jessica (daughter of the Jew) must be taught by her Christian husband how to appreciate music and its loveliness. And in *Othello*, the Moor's inability to understand music marks him as an outsider.

## **Shakespeare's Audience**

For Shakespeare's audiences, music was an integral part of existence. Today, we expect actors to burst into song primarily if we're watching a musical or an opera. But performances of songs or instrumental inclusions would have seemed quite natural—organic—to Renaissance audiences, no matter the genre of play. Lovers were expected to serenade their mistresses; cronies laughing in a tavern were expected to warble drunken catches over their tankards. Thus, the songs in a Shakespearean play can be considered as intrinsic as the action or dialogue; songs can convey plot, highlight character, or underscore a specific mood. As in the ubiquitous sound tracks to film or television programs today, instrumental music in Renaissance plays created an appropriate background for lyrical passages or for heightened emotions; music established setting and marked scenes of solemnity and mystery.

My focus here is on *Twelfth Night*, a play known for its music: songs and fragments of songs which are always appropriate to action and character, music which sets the mood. Two types of songs are found in the play: (1) Sweet, plaintive songs—often ironic—connected to Orsino and to Feste; (2) Ballads and bawdy drinking songs connected to Sir Toby and his pals.

*Twelfth Night* is the only Shakespeare play to open and close in music. Everyone

knows the first words, Orsino's command: "If music be the food of love, play on..."

Even if we weren't in a theater hearing a poignant, romantic melody, Orsino's line tells us that music is playing—for him. Because he has his own consort, we know he is well-born. Orsino listens, he swoons, he orders the music to stop when it ceases to please him. Edward Naylor suggests a tune called "Lord Salisbury his Pavin" (which has a "dying fall") as a candidate for Orsino's music. John Long theorizes that the music for these opening moments would have been played by a recorder consort, but any number of instrumental combinations or solo choices are popular in stagings today. Whatever the composition of the consort and whatever the score, Orsino's reaction to the music immediately establishes him as a man tied to his emotions, a man who believes he is in love. And he is ever so sensitive, hoping first that if he hears enough music, his appetite for love may wane. Then, when the "dying fall" comes, he realizes that he cannot bear hearing any more and orders the music to stop: "Enough, no more! 'Tis not so sweet now as it was before . . ." (I.i 7-8). Everything about these opening few moments shows us that music is an economical way for the author to introduce this posturing, self-absorbed duke!

Music is next mentioned when the name of Sir Andrew Aguecheek comes up. Maria (Olivia's servant) calls Sir Andrew a "very fool and a prodigal" (I.iii.24). Sir Toby defends him and adds, "He plays on the viol de-gamboys" (a bass violin, today). Our author is wickedly ironic here: Sir Andrew may have a title, may have money, may indeed be versed in the arts—he dances, he plays a musical instrument—but oh, is he a dope! A few moments later, when Sir Andrew appears, he and Sir Toby quip about galliards and various dance steps, and from their cavorting and Andrew's bumbling, we

see that the naïve Aguecheek will be easily gulled.

Beyond the actual songs or instrumental passages, references to music also appear early in *Twelfth Night*. Orsino describes Cesario's voice (Cesario is Viola in disguise as a young lad): "thy small pipe is as the maiden's organ" (I.iv.32-33). In contrast, Malvolio peevishly remarks that Cesario "speaks very shrewishly" (I.v.160). Ah, this play calls attention to what we hear, to the pitch and tone of someone's voice. Music supplies a framework even for spoken lines. In one of my favorite passages, Viola chides the haughty Olivia, a countess who has cloistered herself away and who seems to lack passion. In contrast, Viola, if she were in love would "sing them loud":

Make me a willow cabin at your gate  
And call upon my soul within the house;  
Write loyal cantons of contemned love  
And sing them loud even in the dead of night...  
(I.v.269-272)

But *Twelfth Night* is a comedy, and the author punctures Viola's rapturous image a few scenes later. It is well past bedtime; Sir Toby has called for a few stoups of wine and asks Sir Andrew, "Does not our lives consist of the four elements?" A profound question, answered honestly by Sir Andrew: "Faith, so they say; but I think it rather consists of eating and drinking" (II.iii.10-11). In walks Feste, the clown (or wise fool) and Toby immediately asks him for a "catch" (a simple song for several voices, a round). Sir Andrew praises Feste's "excellent breast" (a reference to his lungs, i.e., his singing), proclaiming, "I had rather than forty shillings I had such a leg, and so sweet a breath to sing, as the fool has" (20-21).

Toby and Andrew cry out for a song, and Feste asks the tipplers, "Would you have a love song, or a song of good life?" (II.iii.36). They choose a love song, and Feste obliges

with:

O mistress mine, where are you roaming?  
O, stay and hear, your true-love's coming,  
That can sing both high and low.  
Trip no further, pretty sweeting;  
Journey's end in lovers meeting,  
Every wise man's son doth know.

What is love? 'tis not hereafter;  
Present mirth hath present laughter;  
What's to come is still unsure:  
In delay there lies no plenty; (some texts read  
"In decay. . .")  
Then kiss me, sweet, and twenty,  
Youth's a stuff will not endure. (II.iii.40-53)

Scholars believe the melody for "O mistress mine" was a popular one (it is the title of a consort from Morley's 1599 collection), with the lyrics being Shakespeare's invention (Seng 94). Those words echo standard sentiments from various traditional ballads and reflect a familiar *carpe diem* theme: be happy now, "what's to come is still unsure." Although the song is sweeter than the melody played for the melancholy Orsino, it certainly isn't a raucous or bawdy song (as Toby and Andrew surely expected). In fact, if we take the lines seriously, Feste relays a message appropriate to Olivia, who prefers to honor the memory of a dead brother rather than to seek love in the here and now.

But Sir Toby and Sir Andrew are oblivious to the subtlety of the song. For them, singing and drinking are natural companions. They become progressively drunker, they quip and dance, and Maria comes bursting in to scold them. She calls their singing "caterwauling" (75), but her chiding has no effect on the revellers—including Feste. The trio sings snatches of lyrics, and, in a crescendo of increasing hilarity, they mention titles of old songs: "Hold thy peace," "Peg-a-Ramsey," "Three merry men be we," "On the twelfth day of December..." Much of this is clever satire, for the titles (or references within the songs)

represent various topical allusions--political and social jibes that would be as meaningful to Shakespeare's audiences as "Gimme Shelter" or "The Times They are A'Changin'" are today.

The resultant clamor brings in Malvolio! In many stagings, all four are participants—Maria joining in enthusiastically with Toby, Andrew, and Feste. It's always great fun for an audience: late-night party animals having a good old time, howling and dancing and drinking. But Malvolio, Olivia's steward and our quintessential stuffed shirt, is rigid with shock:

My masters, are you mad? Or what are you? Have you no wit, manners, nor honesty, but to gabble like tinkers at this time of night? Do ye make an alehouse of my lady's house, that ye squeak out your coziers (cobblers) catches without any mitigation or remorse of voice?  
(II.iii.87-93)

The classic Puritan put-down! When Malvolio ends with "Is there no respect of place, persons, nor time in you?" Toby's answer is one of the best musical puns ever made: "We did keep time, sir...Sneck up" (94).

As Malvolio tries to quiet the noise-makers, Feste and Sir Toby sing a crude antiphony—"Farewell, dear heart"—taken from a ballad called "Corydon's Farewell to Phyllis." A clever director often blocks this sequence so that Malvolio is dragged along or somehow entangled in the mess on stage.

Another delicious face-off comes a moment later when Toby stands up to Malvolio, "Art any more than a steward? Dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?" (113-115). My point in reminding you of this wonderful scene is that music is a key element: music provides the means for exposing character and for offering contrasts of mood.

Right after Sir Toby's drunken larking about, the scene shifts to Orsino's palace. Predictably, the Duke calls for music, wanting "that piece of song, that old and antic (quaint) song we heard last night...it did relieve my passion much, more than light airs" (II.iv, II.v). Orsino's "passion," he thinks, is the suffering he endures due to the love he feels for Olivia and which she spurns. During the brief interlude while Feste is sent for, music plays—a plaintive, moody melody to suit the intimate conversation between Orsino and Cesario. It's a sweet moment for audiences, because as Orsino quizzes Cesario about the lad's love life, the haughty (but surely handsome) duke doesn't realize that Cesario is a "she" in love with her boss. Feste is brought in, and Orsino asks for "the song we had last night," which he describes as "old and plain...a silly sooth" which "dallies with the innocence of love..." (42-47). The "sooth" (truth) which Feste sings is "Come away, come away death." (In some productions, Cesario is the singer. Viola has, after all, bragged that she can sing as well as any eunuch.)

The song, often called "Sad Cypress," is all about dying. The singer laments a "fair cruel maid" has shunned me; lyrics include words like *shroud*, *death*, *coffin*, *corpse*, *bones*, *sighs*, *grave*. Quite an odd choice, if we expected a romantic love song! But not odd at all in its context: the song is a favorite of the Duke's, and he, like Olivia, is in love with a sense of suffering—truly, in love with the idea of being in love. Both Orsino and Olivia have chosen to be self-absorbed, have chosen to pine away for a love that will always be rejected. Thus, "Sad Cypress" is not just a melodic filler: it is an effective way to underscore Orsino's and Olivia's exaggerated, egotistical temperaments:

Come away, come away, death,  
And in sad cypress let me be laid.  
Fly away, fly away, breath;  
Not a flower, not a flower sweet,

I am slain by a fair cruel main.  
My shroud of white, stuck all with yew,  
O, prepare it.  
My part of death, no one so true  
Did share it.

On my black coffin let there be strown;  
Not a friend, not a friend greet  
My poor corpse, where my bones shall be  
thrown.  
A thousand thousand signs to save,  
Lay me, O, where  
Sad true lover never find my grave,  
To weep there. (II.iv.59-67)

The tales of the "sad true lovers" on stage are gently shelved for a while, and the plot turns to Maria's forging a letter for Malvolio to find, to Malvolio's reaction, and to silliness connected to Sir Andrew. Once the pranks start, the music of Twelfth Night virtually disappears. Act III does begin with Viola tipping Feste, "God save thee, friend, and thy music," but Acts III, IV, and V contain very little music. There is only Feste's whistle, a few bars of "Hey Jolly Robin" (IV.ii.75-76), and a brief song in Act IV. It's a jarring scene for a comedy: Malvolio, presumed mad, has been placed in a dark cage and cannot see. Feste alters his voice, pretending to be Sir Topas, a quirky curate who feigns help for the hapless steward. Then, when Feste speaks as himself, his voice and his singing and his whistle identify him as Feste. In leaving Malvolio, he sings "I am gone, sir" promising to return: "I'll be with you again, in a trice, like to the old Vice."

I am gone, sir.  
And anon, sir,  
I'll be with you again,  
In a trice,  
Like to the old Vice,  
Your need to sustain.  
Who with dagger of lath,  
In his rage and his wrath,

Cries “Ah ha” to the devil .  
(IV.ii.122-131)

The doggerel serves as a bitter taunt to the helpless, humiliated steward. In the morality plays, Vice was a stock character, a buffoon who usually carried a wooden dagger (Baker 86) and made sport with the devil by leaping on his back and poking him with the dagger. Given Malvolio’s pitiful predicament and Feste’s pretending to happen by—we can assume that “I am gone, sir” is sung *a capella*. The actor playing Feste thus has a chance to show off his voice and his ventriloquist skills.

Until the closing moments, “I am gone, sir” is the only song in the second part of the play. A director can add an interesting twist. John Barton, for instance, staged *Twelfth Night* so that at random intervals, characters would hum bars of the songs already heard. These snippets can serve as counterpoint to the mood on stage, can remind us of a character’s motif, or can simply add texture.

Act V’s unraveling of confusions contains no music: Sebastian and Viola, brother and sister, are reunited; Olivia sees that her husband almost turned out to be a girl; Cesario is revealed as Viola, which means that Viola and Orsino can wed. The Duke now recognizes that Cesario is in fact “Orsino’s mistress” (390), his words a lovely echo to the song “O mistress mine.”

What of the cross-gartered steward? Malvolio listens to Olivia’s explanation of the letters and realizes how he was gulled—Fabian describes the sequence of pranks as “sportful malice” (V.i.367). Feste adds insult to the catalogue of injuries by pronouncing “And thus the whirligig of time brings in his revenges” (379). Most editions of *Twelfth Night* explain “whirligig” as a spinning top; the Riverside edition also suggests a metaphorical interpretation, the whirligig an image of “time’s circling course.” Joan Hartwig suggests that Feste’s whirligig parodies fortune’s wheel. And she mentions the

OED’s citation of a whirligig as an instrument of torture.

Yes. According to the OED, a whirligig is (1) a spinning toy; (2) “an instrument of punishment formerly used, consisting of a large cage suspended so as to turn on a pivot”; (3) something that is continually whirling, a circular course. Feste’s word is thus an apt image: the play’s merry nonsense has indeed come full circle (the third definition) and Malvolio’s cage was very like the instrument of punishment (the second definition).

In some stagings, Malvolio’s exit line, “I’ll be revenged on the whole pack of you!” (380) is said with a wry sense of self-understanding, and he accepts Olivia’s peace offering. We sense that he will no longer imagine himself above his modest station in life. In other stagings, Malvolio’s bitterness cannot be assuaged, he will always be rigid, always incapable of merriment. We feel uneasy about his threat of revenge.

Whatever a director’s choice, the pack of characters exits; only Feste is left on stage. Feste, whose name is derived from festival or festive spirit—Feste, the character who speaks of “the whirligig of time.” Feste is the singer, the wise fool or clown; as such, Feste is taken from the stock characters of Italian *commedia dell’ arte*. As Richard Whalen has argued, Edward de Vere’s journeys in Italy would have exposed him to the *commedia* tradition. Robert Goldsmith, in the 1950’s saw a resemblance between Feste and a *commedia* character called *il dottore*, one of the older men who speaks nonsense—finding this resemblance in some of Feste’s logic-chopping and fun with argument (example, V.i..8-28). I would muse, also, that Feste shares many qualities with Oxford: he is a person at ease with the well-born; he has a quick wit and a way with words; he has a store of knowledge and learning. Goldsmith calls Feste “our guide through the mazes of emotion” (56)—which

I take to mean that Feste is the author's alter ego.

Feste plays a considerable role in *Twelfth Night* and is in all five acts. For any Shakespeare play, it is always interesting to ask, "Who is the main character?" Sometimes, the answer is very clear, particularly in the histories and tragedies: *Henry V*, *Richard III*, *Lear*, *Hamlet*, *Titus Andronicus*—all are definitely main characters. Sometimes, the answer is a pair of characters: Antony and Cleopatra, Romeo and Juliet, Troilus and Cressida. But the comedies and romances present ensembles; no one star (or pair of stars) dominates. In *Twelfth Night*, who has the most lines? Here's the tally: Sir Toby 357; Viola 335; Olivia 322; Feste 315; Malvolio 286; Orsino 225.

Feste is right in the middle of the ensemble. Scholars believe that the same actor who played Touchstone and Lear's Fool also played Feste—Robert Armin. These roles are important, demanding finesse, charm, stamina. As the wise fool, Feste is the mediator between Orsino's and Olivia's courts. Goldsmith states that Feste's wit goes deeper than mere verbal felicity, pairing him with Viola, for it is she alone who shares Feste's awareness of life's contradictions (54). In Viola's words:

He must observe their mood on whom he jests,  
The quality of persons, and the time;  
Not like the haggard, check at every feather  
That comes before his eye. This is a practice  
As full of labour as a wise man's art.  
(II.i.61-66)

This reference to "the haggard" can be seen as another link to Edward de Vere: a haggard is a female hawk, and figures of speech based on the aristocratic sport of falconry point to a well-born writer. Another falconry reference occurs in Orsino's opening lines ("If music be the food of love..."). The phrase "validity and pitch" (line 12)

means value and superiority, pitch being the highest point of a falcon's flight.

In *Twelfth Night*, it is Feste who has the last word, for the play closes with his song, "When that I was an' a little tiny boy, with Hey, ho, the wind and the rain..." It is an epilogue that has elicited a range of reactions, from those who consider it irrelevant/unnecessary (Chambers, for example) to those who see it as perfectly appropriate to the conclusion of *Twelfth Night*.

Personally, I love the song. I would bring Feste to the edge of the stage, have him sit, dangle his legs, and sing the ballad's five verses. He starts, "A great while ago the world begun, with Hey ho, the wind and the rain..." The net effect is both musical and musing: this great world will go on spinning, nature will do its things, and we humans will go from childhood to adulthood, with the events of our lives raining down on us. How serious are our troubles? How much pleasure should we have?

When that I was and a little tiny boy,  
With hey, ho, the wind and the rain,  
A foolish thing was but a toy  
For the rain it raineth every day.

But when I came to man's estate,  
With hey, ho, the wind and the rain,  
'Gainst knaves and thieves men shut their gate,  
For the rain it raineth every day.

But when I came, alas, to wive,  
With hey, ho, the wind and the rain,  
By swaggering could I never thrive,  
For the rain it raineth every day.

But when I came unto my beds,  
With hey, ho, the wind and the rain,  
With tosspots still had drunken heads,  
For the rain it raineth every day.

A great while ago the world began  
With a hey, ho, the wind and the rain;  
But that's all one; our play is done,  
And we'll strive to please you every day.

Reminding you that the subtitle of *Twelfth Night* is “What You Will,” as in “make of it what you will,” I think that Feste’s song tells us that however tossed about we may be, there is always a silly play to stave off the whirligig of time.

**Notes:**

The sole text for *Twelfth Night* is the First Folio (1623). This paper, with musical accompaniment was presented at the joint conference of the Shakespeare Fellowship and the Shakespeare Oxford Society, Washington, D.C. October 13, 2011.



**Social Theory *Continued***

half; and one for the data treated as a single network. Overlapping “generations” of dramatists are evident. The first consists of Nashe, Peele, Lodge and Lyly, plus Shakespeare, Kyd, and Munday. Four of the “Wits” and Kyd were dead by 1596, and except for Munday and Lodge, the others by 1606. These early deaths largely account for the scarcity of cross-generation ties. The central-most of the first generation were Greene and Peele—both dead by 1596. The second “generation” had as its central-most figures Dekker, Jonson, and Middleton. These results reflect the *dense network of social relationships among those dramatists*. Shakespeare was the most well-connected in the combined generations, but not the central-most dramatist in either period. John Lyly was the least integrated member, in part because he had retired from writing plays early. Heywood and Chapman, while first generation in age, are included with the second generation because they began writing in the latter period. High as these centrality values are, they *underestimate* the true level of relationships between these dramatists since much of the evidence, espe-

cially as it bears on their informal relationships, is missing. The high density of these relationships in both “generations” of dramatists ensures that each knew the other, not just by reputation, but directly—personally. That means that *William Shakespeare’s identity was known by all of them*. If Shakspere was really Shakespeare, all of his dramatist peers would know who died in Stratford.

**The Jonson/Shakespeare Link**

There is a significant omission in what is otherwise a densely-interconnected network. There is no link connecting the two most prominent members of London’s dramatist community—Jonson and Shakespeare. Jonson worked with many of his colleagues, but there is no evidence that he and Shakespeare had ever worked together. Nor had Jonson mentioned Shakespeare by name in his extensive and surviving records of works or private commentaries between 1598 and 1616.

After Marlowe’s death in 1593, Shakespeare became the most prominent dramatist in London and remained so until the late 1590s when challenged by Jonson after his successful *Every Man In His Humour*, produced by Burbage brothers’ company in 1598. Jonson had already begun working for Henslowe (receiving a £4 advance). Ever feisty, Jonson made public appraisals of his peers (e.g. he satirized Dekker and Marston’s works, leading to an exchange, in kind), but as far as is known, Jonson never took on Shakespeare—in print. In both the earlier and later years, they remained distant and cool—prominent colleagues and rivals, but without documented evidence of animus. Their relationship, in turn, probably affected their alignments with other dramatists and theirs with one another—forming small subgroups. The relationships between those twenty dramatists were also being affected by their alignments with the rival theater companies and by their patrons. If a patron

was a noble, his standing at Court (favored or not) would affect a dramatist's alignment with others. An important example is Jonson, favored by his noble friends, including the third Earl of Pembroke and his brother, wife, and mother. The Pembrokes had strong negative feelings toward the Earl of Oxford. In deference to his noble friends, Jonson would have avoided working with any London dramatist peer closely aligned with the Earl of Oxford, such as John Lyly and Antony Munday. In short, Jonson's external relationships affected his links within London's dramatist community, which, in turn, affected others with whom he was aligned. While Shakespeare's extended association with the Lord Chamberlain/ King's Men companies is uncontested, the identity of his patron(s) is not.

Unsupported speculation has Shakespeare closely linked to the Earl of Southampton, but

Southampton was out of favor with the Queen and Court and later barely survived after his conviction for treason. Those dramatists' alignments with theater companies, impresarios, and their patrons all produced fault lines within that playwright community. The presence and absence of linkages between the members suggests some probable alignments: Beaumont, Chapman, Drayton, Marston, and Middleton appear to have been aligned with Jonson; Lodge, Munday and Heywood with Shakespeare, leaving Chettle, Fletcher, and Dekker in the delicate position of maintaining relations with both camps. Lyly simply withdrew from the community.

### Jonson's 1623 Eulogy

The relationships in the matrix help in understanding Jonson's role in the 1623 *First Folio*, for which he wrote a lavish tribute to Shakespeare. So far as is known,

Jonson never collaborated with Shakespeare, nor had he written a tribute for Shakespeare on his death. In his private writings, he ignored Shakespeare. Given their long-term relationship, there are some puzzling aspects to Jonson's being chosen to write the principal eulogy for his long-term rival.

Can Jonson's eulogy be taken at face-value? Price (2001) has developed this question, noting that there has always been and continues to be debate over his eulogy. Scholars generally agree that it is an ambiguous document. John Dryden (1631-1700) asserted that Jonson's eulogy was "an insolent, sparing and invidious panegyric." Dryden's interpretation coincides with what is known of the Jonson-Shakespeare relationship—if not hostile, it was cool and distant.

Jonson was the most prominent dramatist of his time—he became Court Poet around 1605 and England's Poet Laureate in 1616. What

could have motivated him to produce the eulogy for his rival Shakespeare in the *Folio*? There are many speculations. Jonson may have been hired to write the eulogy as a "puff"—a public endorsement on a script designed by the promoters. A second explanation for Jonson's role in the *Folio* is that he did it as a personal favor for his long-time friends and patrons—the Earl of Pembroke and his brother to whom the *Folio* was dedicated. That too does not assure that his eulogy can be taken at face value. A third explanation is that despite their cool relationship, Jonson admired Shakespeare and welcomed the opportunity to write an effusive tribute, although his appraisals of Shakespeare in his private papers were reserved, critical and ambivalent. Jonson's eulogy is an ambiguous document, particularly when read against the background of his private commentaries, others' reports of

### ***What could have motivated Jonson to produce the eulogy for his rival Shakespeare in the Folio?***

his appraisals of Shakespeare, his extended cool and distant relationship with Shakespeare, and the practice of commissioning puffs. If Shakspeare became Shakespeare, there has to have been a good reason for his peers' silence, or they were two men: one from Stratford, born and died as Shakspeare, and a second, the historical poet/playwright Shakespeare, whose identity has been in dispute for 400 years.

### Discussion

If the "silence" of his peers (especially his closest co-author, Fletcher) is not to undermine the main Stratfordian premise, there must be a plausible explanation. Several are proposed. One is that news of Shakspeare's death in Stratford was long-delayed in getting back to London—it came too late for tributes. That is implausible given the level of Shakspeare's engagement with London. Though it took days, there was regular traffic between Stratford and London. In London, there were creditors and agents involved in Shakspeare's documented real estate and theatrical holdings and his money lending. There were debtors to whom Shakspeare had loaned money and he held their bond. A solicitor would have been required in the course of some of his business transactions. The identity of one partner is known from his signature as a co-buyer on the legal papers for the purchase of a gatehouse near the Blackfriars theater. Shakspeare's London agent(s) would need to learn of his death promptly in order to negotiate the settlement on his extensive business affairs. Finally, there were his fellow shareholders in the King's Men company of players, and in the Globe and Blackfriars theaters. If not already sold, his shares and the income from them would have to be negotiated by someone acting in the interests of his family and estate.

News of Shakspeare's death might also have gotten back to London through members of a traveling company of players. If

they believed Stratford's William Shakspeare was the famous playwright, it would have been natural for them to look for him in the audience when they played there or for them to inquire after the famous dramatist's health. If no actor had the opportunity to do so, Michael Drayton, a fellow Warwickshire native, and a member of that London playwright community should have (if he believed the Stratford man was the dramatist). Drayton often summered with the Rainsford family, two miles from Stratford (Jiménez, 2002). Though there is no direct link between Drayton and Shakespeare, they could easily have visited one another and shared the latest literary and theatrical news. When Drayton became ill, he was treated by Shakspeare's next-door neighbor and son-in-law, the physician John Hall.

Later, Hall made notations in his notebook about Drayton, noting his stature as a poet and dramatist. His published notebook contains no mention of a remarkable coincidence: both his father-in-law and Michael Drayton shared an uncommon London occupation.

Jiménez has found another Shakspeare link to London. The Stratford Corporation's solicitor and Town Clerk of Stratford for ten years was Londoner Thomas Greene. For many months, he, his wife and children actually lived in Shakspeare's New Place home. Greene's diary mentions Shakspeare once—in connection with the Welcombe land enclosure matter. He referred to Shakspeare as "my cosen Shakespeare." Greene was a friend of John Marston, still another of Shakespeare's London dramatist peers. They had gone to school together in the mid-1590s, making it curious that Greene never mentions his host's place among London's playwrights. Finally, there were people in London who had once known Shakspeare as a child and adolescent in Stratford. One was Richard Field, who became an apprentice to the London publisher Harrison. Eventually

he took over the business and published both Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* and *Rape of Lucrece*. Another former Stratfordian emigrant was Shakspeare's own brother, Gilbert, who became a London haberdasher. This explanation for the silence of his peers—that news of Shakspeare's death was long delayed in getting back to London's dramatist community—is implausible for these many reasons. Once his death became known to any one of his kin, literary, theatrical, business or legal associates, the high density of their network provided multiple channels through which that news could pass to the others, enabling them to organize some form of tribute. Their seven-year silence after learning of his death violated their own established practice, especially on the death of so prominent a member.

A second proposed explanation for this silence is that the Stratford Shakspeare was not eminent

enough to warrant tributes, i.e., he was a marginal figure in their dramatist community. That might have been true in the early 1590s but not after the two major poems were published or his works produced in his middle or latter years. He maintained a central place among his peers through twenty years. Furthermore, his plays were often performed at Court, at Greenwich, at both the Globe and Rose theaters in London, at regional theaters, at both universities, at Grays and Lincoln Inns, at the great noble houses, and possibly in northern Europe. Meres' ranking of Shakespeare's works in *Palladis Tamia* (1598), and a quarter-century later, Jonson's lavish appraisal in the *First Folio* also make this explanation implausible.

In a third explanation for the silence, Kathman (2002) proposes that his peers did

write tributes to Shakspeare (Shakespeare) after his death but those were circulated privately and all have been lost. It is unlikely that this hypothesis can ever be disproved (e.g., by some 21st-century manuscript discovery) or even tested. What makes it implausible is that tributes for several dramatists, especially the more prominent members of that community, have survived. The tributes for Jonson were so numerous that they were organized into a book. Why should tributes for the equally-prominent Shakspeare not have survived? Kathman's explanation remains possible, but is not plausible.

What would be a genuine explanation for his peers' silence? An obvious one is based

on network theory—if his dramatist peers did not write tributes for him, then they must have known that he was not a dramatist—*William Shakspeare was not*

*William Shakespeare*. They knew him as a part-time actor, a prosperous businessman, a major shareholder in a theatrical company and theaters. Not being a dramatist, it would have been absurd for them to write tributes for him. The authorship dispute would be resolved for all time if so much as a single tribute by one of his dramatist peers had survived. In his death, no one honored Shakspeare as a dramatist or the author of best-selling erotic poems.

This anomaly, the “silence of his peers,” is the single most serious threat to Stratfordianism and its first premise. There would be no Stratfordian anomaly, no threat to the orthodox position, if even one contemporary document were found.

This network analysis has established Shakespeare's central place in that small 16th- and 17th-century community of Lon-

***This anomaly, the “silence of his peers,” is the single most serious threat to Stratfordianism and to its first premise. There would be no Stratfordian anomaly, no threat to the orthodox position, if even one contemporary document were found.***

don dramatists. For nearly twenty years, he was near or at the center of a dense network of interpersonal relations, ensuring that all nineteen of his peers would have known Shakespeare's identity. According to network theory, if it was the dramatist who died in Stratford in 1616, his high level of centrality would have assured many tributes from his peers. The absence of tributes undermines what is already a modest and heavily-disputed evidentiary case for Shakespeare being Shakespeare. The absence of their tributes encourages non-Stratfordians to seek Shakespeare's identity elsewhere. Unless a new, well-documented and far more plausible explanation can be developed for this silence of his peers, the odds that the man from Stratford grew up to become the master poet-dramatist William Shakespeare have fallen to the level of the improbable.

### Appendix

Beyond who was included in the matrix of Shakespeare's literary and other social relationships, and what constituted a "link or relationship" is this question: which contested scholarly claim for a relationship should appear in this matrix and graph? Strikingly different matrices result from those contradictory claims. An *inclusive* principle would accept every Elizabethan scholar's claim to having found a link between any two of these 20 playwrights. Such claims could be based on many grounds: stylistic and metric considerations, allusions or other forms of internal or external evidence. In Shakespeare's case, Chapman has been reported to have written part of *Cymbeline*; Middleton, one third of *Timon of Athens*; Kyd to have coauthored part of *Titus Andronicus* and an early version of *Hamlet*; Peele is reported to have written part of *Titus*; while still others have proposed that Nashe wrote parts of *Henry VI, Part 1*.

Fletcher is reported to have collaborated with Shakespeare on *Two Noble Kinsmen*, *Pericles*, (the latter with Wilkins) and *Henry VIII*; and finally, Greene, Peele, Marlowe, Nashe, Chapman, Drayton, Kyd and Lodge have all been reported to have had a hand in the *Henry VI* plays (Baker, *Riverside Shakespeare*, 1997, p. 623). A matrix/graph based on this *inclusive* principle would be challenged on the grounds that some claims have not held up on further or close examination.

Were such a matrix produced (not shown) Shakespeare would be directly linked with at least 14 of his 19 peers—through claims of co-authorship alone. That would put Shakespeare at the very center of a dense network of social/literary relationships, but would make the silence of his peers on his death even more anomalous.

An alternative matrix could be constructed by following an *exclusive* principle—one which omits any claim of a relationship with Shakespeare (or any other writer) if Elizabethan scholars disagree among themselves. The *First Folio* is a good example of a document most take as supporting such a matrix. By this principle, the Fletcher-Shakespeare link for *Pericles*, *Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Henry VIII* would have to be omitted as there is scholarly dispute over each. More controversial would be the links connecting Chettle, Dekker, Heywood and Munday to Shakespeare for *Sir Thomas More*. (One incongruity about that set of linkages is that all those four dramatists worked for Henslowe, owner-producer of a competing theater company; never, so far as is known, did they work for the Lord Chamberlain's or King's Men companies). Since the joint authoring of *Sir Thomas More* remains controversial, the exclusive principle would remove all such links from the matrix. The most controversial relationships may be those associated with *Groats-worth of Wyt*. Some scholars contend that the ref-

erences to an “Upstart Crow “and other objectionable descriptions refer to Shakespeare, others believe they refer to Shakespeare, still others deny that either Shakespeare or Shakespeare was Greene/Chettle’s target. Given the controversy on those points, those links between dramatists too would be omitted. A matrix based on the exclusive principle would show Shakespeare as having no links to his peers—he solo-authored every play. Given Shakespeare’s stature among playwrights, at court, and with the public, the absence of any links whatsoever in what is otherwise a dense network of dramatists, is implausible, though not impossible. Most contemporary Shakespearean scholars would consider such a matrix to be an invalid depiction of London’s playwright community at the beginning of the 17th century. As in the sciences, there are no courts for adjudicating scholarly disputes; consequently the data depicted here is a compromise—somewhere between the *exclusive* and the *inclusive*.

Three controversial works were retained in this analysis: *The Two Noble Kinsmen*—most scholars believe it to be a Shakespeare/Fletcher collaboration; (2) the *Groats-worth* pamphlet—linking Greene to three of his playwright friends; and (3) *Sir Thomas More*, linking four Elizabethan playwrights—Chettle, Dekker, Heywood and Munday with William Shakespeare.



### 2011 Conference *Continued*

as a portrait of Shakespeare). The “official” position of the Folger is that the portrait is of Hugh Hammersley, but the docent admitted that there is a good case for it being the Earl of Oxford. There is also a very good portrait of Queen Elizabeth in the room, directly across from the Ashbourne. Is there any significance to this?

In the Board Room the Folger staff had assembled an excellent collection for us to

see. Of course, the Geneva Bible (1560) once owned by Edward de Vere was there and commanded the most attention, but seven other rare books and items connected with Oxford were also on display. Four of these were collections of poems including some by de Vere, *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589) by George Puttenham, *The Phoenix Nest* (1593), *The Paradise of Dainty Devises* (1596) by Richard Edwards, and *England’s Parnassus* (1600). There was also a copy of Francesco Guicciardini’s *La Historia d’Italia* (1565) which had belonged to de Vere and a 1584 manuscript detailing the sale of a manor and land by de Vere to Richard Bowser (containing de Vere’s seal and signature). Several more modern (from the 1930s to today) Oxfordian books owned by the Folger were also on hand. Two staff members of the Folger (the Head of Research and the Head of Reader Services) were there to answer questions.

The Conference resumed at 4:00 at the hotel for talks by Ron Halstead and Barb Burris.

### Ron Halstead

Ron Halstead’s “A Miracle! A Miracle!—Shapiro’s Defense of the Stratford Claim,” focused on the chapter in James Shapiro’s book which tries to relate the rise of Anti-stratfordianism to the emerging literary criticisms of the Bible in the late 1880s. Ron showed how Shapiro had misread these literary scholars and misrepresented how their search for the “historical Jesus “ fueled doubt over the authorship of Shakespeare. Hopefully, we can have more such talks or articles about other problems with the scholarship of James Shapiro in the future.

### Barb Burris

Barb Burris presented a wonderful talk on the Janssen and Cobbe “Shakespeare” portraits. She was able to make a good case for the provenance of these paintings, tracing them from de Vere’s family. Her conclusion

was that the Janssen (as Barrell reported in 1940) was originally a portrait of Edward de Vere which was over-painted to become “Shakespeare,” and that the Cobbe portrait was a later copy of this painting (this is exactly the opposite of what Stanley Wells of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust is claiming).

### **Saturday, October 15**

The morning began with the Annual Meeting of the Shakespeare Oxford Society. At this meeting, John Hamill and Robin Fox were elected to fill two vacancies on the Board of Trustees, previously held by James Sherwood and Susan Width. Discussion was held on how membership in the SOS could be expanded, especially with the release of the movie *Anonymous*. After the meeting ended, the Conference resumed with many great presentations.

### **Bonner Cutting**

First up was Bonner Cutting on “She Will Not Be A Mother” (title taken from a letter from William Cecil to his son Robert). The talk was in two parts. In the first, Bonner presented the evidence about whether or not Princess Elizabeth had a bastard child with Admiral Thomas Seymour in 1548. She concluded that was a good likelihood that it had happened. In the second part, Bonner considered some evidence pro and con about this child being sent to be brought up in the home of the 16th Earl of Oxford and then growing up to be the 17th Earl (and writer of the Shakespeare canon). In this part, Bonner concluded that this probably did not happen and that Elizabeth’s child (assuming that she had one) was more likely to have been fostered out to a family of squires, not the high nobility.

### **Panel Discussion**

A lively panel discussion (with Richard Whalen, Roger Stritmatter, Alan Green, Bonner Cutting, and Mark Anderson) on

*Anonymous* was next. No big revelations were forthcoming, but there was a very good give and take between the panelists and the audience. Overall, it was concluded that this movie will be huge for our movement.

### **Mark Anderson**

A nice Saturday buffet lunch was provided which the conference attendees ate in the meeting room while listening to the Keynote Address by Mark Anderson, “Prince Tudor—the Elephant in the Room.” Mark did not really want to discuss much evidence pro and con regarding the PT theory (although he did mention a few things). He preferred to offer what he thinks is an often overlooked facet of the PT theory, the assumption that Edward de Vere actually knew of the secret relationships he might have had with the Queen and with Southampton. Perhaps the allusions and themes we find in the plays and Sonnets which lead to a consideration of the PT theory are just de Vere exploring these questions whether or not he believed or knew about them.

### **Frank Davis**

The next talk, by Frank Davis, was an update on his (and Derran Charlton’s) efforts to find out more about the “pleasant conceit” by Oxford mentioned by Sir Francis Peck in Part I of his *Desiderata Curiosa* (1732). Peck said he was going to include it in Part II, but it never appeared. We don’t know what it was (a play—perhaps *Twelfth Night*? A poem?).

Frank detailed his efforts to trace this “conceit.” He has not found it, but feels that it is may very well be located in the monument room of Belvoir Castle. However, the owner (the current Duke of Rutland) will not allow anyone to see the document collections in this room.

### **Katherine Chiljan**

Next, Katherine Chiljan read from a chapter in her new book, *Shakespeare Suppressed*,

about the neglected poem *Willobie, His Av-isa*, the first literary work to mention the name Shakespeare (except for the two narrative poems dedicated to the Earl of Southampton). Katherine's conclusion (different than other Oxfordians who have written on this poem) is that it is a backlash at the Shakespeare poem *The Rape of Lucrece*, which was felt by the author of *Willobie* (likely Matthew Roydon) to reference a scandal involving Sir Walter Raleigh.

### **Albert Burgstahler**

After a break Albert Burgstahler presented "Verifying de Vere's Authorship." This was an updated version of a talk Albert gave at the 2008 Conference in White Plains, New York. He detailed three different forms of cryptographic evidence showing that de Vere was the author of the Shakespeare works.

### **Gerit Quealy**

Gerit Quealy and two of her fellow New York actors then talked about how knowing who the author of the works of Shakespeare was can have a positive impact on how an actor can approach a role and how the play can be presented. She illustrated this with several short scenes, performed by the actors, from *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Twelfth Night*, *Henry IV Part I*, and *Henry V*.

### **Richard Waugaman**

Next was Richard Waugaman on "An Oxfordian's Reflections on the Psychology of Orthodoxy," in which he detailed some of the ways Stratfordians relate to those who doubt the traditional authorship of the plays. These include *ad hominem* attacks, "group-think," "double-think," the defense mechanism of projection, and appeals to tradition.

### **Cheryl Eagan-Donovan**

The day ended with Cheryl Eagan-Donovan showing us some excerpts from her soon-to-

be-released documentary, *Nothing Truer than Truth*. Her presentation included a short discussion of sexuality in 16<sup>th</sup>-century Venice (helping to explain some allusions in the works of Shakespeare).

### **Ron Hess**

Sunday, October 16, the last day of the conference, began with Ron Hess on "Did Shakespeare Have a Literary Mentor?" The talk consisted of showing various literary works and dedications by Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, later to become Earl of Dorset. These were all works from the 1560s and 70s. It is obvious that some of these works influenced later works by Shakespeare. This has led some (for example Sabrina Feldman in her article in the 2010 *The Oxfordian*) to conclude that Thomas Sackville was Shakespeare). Ron thinks the evidence points instead to Sackville being a "literary mentor" to Oxford in his early years.

### **Thomas Regnier**

Thomas Regnier then gave another in his series of talks explaining the actual early English law behind a lot of what we Oxfordians are saying. In this case he spoke about the Law of Succession in an effort to clarify some issues surrounding the various PT theories. The main point was to correct the misconception (mentioned by Paul Altrochi, Paul Streitz, and Charles Beaucerk in their books as well as other writers on PT) that the 1571 Treason Act changed some provisions of earlier Acts of Succession by changing the phrase (as applied to Elizabeth) of "lawful issue of her body" to "natural issue" and thereby made it possible for a royal bastard to succeed her. Tom pointed out that this was not the case. This act only had to do with what kinds of statements about the succession would be considered treasonous. The considerations for succession in the prior acts were not changed by this.

### Richard Whalen

After a break Richard Whalen gave his presentation (an expanded version of one he gave at a conference in 1994) that there is evidence (although a bit speculative) that some people had already begun thinking of Edward de Vere as the true Shakespeare before Looney's book in 1920. He mentioned the 1769 song "Sweet Willy-O," an 1827 novel titled *De Vere, or The Man of Independence*, and the listing in an inventory of a portrait of Oxford in 1696 that seems to have become a portrait of "Shakespeare" in the 1782 revision of the inventory. Richard also pointed out early illustrations of Shakespeare (for editions of the plays) showing him as an aristocrat.

### Peter Dickson

The next presentation was Peter Dickson going through portions of the evidence he has gathered in his new book to show that there was a campaign of "vengeful deception" in the effort to cover up the identity of de Vere as Shakespeare and give it to the man from Stratford. This was done, according to Peter, by the Howard family in combination with other royalists, particularly with the publication of the Second Folio in 1632.

### Annual Awards Banquet.

At the banquet which followed, a Special Award was given to Roger Stritmatter in view of his many contributions to the Oxfordian cause for more than 10 years. *The Oxfordian of the Year Award* was given to Kevin Gilvary for his work on the dating project of the De Vere Society and the publication of the *Dating Shakespeare's Plays*.

### Kevin Gilvary

Kevin then gave the luncheon talk, on "Bibles, Histories, Shakespeare—The Rise of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Publications During the Tudor Period." Kevin spoke about some of the early bible transla-

tions and how the authors were forced into exile or worse, leading later bible translations to come out without any mention of who the actual translators were (this includes the Geneva Bible and the King James Bible). In the case of Histories written during this time, similar problems occurred for the author (like being forced into exile). Kevin presented some evidence that the histories of Hall and Holinshed, both used extensively by Shakespeare, were actually written under pseudonyms, with William Cecil being the real author (or at least strongly influencing them). This background can help explain why the works of Shakespeare were at first published anonymously and then under a pseudonym after 1598 (when William Cecil died).

### Adjournment

The Conference then adjourned. Attendees agreed that it had been a very interesting and full time.

Next year's Conference is expected to be in Carmel, California, in September. Further details will be provided as they become available. Hopefully, with the release of *Anonymous* and the help of all of us, next year's Conference will be even better!

**PROVING SHAKESPEARE:  
THE LOOMING IDENTITY CRISIS**

By  
**David L Roper**

Orvid Editions  
ISBN 978-0-557-01261-9

'For the first time Scientific Methodology, backed by Historical Report, and amply aided by Contemporaneous References, unite together to support Ben Jonson's and Thomas Thorpe's identification of Edward de Vere as the true author of Shakespeare's literary work.'

H/b with illustrations, 534 pp (6" x 9")  
Available only from Barnes & Noble and Amazon \$49.94

## Concordia Report

The 15th Annual Shakespeare Authorship Studies Conference convened at 6 PM on Tuesday, September 6, 2011 at Concordia University in Portland, Oregon.

### Sally Mosher

Sally Mosher began the evening with her talk, “Politics, Symbolism, Finance: The Role of Jewels in the Age of Shakespeare”. It was a very nice talk with lots of good pictures of jewels and the famous (and not so famous) people who wore them. Sally pointed out how important jewels were in the 16th century, how they had a role in finance (such as serving as collateral for loans), and social commentary. The kind of jewels you wore denoted your social status and served symbolic roles as well (signifying such things as power, authority, magnanimity, friendship, nobility of mind, chastity, wisdom, etc). Elizabeth both gave and received jewels as presents. Certain jewels and colors had special meanings. This kind of information is certainly useful to further understand the cultural and political surroundings of the works of Shakespeare.

### Bonner Cutting

The next talk was Bonner Cutting on “Shakespeare’s Will Considered Too Closely.” This was an updated and improved version of a talk Bonner has given in the past and has published in *Brief Chronicles* as well as newsletters. She basically shows

that the will of William Shakespeare (or maybe that should be Shaksper?) of Stratford just cannot be that of a literary man (or even one with any kind of “culture” whatsoever). Bonner points out that not only are no books or literary things mentioned in the will, but neither are there any bequests for public improvements or education (like in other wills of the time from people in the same kind of town and situation). The Religious Preamble is basically copied from a “formula” book (a writer should have been able to write his own or at least embellish a “formulary one”). Bonner also spoke about

the “second best bed” bequest and about the problem that the first page of the will was revised (when was this done?). Bonner intimates that she will be collecting all of this information (and more) in a forthcoming book.

### Alan Nelson

The last “talk” of the evening was by Alan Nelson, “William Shakespeare of Stratford-Upon-Avon: Thoughts of an Old-Tyme Scholar.” I say “talk” because it was really more of a collection of short topics. By “Old-Tyme Scholar” Professor Nelson means an established academic (who’s the snob here?). He pointed out that Anti-Stratfordians have really not made such a big dent in the world of scholarship, but that the upcoming movie might have some kind of effect. He then talked about how there has been much progress in indexing the Patent Rolls of the Elizabethan reign and that this might prove to be a good source of new documents and new research. Who knows what might turn up? He next talked about a “discovery” (it



was actually known about before and then forgotten) that he and his friend made: a copy of the Token Book for the parish in London where most of the theaters were. Without going into much detail here, I can say that a Token Book was kind of like a census. This particular Token Book mentions Edmund Shakespeare (Will's brother) and indicates that he was a "player." Alan takes this to show that the Shakespeare family were in fact theatrical. The next part of the talk was about how Stratford *did* have books and libraries and a good school. This is fine of course but did William ever look at any of the books? Perhaps.

The final part of the talk was about how Lady Anne Clifford had a large library, but seemingly no books by Shakespeare. Alan says this shows that Shakespeare had "fallen out of favor" in the mid 17th century (1630s and 40s) and Jonson was more popular.

### **Anonymous**

Wednesday, September 7, 2011 the movie *Anonymous* had its World Premiere! (Actually the "official" premiere was the following Sunday at the Toronto Film Festival). The movie was shown to about 200 conference attendees and others connected to Concordia University.

The audience assembled at 11 AM at the Portland Art Museum for a hosted luncheon (sandwiches, chips, and salad) in a beautiful ballroom (I think the building used to be a Masonic Hall and it is very well decorated [even for an art museum]).

Then at 12 we all went over to the museum auditorium where they show films (as part of an ongoing film festival). We had an introduction of Roland Emmerich by Professor Daniel Wright and a few quick remarks by Emmerich about how he was very happy with the movie and how he thinks that this story has to be told.

Then...the movie began!

I won't go into much detail here since there will certainly be reviews and other

writing about this movie in the near future. I will say that I thought the movie was quite fantastic. The acting and cinematography are among the best I've seen.

As we had been led to believe from prior rumors and the movie trailer (some of what is in the trailer is not actually in the movie though), the story does concentrate heavily on the Essex Rebellion and the idea that the Earl of Southampton is the bastard son of Elizabeth and Edward de Vere. There is also the idea that de Vere himself was a son of Elizabeth, but it is not given any real prominence. It is almost a throwaway point near the end of the movie. The characterizations of Edward de Vere as a man with a "tortured soul" and William Shakespeare as an almost incompetent illiterate actor without much of a conscience are first-rate.

After the movie was over there was a panel discussion with Roland Emmerich, Prof. Daniel Wright, Hank Whitemore, and Prof. Joel Davis of the History Department at Concordia.

Of course, Emmerich's remarks were the most interesting. He admitted that he was drawn to make this movie because he knew it would make a great story. Only later did he realize that he was stepping into a "hot bed" of controversy among Oxfordians, not to mention the "orthodox" academics. He knows that he was playing with history, but defended it in much the same way Shakespeare would have defended his own use of history: We can only offer our own interpretation of history in order to tell the story that we want to tell. In his words, "Life is messy. Film is more organized."

Emmerich admits that he didn't know much about the Authorship Controversy when he began working on the movie, but he has since been "converted" to Oxfordianism (to use the religious language that has sprung up around this issue). Some of the actors in the movie (such as Rhys Ifans and Vanessa Redgrave) also admitted to

Emmerich that they were now very interested in the question, while other actors “just didn’t care.” Of course, the movie does have Derek Jacobi and Mark Rylance, both already confirmed “antistratfordians.”

The day finished with a nice reception with cocktails and “heavy *hors d’oeuvres*.” A brief award ceremony was held to bestow the Annual Award for Scholarly Excellence posthumously on Richard Roe, author of the forthcoming book, *Shakespeare’s Guide to Italy*. Awards for Artistic Excellence went to Sally Mosher and to Roland Emmerich.

### Michael Egan

Michael Egan began Thursday, September 8, 2011 with his presentation, “The Essex Rebellion and *Richard II*: Why wasn’t Shakespeare Arrested?” Michael noted that the consensus among scholars is that on the eve of his planned rebellion in February 1601 the Earl of Essex commissioned the Lord Chamberlain’s Men to put on a performance of *Richard II* to harden his co-conspirators’ resolution and stir support for an uprising among the population. Yet when the rebellion failed and Essex, Southampton and the others were arrested, members of the Chamberlain’s Men were not detained and only Augustine Phillips was questioned.

Michael reviewed the evidence presented at the trial and proposed the original conclusion that no play had actually been performed. The whole story was an “evidentiary fraud,” a fabrication by the prosecution to strengthen its claim that the Queen’s life had been in danger.

Shakespeare and his fellows were never arrested because they had actually done nothing. Indeed, they were rewarded for their false testimony by a command performance before the Queen herself the evening Essex was beheaded.

### Panel Discussions

There was then a panel discussion with Roger Stritmatter, Lynne Kositsky, Bill

Boyle, William Ray, Bonner Cutting, and Earl Showerman regarding recent responses by the academic establishment about the Shakespeare Authorship Question and how our movement might counter them or come up with new ways to engage them. Many interesting anecdotes were discussed. No major decisions on what to do next were forthcoming, however.

After a lunch break at 1 PM, the entire afternoon (2:30 PM to 5:00 PM) was devoted to a panel discussion with Daniel Wright, Bill Boyle, Hank Whittemore, and Michael Dunn on the “Politics Behind the Authorship Question” Bill Boyle provided a nice PowerPoint presentation detailing all the “facts” we know about the Earl of Southampton, Oxford, Essex, etc., which point to the PT theory. The panelists all then made comments on these and also addressed the points which have been made by other Oxfordians in the past as to why the PT theory is not tenable. All in all a good, but perhaps biased, discussion of this idea of the politics behind the creation of the Shakespeare works and the reason why Oxford’s authorship had to remain hidden. Of course, the new movie *Anonymous* is in line with all of this.

### Sylvia Holmes

Friday, September 8, 2011, the last day of the Conference, began with Sylvia Holmes on “Othello and Desdemona’s Secret Meeting Place in Venice.” Sylvia, who was responsible for some of the photographs used in Richard Roe’s new book on Shakespeare and Italy, sought to identify the “Sagittary” which Iago says (in the first scene of the play) is where they will be able to find Othello. She finally concluded that it refers to the great clock tower in St. Mark’s Square right next to the Doge’s Palace. This clock has astrological symbols on it and of course Sagittarius is one of them. This location is an alternative to the one discussed in Richard Roe’s book, but argues equally well that

the author of the play *had* to have been in Venice.

### Earl Showerman

Earl Showerman then presented “Shakespeare and Venice: A Review of Recent Literature.” He talked about many recently published books from traditional scholars on the topic of Shakespeare’s use of Italy, and Venice in particular, and contrasted them with some older works. It seems that, while older books (and also books by scholars not in English Departments) mention freely how well Shakespeare knew Venice and how it seems he must have been there, the newer books try to paint Venice in Shakespeare as a more imaginary place, an idealized world which is supposed to be contrasted with London, and posit a general migration of Italian cultural ideas into London society. Of course this is quite nonsensical. Earl thinks that this kind of thing is a reaction to the increasing scholarship of Oxfordians and others in showing just how well Shakespeare did know intimate details of Venice and Italy and how that is proving to be a kind of embarrassment for the Stratfordian argument.

### Roger Stritmatter

Roger Stritmatter then read some excerpts from the new book he is working on (no word on when it will be forthcoming). The section he read was in regards to the famous list by Frances Meres in his 1598 *Palladis Tamia* where the name Shakespeare is linked to a list of plays. Another part of this book contains a long list of comparisons Meres makes between classical writers and “modern” English writers of his time. Stratfordians are quick to point out that this list contains both the names “Edward de Vere” and “Shakespeare,” apparently showing that Meres knew they were different people. However, Roger, drawing on the recent paper (in *Brief Chronicles* 1999) by KC Ligon and Robert Detobel on *Palladis Tamia*,

showed that in fact Meres was purposely constructing his list along precise mathematical and symbolic considerations and that he was actually subtly linking the name of Shakespeare to that of de Vere.

### Bill Boyle

After lunch, we heard Bill Boyle on “Unveiling the Sonnets” which was basically a combination of some presentations he has made in the past. Much of it was directly from Bill’s article in the Festschrift published by the SARC (Shakespeare Authorship Research Center) in 2009. This talk again went through some of the evidence leading to the PT theory and related issues, nicely portrayed in the new movie *Anonymous*.

### Hank Whittemore

Hank Whittemore followed with his talk, “The Road to the Monument of the Sonnets and the Clearly-Marked Signposts Along the Way.” Actually, Hank did not talk very much about his own work, *The Monument*, but used the time to go through the argument made by Katherine Chiljan in her new book *Shakespeare Suppressed* in which Katherine, apparently independently (she says she never read *The Monument*), comes to pretty much the same conclusions as Hank and others (including *Anonymous*) have come to, that Oxford had to agree to “bury his name” as part of a deal to save Southampton’s life (Southampton of course being his son and a possible heir to the crown).

### Sam Saunders

*Richard Smiley writes:* The afternoon session by Professor Sam Saunders was titled “The Elevation of Gulliam; the Gullible, the Guileless, and the Guilty.” In this paper Professor Saunders reviewed the publication history of Shakespeare’s work in order to answer the question “how did Shakespeare become Shakespeare?” Professor Saunders reviewed the publication history of Shake-

Shakespeare's work beginning with Nicholas Rowe, Alexander Pope, Lewis Theobald, and finally Dr. Samuel Johnson. Following these publications David Garrick held the Shakespeare Jubilee in 1769. Playing Richard III, Garrick noticed how wildly enthusiastic was the audience and he discerned the potential for earning money by staging old Shakespeare plays. Professor Sanders concluded that this was the catapult point from which Shakespeare's fame and reputation soared. In Professor Saunders view, Dr. Johnson was the guileless, Garrick the guilty, and us (meaning the audience) the gullible.

### Daniel Wright

The final session of the day was by Professor Daniel Wright assisted by Professor Alan Nelson. Their talk was about Manuscript 294, a paper allegedly presented to the Ipswich Philosophical Society in 1805. Titled "Some Reflections on the Life of Shakespeare," the paper was found in the library of Baconian Edwin Durning-Lawrence in 1930. Dr. John Rollett, a resident of Ipswich, reviewed the paper and was puzzled by some anomalies, specifically he could find no record of any Ipswich Philosophic Society, or any reference to James Cowell, the putative author of the manuscript. Also it was noted that the paper showed a preoccupation with Francis Bacon and was part of a collection of Baconian literature. Two additional experts, Peter Beal and Janet Eng Freeman, were called in to review of the manuscript, but the experts involved could reach no definitive conclusion regarding whether the manuscript was a forgery or not. Although this discovery has been mentioned previously in Oxfordian periodicals, Professor James Shapiro in his recent book, *Contested Will*, declares the manuscript to be a forgery! But credit for the discovery is buried at the end of *Contested Will* and Stratfordians reading the book will assume that Professor Shapiro made the

discovery. Additionally, it remains a mystery how Professor Shapiro reached the conclusion that the manuscript was a forgery when four other experts were unable to make such a determination. Finally, Professor Wright speculated that if the manuscript is a forgery, it was created to regain the limelight for Bacon whose candidacy for the authorship of the Canon was eclipsed by Oxford as a result of the seminal work of J. Thomas Looney published in 1920.

### Michael Dunn

*Richard Joyrich writes:* The conference ended with Michael Dunn's new one-man play "Sherlock Holmes and the Secret Sonneteer—Cracking the Shakespeare Code." I cannot report on this since I was absent (and Richard Smiley did not provide me with a report either). Michael planned to perform this play again during the Washington Conference, but was unable to attend, so again I was denied the opportunity to comment on it.

All in all, this Conference in Concordia was one of the more enjoyable ones (even though it came at a different time of the year than usual). This was, of course, primarily due to the opportunity of being among the first people to view the movie *Anonymous*, but the quality of the presentations at the Conference was also first-rate.

The 16th Annual Conference is currently scheduled for a "more usual" time of the year (April 12-15, 2012). It should be exciting as well.

Season's  
Greetings  
To All  
Our Readers