



The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter



Volume 49: No. 1

Published by the Shakespeare Oxford Society

Winter 2013

Membership Renewal 2013
See page 24

Time to Catch our Breath

In This Issue

From the Editor Time to Catch our Breath	1
Letters to the Editor <i>Greg Ellis</i> <i>Carole Sue Lipman</i>	3 5
John Hamill Shakespeare's Bisex- uality vs. the Prince Tudor Theory	7
Richard M. Waugaman A New 1569 Poem by Arthur Golding, Attributed to Edward de Vere	9
Michael Egan <i>Shakespeare's</i> <i>Education</i> by Robin Fox	11
John Hamill President's Message	13
Lamberto Tassinari A Comparison of Shakespeare's and Florio's Wills	14
Stephanie Hopkins Hughes The Big Six Candidates for Shakespeare's Crown	18
Richard Joyrich Eighth Annual Conference Report	19

For the past several months this journal has given space to all sides of the so-called "Prince Tudor" debate. Prominent advocates for the parties will, after this issue, have had their say in full. We believe it may be time for everyone to pause and take breath.

Our reasons are pragmatic and philosophical. First, the Oxfordian movement is entering a critical phase in the far larger matter of the Shakespeare Authorship Question. Last year, thanks in part to the interest generated by Roland Emmerich's movie *Anonymous*, but also in the face of a series of well-researched and highly regarded books, articles, documentaries, web sites, discussion groups, listservs and talks, the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust generated a website, "60 Minutes with Shakespeare." It strongly restated the case for the traditional position. Prominent academics, actors and other notables, including Prince Charles, poured scorn and defiance on a notion that has been around since at least 1592, when *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* complained that an upstart crow was borrowing the feathers of other playwrights. In response to the SBT, the Shakespeare Authorship Coalition, sponsors of the Declaration of Reasonable Doubt, created its own website answering "60 Minutes with Shakespeare" point by point (and more).*

SBT Book

Now we learn that Cambridge University Press is about to publish what appears to be a book version of "60 Minutes with Shakespeare." It pretty much stars the same commentators on the same topics, but at greater length and of course with all the authority of print and the great university itself. This is *Arguing From Authority with a vengeance*, that old logical fallacy, and its manifest intent is to silence the opposition. It won't work. The SAC is planning a counter statement of its own in reply—the details remain undisclosed, but history and John Shahan, president of the SAC, assure us it will be vigorous.

But in view of the coming public battle, which will unquestionably hit the literary and academic headlines, Oxfordians need to close ranks too. The various divisions represented by the strongly held feelings concerning de Vere's undocumented biography—that he was in reality Queen Elizabeth's bastard son, that they had an

* https://doubtaboutwill.org/pdfs/sbt_rebuttal.pdf

incestuous relationship and together sired another illegitimate prince, Henry Wriothesley, and that finally, in an appropriately fifth-act twist, de Vere enjoyed an incestuous homosexual relationship with his own child—are damaging in the extreme and will only be exploited by the silencers.

Philosophically too, the Prince Tudor thesis may well be barking up the wrong family tree. The multiple-homosexual-incest scenario seems not only *prima facie* unlikely but—the nub of the matter—there is simply no direct evidence for it. This means there are no documents, anecdotes, reports of court gossip, letters, memoirs, lines in plays or poems even hinting at such scandalous goings-on at the highest levels of government. While the absence of evidence, as Carl Sagan remarked, is not evidence of absence, in this case the silence screams. The queen of course lived her life under a spotlight. There were immediate rumors of even the slightest of her personal scandals, such as the convenient death of her lover Leicester's wife, and other tales of her many *affaires de coeur*. The idea that Queen Elizabeth I was really Shakespeare's mother seems fantastic enough, but that they later had a child together whom Shakespeare seduced and then wrote about in sugar'd sonnets circulated at court, is a story that frankly strains credulity beyond its breaking point.

Evidence

The indirect evidence is equally forced, a consequence of the vacuum surrounding Shakespeare's official biography and the practice, on both the Stratfordian and non-Stratfordian sides, of inferring a life from the texts. Shapiro's attack on the practice in *Contested Will* is paradoxically both right and wrong. It's right in the sense that one has to be extremely careful, but absurdly wrong when arguing that the practice should be banned in the case of Shakespeare. That's just a debating stance: Shapiro of course does it himself in *1599*. Besides, psychological and socio-historical criticism, deriving from the work of Freud and Marx, are now well established and respected approaches to literary analysis. They have repeatedly thrown light on the work of even the most concealed and emotionally complex writers, Emily Dickinson, Henry James and E.M. Forster among them. There is neither reason nor justification to except the author of the *Complete Works*.

The Prince Tudor hypothesis takes the view that the *Sonnets* are more political than personal and concerned obsessively with the Succession Issue. Shakespeare was indeed a highly political writer, yet these great poems, cast in such an intimate format, little songs, seem undeniably personal. They speak uniquely in their author's voice and describe his inner life with searing honesty, from lust to love to heartbreak. The idea that most of them are not about deep passion, jealousy, the author's manifest bisexuality and related musings on Time itself is, in my view, simply insupportable. This is not of course an unconventional position—most readers agree.

Anything is possible, that's true, and much remains unknown about Shakespeare's lives. But at this stage it seems politic to take one's stand on what is probable rather than improbable and what is supported by the evidence rather than what is not.

Michael Egan

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
www.shakespeare-oxford.com

Editor

Michael Egan
drmichaelegan@yahoo.com

Publications Committee

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

Printer

Eagle Graphics, Inc
cbenger@eaglegraphicsprinters.com

Contributors

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.

Copyright

Shakespeare Oxford Society
501(c)(3) non-profit, educational
organization © 2013

Letters to the Editor

Rush to Judgment

Dear Editor:

I've come to the conclusion that the only thing wrong with PT2 is PT1! Everyone who reads this is going to be someone who recognizes the way in which the Stratfordian myth has forced its adherents into evermore contorted interpretations and absurd inventions to allow them to support the creaking paradigm which frames their reality. Like medieval and early Renaissance astronomers trying vainly to stack ever more planetary epicycles onto their Ptolemaic models, Stratfordians pile increasingly intricate and elaborate claims onto the Stratford myth in desperate and vain attempts to keep it rotating. We who have seen through the Stratford fiction find it amazing just how it is that otherwise intelligent people can be so deeply convinced by such comical falsehood in the face of the growing mountain of contrary information.

In general, it is probably reasonable to say that it takes a long time for there to be a shift in major paradigms, though there is clearly a relationship at work between the length which a paradigm holds sway and the degree to which sufficient information can be brought to bear in ways which loosen a paradigm's grip on the collective imagination, and undoes public consensus.

The Stratford paradigm is a good case study. Established for more than 300 years, when it began to creak under the weight of new information, the new scientists challenging the orthodoxy of this subject were treated as insane, stupid, immoral, or a combination of the three. Powerful new works revealing the absurdity of the paradigm (Looney, Ward, Clark, Ogburns) were ignored and abused and went into obscurity. Indeed, it has probably really only been since the emergence of the internet that there is now clearly enough focused weight of information for the Stratford paradigm to finally come crashing down within the foreseeable future. Without the internet, I would have despaired at how many generations of new masterworks by the likes of Looney, Ogburns Sr. and Jr.), Fowler, Price, Stritmatter, Anderson and Roe, it

would have taken just to defeat the basic premise of the Stratfordian matrix and establish Oxford as the leading candidate. The internet makes me confident! If only Looney and the rest of the older generation of Oxfordians could have been here to see it.

But if Stratfordians are soon to be swept aside by the 21st century version of Copernicus's *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*, we need to avoid being too smug, especially those of us who wish to move the debate expeditiously into Prince Tudor territory. While we can be certain that the sun (Oxford) is the centre of this solar system, as Thomas Kuhn was at pains to point out when he wrote *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* in 1962, paradigms *shape all of our thought*. Old creaking paradigms might be easy to see if they are at the end of their life but we need to be alert to the way in which they guide all our thinking.

To my mind, after Thomas Looney's discovery of Oxford in 1920, the most important realization in overturning the Stratfordian paradigm has been that made by Paul Streitz in 2001 that Oxford was Queen Elizabeth's son. For reasons too innumerable to go into here, but known by every adherent of PT2, the realization that Oxford was the illegitimate son of Elizabeth does everything that is needed to explain the remarkably indulged and protective treatment he received throughout his life. *Hamlet*, as Streitz says, is autobiography, and once you realize that, everything else falls into place.

The problem as I now see it—with the greatest respect to the memory of those courageous and unstinting champions of Oxford, Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn Sr.—is that their 1952 master work *This Star of England* established a paradigm, which is increasingly looking like it has led a great deal of (often valiant) Oxfordian scholarship astray. Despite the decision of their ferociously determined son, Charlton Jr, to suppress it in his works, their thesis that Oxford and Elizabeth were lovers in the early 1570s leading to the birth of Henry Wriothesley, later 3rd Earl of Southampton—the PT1 thesis—eventually came to the fore amongst the heresy and established the paradigm for Oxford's charmed relationship with Elizabeth before Streitz's thesis gained hold. Even Streitz himself has held to PT1 even while supplementing it with a better explanation! And like everyone else this has led him into contortions, for

example, his anachronistic contention that the morality of the Elizabethan court can be compared to that of the Julio-Claudian emperors of Rome!

I believe we should stick to the Streitziann innovations of PT2 and jettison PT1. Here is what I believe.

1. Oxford was Elizabeth's son. Unlike Streitziann, I prefer Mike Adair's thesis in *Four Essays on the Shakespeare Authorship Question*, pp. 86-91, that Oxford's father was John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford (Adair pp.86-91). Although there is much to recommend Streitziann's view that it was Seymour, Adair argues persuasively that John de Vere is far more convincing than Thomas Seymour as a role model for *Hamlet's* ghost; John de Vere as his father fits with the philosophical "vere-ness" of Shakespeare's plays; it provides a cogent reason for the strange events surrounding the 16th Earl's fate; and, finally, the possibility that Cecil

opportunistically used Elizabeth's pregnancy to blacken his enemy Seymour, knowing it to be false, is delicious. But for present purposes, this is like Kepler's discovery that the planetary orbits are elliptical—the important thing is to first accept the paradigm shift that Oxford is Elizabeth's son.

While some court gossips regarded the interplay between Elizabeth and the young Earl as flirtatious I believe this is proof of nothing other than that the Queen was being affectionate to her first born, and brilliant son. That Cecil didn't quash this courtly "love talk" makes sense because he was no doubt pleased that such gossip served to hide the true relationship, the fact of her non-virginity and his illegitimate birth.

2. Henry Wriothesley is Oxford's son. However, contrary PT1, my view is that the mother is surely none other than Mary Wriothesley (née Browne), wife of the 2nd earl of Southampton!

PT1 would have it that Henry Wriothesley had to be the son of the Queen because of the royal way the *Sonnets* regard him. But it needs to be remembered that it is his father, Oxford—a man who regarded his own illegitimate birth as

no barrier to eventually becoming Edward VII on the death of Elizabeth—who is writing the *Sonnets*. Of course he regarded his son as legitimately royal as much as he regarded his own claim. It is difficult to see why references in the *Sonnets* to "double majesty" need necessarily mean other than that he considered both himself and his son to be of the royal line.

All of the mystery around the second earl of Southampton's death and the Countess's apparent indifference to the child is perfectly understandable if the countess was his mother. She had had an affair with the Queen's son, she was a Catholic—or at least had been married to one—and there could be no suggestion that the possible future king could be the son of a Catholic! Walking away from the "changeling boy"—and the word "changeling" is hardly proof that Eliza-

beth is the mother—the Countess was doing what she needed to keep her life. Incidentally, it is curious in this regard that there

don't appear to be any portraits of the second earl of Southampton. Perhaps this is just a gap in the internet, but if this represents the true situation, the lack of a portrait, when there are so many of the 1st, 3rd and 4th earls suggests a deliberate policy to rub out the fact that he and his heir don't look alike. Henry certainly looks nothing like the first earl, his purported grandfather. While obviously not conclusive, it is interesting to use the internet to compare the portraits of Oxford, the 2nd Countess, and then Henry Wriothesley, to see what appear to be remarkable likenesses.

As someone of Elizabeth's royal line, through Oxford, Southampton would still have been a potential rallying point for the anti-Cecil/Stuart forces. At the same time though, his claim being once removed could also partly explain why Essex was the Queen's favorite above Southampton, and the leader of the anti-Stuart forces, precisely because Essex was surely the queen's son fathered by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester; a fact no doubt widely known or suspected within inner circles. (I'd claim this point as mine but Streitziann beat me to it by more than a decade.)

Henry certainly looks nothing like the first earl, his purported grandfather. While obviously not conclusive, it is interesting to use the internet to compare the portraits of Oxford, the 2nd Countess, and then Henry Wriothesley, to see what appear to be remarkable likenesses.

Key to the PT1 argument is a very heavy reliance on an interpretation of Sonnet 33, which has it that after only an hour of life the “region cloude” had effectively whisked the new born Southampton from his father Oxford. While this can be read to be suggestive of Elizabeth being the mother of Southampton, there is no need for this. Given what we now understand about the paranoid Elizabethan state it would seem equally plausible, if not more so, that any future heir—and a grandson is a potential future heir—might be taken into “protective custody,” especially if the father is a bit reckless in his behaviors, as no one disputes Oxford was. de Vere’s dedication to him in the long poems is thus of a first-born son who should in his view follow him (Oxford) in the royal line.

Finally, I would make the point that PT1’s starting premise in interpreting many of the Sonnets is that they are love poems between Elizabeth and Oxford. Shackled with this, the interpretation requires that Oxford retained a lover’s passion for the most part of 30 years. Yet at no stage in these three decades does the queen appear to treat Southampton as her son. Yes, he was spared the fate of Essex, but he was not loved. In my view, this remote, and often savage grandmother spared this rash boy as a favor to her wayward and beloved first son, her brilliant illegitimate child, Oxford, and in recognition of Southampton’s royal blood through Oxford but not because he (Southampton) is her son.

I have to concede in the end that, of course, it is *possible* that Oxford and his mother had sex and that this led to the birth of Henry Wriothesley; and I acknowledge that some authors I greatly admire in this debate, including Streitzius himself, do, after all, hold this view. Yet I would still want to argue that even if this were the case, the precedence of the paradigms affects the way we interpret the texts. Unless we want to endorse the assumption that Elizabeth had no idea who she was sleeping with, or was unperturbed by sleeping with her son, the incestuous union should not in my view be passed off as just something that the Elizabethan’s accepted as a duty, or that it reflected the fact that they shared the same morality as Roman emperors—this was a society in the grip of proto-Puritanism, after all. Charles Beauclerk in *Shakespeare’s Lost Kingdom* has come closest to providing a coherent narrative for how the incest may have occurred but key to the realism of his portrait is

that first and foremost Oxford is Elizabeth’s son, not the father of their child. The difference matters.

Greg Ellis
Canberra, Australia

Barbara Crowley, 1924-2012

The Shakespeare Authorship Roundtable will long remember Barbara Crowley as one of our most thoughtful and devoted Oxfordians. Many of us over the years did not realize that there would simply have been no Roundtable without her!

More than 25 years ago Barbara was part of our first authorship seminar in 1984, which was



Barbara Crowley
March 19, 1924—August 13, 2012

inspired by my interest to make a documentary film involving Charles Champlin, then Arts Critic of the *LA Times*, Ruth and M.D. Miller, Richard and Jane Roe, and Barbara and John Crowley among others. We all met for six sessions where Shakespeare was put on trial, so to speak. Each session was devoted to a differ-

ent candidate who was presented by an expert, then cross-examined by an attorney.

At the end of those sessions, the group continued to meet and discuss the question at the homes of either the Roes or the Crowleys. The following year, I thought I had enough research to go off and make my documentary, but Barbara had other ideas. She suggested we form an official educational organization. As a corporate attorney she would file the 501(c)3 papers, which she actually did! She then told me I should be in charge and keep organizing meetings and sending mailings. I made every effort to protest and get out of it. However, she insisted and the rest is our history.

I had no idea until years later what a great gift Barbara had given me. The Roundtable took us to many places and brought us many extraordinary people, so I am forever grateful to her for making my life a better one; but most of all, for insisting on that 501(c)3, so others could benefit as well.

Over the years, she never stopped coming up with new ideas and new people to support the Roundtable. We attended most of the authorship conferences over the years, and she was always behind the scenes encouraging others in her optimistic and quiet ways. She was particularly pleased when Mark Rylance told us that he modeled The Shakespeare Authorship Trust in London after our eclectic and open-minded Roundtable. And like John Shahan's Shakespeare Coalition, she wanted to get the question accepted everywhere.

Barbara's father was an author and social scientist, S. Colum Gilfillan, and was himself a long-time Oxfordian and head of one of the early Oxfordian societies. She loved to tell the story about how he wanted her to read Dorothy Ogburn's book, but like a lot of young people then and now, she didn't want listen to the older generation. Barbara confessed at first she had no interest. However, some years later when she actually sat down and read that early Ogburn book, she had to admit that she thought her father was absolutely right! Fortunately, he lived long enough so they could share their special interest.

However, some years later when she actually sat down and read that early Ogburn book, she had to admit that she thought her father was absolutely right! Fortunately, he lived long enough so they could share their special interest.

Barbara was raised in Hyde Park, Chicago and attended U. High (University of Chicago Laboratory Schools), also earning her BA in Psychology at the University of Chicago in 1944, where she met and married John Crowley. John and Barbara maintained a partnership throughout their marriage, and Barbara played the part of First Lady of Pasadena when John was mayor for two years. She believed her biggest accomplishment in life was her six children. A loving mother, she respected their differences

and encouraged them to pursue their own interests. As they grew up, she began her second career as an attorney. She

attended Loyola Law School, where she was one of the few women in her class. Barbara's sense of civic responsibility motivated her to be an active participant in her local community. She generously gave her time and energy to many organizations including the Pasadena PTA, Descanso Gardens Guild, Women at Work, League of Women Voters, University of Chicago Alumni and Los Angeles Beautiful, to name a few. But her primary interest lay in the Shakespeare authorship question. Thrilled by this real-life mystery, she studied and championed it throughout her life. More recently, she and John were able to sponsor the new Conference Room at the Shakespeare Authorship Reading Center at Concordia University in Portland, Oregon.

There are so many of us who will miss her and treasure our memories.

Carole Sue Lipman
President
Shakespeare Authorship Roundtable



Shakespeare's Bisexuality vs. the Prince Tudor Theory

John Hamill

I was glad to see Helen Gordon's and Peter Rush's response to my article, "*To Queen Elizabeth*" *Just a Plea for Mercy*, in the last issue of the Newsletter. My article in turn was in response to Hank Whittemore's *Southampton Poem Proves Oxford, Prince Tudor Hypotheses*.

Whittemore's PT interpretation of the *Sonnets* is that the Fair Youth was Southampton, that he was the illegitimate son of Queen Elizabeth and Oxford, and that the *Sonnets* were mainly written during and after the Essex trial.

I was looking forward to PT responses to my claims that *Shakespeare's Sonnets* do not represent fatherly concerns for his son, or that they are even an appropriate way to address one's son, unless one had a sexual desire for him. I maintain, as do many other scholars, both orthodox and Oxfordian, that the *Sonnets* reveal a bisexual triangle, full of the language of sexual desire and jealousy, and of lavish praise for the Youth's beauty.

Finally, I thought, we would at last see a PT position paper to support the thesis. But alas, we came up empty-handed again. Just the standard statements that Southampton was Oxford's son, with no evidence in support. How can one argue with twisted logic and a blank wall?

Helen Gordon seems to combine both theories in her statement,

I believe [Hamill and Whittemore] could both be right, since Oxford could have been both bisexual and a loving father.

An amazing compromise! Is she proposing incest? But she offers no evidence for the claim that Oxford was Southampton's father, or that Queen Elizabeth was his mother. Indeed, she admits

Lacking documented proof, the best we can do is create a credible scenario, explaining as many of the mysteries as we can, until a preponderance of evidence leads to high probability.

In other words, we are free to create an al-

ternate universe. Gordon makes many more assertions, such as identifying the Dark Lady and the Rival Poet, again without providing any evidence. People are entitled to have their own opinions but not their own facts.

As an example of twisted logic, we see how the interpretation of some sonnets has to be creative to accommodate her theory. Almost all scholars agree that sonnets 1–126 were addressed to the Fair Youth. However, Gordon cannot accept this, since she has to acknowledge the sexual implications of some of them—unlike Rush. To address this problem, she claims that some of these Sonnets were addressed to the Queen or Anne Vavasour, instead of the Fair Youth!

She theorizes:

Take, for example, Sonnet 87: "Thus have I had thee, as a dream might flatter / In sleep a king, but waking no such matter."

The sexual connotations of "had thee" clearly suggest a heterosexual love affair, and if Oxford ever felt like a king, it would be as Elizabeth's mate. This interpretation would strengthen Whittemore's PT1 case that Oxford and Elizabeth were lovers.

Since the sonnet has a clear sexual connotation, she insists it must be heterosexual. Since the writer sleeps like a king, his partner must have been a queen—the Queen.

All we see from the PT side of the argument are statements prefaced with "if," "it appears," "must have," "should have," "strongly suggests," and so on for evidence. Peter Rush in turn makes the same accusations against me. But Rush fails to comprehend that the logic he and Whittemore present is exactly what he accuses me of. He states "I submit that [Hamill's] reading is tortured in the extreme, and only appears plausible by assuming one's conclusion and employing circular reasoning."

I stated in my article that I do not question that Southampton was the Fair Youth of the *Sonnets*, and that 107 is the one sonnet we can date

with certainty—it was written in 1603, after the death of Queen Elizabeth. But the claim by Rush and Whittemore that certain sonnets were written in specific years, will require more evidence besides “word associations” and the debatable numbering of the *Sonnets*.

Was Oxford Bisexual?

But, this is not the main point of disagreement. Rush mainly claims that I provide no basis for the “presumption that Oxford and Southampton were bisexual,” (which I do by referencing a previous article providing the evidence) and that therefore his sexual reading is correct. Rush maintains that I “heavily” rely on Joseph Pequigny’s homosexual interpretation of the *Sonnets*, which he believes is incorrect.

But curiously he doesn’t mention any other authority I cite, including Berryman, Bloom, Charney, Garber, Giroux, Holland, Ramsey, Sams, Sobran, Sinfield, Bruce Smith, Waugaman, and Stanley Wells, among others. He does not rebut a single argument presented by them. Why? They deserve answering. Rush asserts:

For Whittemore (and for that matter most conventional scholars), those words admit of non-sexual meanings that provide more coherent understandings of the specified sonnets. Hamill’s logic appears to be entirely circular.

Rush and Whittemore, like Gordon, go out of their way to deny a sexual, meaning homosexual, interpretation of the first 126 sonnets. They don’t seem to have a problem when the sexual puns relate to the Dark Lady.

Rush then make the outrageous statement that

[Hamill] asserts, as if it were above dispute, that the sonnets exhibit an “overall sexual nature,” and then chides the vast majority of scholars for “largely omit(ting)...the author’s bisexuality,” as if the latter were a proven fact. By assuming what he needs to prove, Hamill avoids the difficult task of actually proving that either alleged “fact” is truly so.

Rush is right, I did not prove that the alleged facts of the sexual nature of the *Sonnets* and bisexuality “are truly so.” Instead, I cited those scholars mentioned above, who demonstrated it, as Rush could have discovered, had he bothered to read them.

For instance, Stephen Booth observes that the sexual puns in the sonnets are the same puns as in the plays. Why would they mean something different? Marjorie Garber adds:

Amid all of these ingenious and enlightening critical maneuverings no one wants to comment on the obvious—that the sonnets describe a bisexual triangle.

In the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004), Peter Holland acknowledges that the “explicit homoeroticism [of the *Sonnets*] suggests that Shakespeare’s sexuality was consciously bisexual in its desires.”

Aside from Pequigny, Rush does not seem to have read much about the evidence for a bisexual element in the work of Shakespeare. He seems to be unaware of the substantial scholarly research that has come to this conclusion. In “Shakespeare’s Sexuality, and How it Affects the Authorship Debate,” (*The Oxfordian*, 2005), I demonstrate in detail the presence of bisexuality throughout the Shakespeare canon, and also summarize the evidence published by numerous scholars. The accumulation of this evidence is the reason that bisexuality in Shakespeare is now more openly acknowledged. I also present the evidence for both Oxford’s and Southampton’s bisexuality. Again, I cite this document in the article.

Rush apparently did not read the available literature, or my “Shakespeare’s Sexuality” article, before he wrote his rebuttal. He has nothing to say in response—except to ridicule Pequigny’s interpretations and to quote his sole authority—Hank Whittemore. Rush provides no information to rebut points raised by me or others on the subject of Shakespeare’s or Oxford’s bisexuality.

One cannot focus solely on interpreting the *Sonnets* in a vacuum, as Gordon, Rush and Whittemore do. Harold Bloom summarizes, after evaluating the canon: “The human endowment, Shakespeare keeps intimating, is bisexual.”

In addition, neither Gordon nor Rush addresses any of the objections I and others have raised to the PT theory. What is needed is a clear statement presenting the facts.

Are there any facts? As long as they don’t present them, there is no point in pursuing this debate.

A New 1569 Poem by Arthur Golding Attributed to Edward de Vere

Richard M. Waugaman

In a recent *Notes & Queries* Rebecca Tomlin of Birkbeck College speculates that a 1569 commendatory poem published above the initials “A.G.” may have been by Arthur Golding.*

At the same time Tomlin curiously comments a book by James Peele on double-entry book-keeping. She links Golding’s possible interest in this seemingly esoteric topic with his role as receiver to his nephew Edward de Vere, inheritor of vast estates. Some Oxfordians speculate that the young de Vere may have collaborated with his uncle on the translation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* published in 1567.

Tomlin’s poem is an acrostic, the first letters of each couplet (except the final three) spelling out Peele’s name (as “Iacobus Peele,” which is printed vertically to the left of the poem). It is written in the “fourteeners” of the *Metamorphoses*. Tomlin finds its style to be similar to Golding’s translation. Oxfordians maintain that the Puritan Golding’s precocious nephew was the actual translator, given the facts that the translation is even racier than Ovid’s original, that the adolescent de Vere’s Puritan guardian William Cecil may not have allowed him to put his name to such a work, and that the equally Puritanical Golding published nothing else like the *Metamorphoses*, and that finally Gabriel Harvey praised de Vere’s apparently lost Latin poetry. If de Vere put his uncle’s name to his translation of Ovid, it would be consistent to do the same with this 1569 poem.

There are some striking similarities between this poem and de Vere’s other poetry. In both the 1569 poem and then again in de Vere’s commendatory poem “To the Reader” in Thomas Bedingfields’s 1573 translation of *Cardanus’s Comfort*, the poet enlists the trope of a farmer laboring in the field to describe the poet’s work. The 1569 poem says: “...every man (that will) may reape a fruitefull harvest heare:/ So

fertile are these fields...” And in the next line, “As he that tills them.”

Four years later, de Vere’s prefatory poem to *Cardanus’s Comfort* began: “The labouring man, that tills the fertile soyle/ And reaps the harvest fruit...”

Caroline Spurgeon notes Shakespeare’s fondness for snail imagery. Previously, I attributed an anonymous 1585 poem, “In Praise of Snayle,” to de Vere. The 1569 poem also includes a snail trope: “...none/Is borne by nature, like a Snayle to live at home alone.” In speaking of the snail, the 1585 poem includes some of the same words: “that lives devoid of ease” and “to keep a quiet home.”

As Tomlin observes, “A.G.” adopts and adapts Golding’s [i.e., the translator of Ovid] description of the Labyrinth [of Daedalus] as a metaphor for the disorder of badly kept accounts: “A.G.’s verse echoes Golding’s distinctive phrasing and vocabulary” (502). For example, in the use of “busy” meaning intricate or impenetrable; and “clew” meaning a ball of thread that can guide one out of a maze.

Tomlin makes the crucial observation that the author of the 1569 poem may have been drawn to Peele’s book because of his interest in “proper accounting as a means of ensuring moral rectitude and justice” (504). Paula Blank, in her *Shakespeare and the Mismeasure of Renaissance Man* (2006) made the intriguing observation that Shakespeare deeply considered every available means of measurement to ask if they might help in the moral appraisal of mankind. This 1569 poem suggests that this was an interest that had its roots in de Vere’s adolescence.

Some of the spellings in the 1569 poem are consistent with the spelling variants that Alan Nelson found in de Vere’s extant letters. Although Nelson believes that de Vere’s spelling habits disqualify him from having written the canon, they are consistent with some of the unusual spellings in Hand D. We do not know how much control de Vere had over the compositors who set the type of his publications.

* Rebecca Tomlin: “A New Poem by Arthur Golding,” *Notes & Queries*, December 2012 (59: 501-5).

In other words, the variant spellings in the 1569 poem are consistent with de Vere's spelling in his letters, but moderately to extremely unusual for all of the (searchable) books on Early English Books Online (EEBO) that were published in 1569. Most extreme is "owt,"

Examples of Similar Spellings

<i>1569 Poem</i>	<i>de Vere's letters</i>
clayme	clayme/s 4, claim 0
dew (for <i>due</i>)	dwe 4; due 1
mynd	mynde/e 15; mind/e 4
neyther	neyther 8; neither 0
owt	owt 55; out 15
trew	twe
vew	vew 1; view 0

EEBO for 1569
 clayme/e 12 claime/e 21
 dew 32; due 132
 mynd/e 186; minde/e 854
 nyther 0; neither 548
 owt 1; out 2,333
 trew 31; true 997
 vew 13; view 25

which de Vere used 55 times in -his letters (whereas he used "out" only 15 times); "owt" was used only once in the 1569 searchable EEBO books, compared with 2,333 instances of "out." By contrast, "claym/e" and "vew" were used roughly half as often as "claim/e" and "view," respectively, among the same sample of 1569 books. Although these striking similarities are not proof, they are consistent with de Vere's authorship of the 1569 poem.

Once again, a Stratfordian scholar has inadvertently helped us by drawing attention to a poem de Vere is likely to have written, and published when he was nineteen. Here is the untitled poem:

TO THE READER in commendation of this present worke.

In yielding every wyght his owne, trew justice doth consist,
 The Gordian knot of manes estate which no man can untwist.
 A blissfull braunche wherof behold presented in this booke,

Whose fruite is pleasaunt for to tast and wholesome
 for to brooke.
 Conveyance wrought by crafty flightes this touch-
 stone doth bewray.
 This lampe bringes open light to thinges that deepe in
 darkenes lay.
 Of Reknings buzyer than the Maze of Dedalus, this
 Clew
 Doth wynd men owt. Greate thanks of you O
 merchantmen are dew.
 But what? Extendes this woorke alone to Merchaunt-
 mens behoof?
 And not to all men else that list to put the same in
 proof?
 Upon advysed vew (no doubt) it plainly will appeare,
 That every man (that will) may reape a fruitefull har-
 vest heare:
 So fertile are these feeldes. Which yelde so much the
 greater gayne.
 As he that tilles them greater trades of dealings doth
 maintayne.
 Peruse this worthy worke then, pend by Peeles most
 painefull hand:
 And learne by just and trew accompt thy state to
 understand.
 Enforce the selfe yet furthermore, and beare in mynd
 that none
 Is borne by nature, like a Snayle to live at home
 alone.
 Eche servaunt, kinsman, freend, alye, eche straunger,
 every wyght,
 With whom thou dealst, (as deale thou must) clayme
 faithfulness and right.
 Lo heare wherby to mend thy skill, thy credit to
 preserve,
 To win thee welth, to get thee friendes, thy common
 weale to serve.
 Exceeding, yea immortall thanks thou oughtst to
 yelde thefore
 What wyght so ere thou art whose neede is helped by
 this store.
 And specially with you that deale with great and long
 accountes,
 Whose Reknings oft are intricate, whose charge
 right farre amountes
 Above the common rate, on whom doth oftentimes
 depend
 The weale and welfare, or decay of thousandes in the
 end:
 In part of Peeles dew recompence for penning of this
 same,
 Let neyther spyght abate his prayse, nor time
 outweare his fame.

Book Review Shakespeare's Education

Robin Fox: *Shakespeare's Education: Schools, Lawsuits, Theater and the Tudor Miracle* (Laugwitz Verlag, 2012).

Michael Egan

There are exceptions, but most Oxfordians are not college professors—yet. Nevertheless, the idea that Edward de Vere, the 17th earl of Oxford, was the man behind the Shakespeare mask has its supporters in academe, none more so than Professor Robin Fox of Rutgers University.

A distinguished anthropologist and Oxfordian stalwart, Fox's restless and eclectic intelligence, supported by scrupulous scholarship, has focused over recent years on the authorship question. His work has earned him a place of honor among those who have added significant evidence to the case for the elusive earl. We are not surprised to learn that Fox's original academic interests were English and History. Only later was he drawn to anthropology.

Personal Anecdotes

Fox's new book, *Shakespeare's Education*, brings together his essays on the authorship question, many of which were originally published in *The Oxfordian* and *The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter*. The result is a brief but significant challenge to the confused orthodox position on the Bard's schooling—a barely educated provincial lad, familiar only with the hornbook but somehow immensely learned about almost everything in his world, including military matters, medicine, the law, astronomy, horticulture, and much else. *Shakespeare's Education* brilliantly resolves the paradox.

Characteristically, Fox integrates his ideas with personal anecdotes and a chatty style, amusingly describing his progress towards non-Stratfordianism following an early encounter with Twain's *Is Shakespeare Dead?* Readers may particularly cherish the story of his subsequent meeting at the LSE with Enoch Powell, the notoriously right-wing English politician, a brilliant classics professor and anti-Stratfordian. Later in his career Fox debated the matter with the irascible A.L. Rowse of All Souls College,

Oxford, who repeated his absurd proposition (restated almost verbatim in the Frontline program, *The Shakespeare Mystery*) that only clever grammar-school boys write plays. Evidently this was one of Rowse's standard put-downs.

Still later Fox discovered a connection between his interest in the evolution of the incest taboo (*The Red Lamp of Incest* was published in 1980) and the Sophoclean theme Freud so famously detected in *Hamlet*.

The Grammar Schools

The question of Shakespeare's education naturally begins with an assessment of Stratford's celebrated and still functioning grammar school where, it is generally hypothesized, the young genius received a formal education—his famous small Latin and less Greek. The orthodox position on this swings like a bewildered pendulum: (1) Shakespeare was superficially educated but a natural genius; or (2) the Stratford grammar school was so academically excellent that he graduated at about age 14 with the skills of a modern college classics student.

Oxfordians on the other hand—exemplified by Ogburn's *The Mysterious William Shakespeare*—have mocked both notions and commented that neither (1) nor (2) explains the breadth and depth of learning and experience evident in the plays and poems. Their conclusion is that Shakespeare must have been someone else, a nobleman like de Vere, who received the very best English education possible, traveled extensively, encountered all levels of society from queen to commoner, bishop to bailiff, and had access to the vast libraries and scientific knowledge evident in the *Collected Works*.

But this belief has difficulty accounting for the author's equally evident familiarity with Elizabethan grammar schools, the curriculum they followed, their students, and the schoolmasters who taught them. He seems genuinely to have been a grammar-school attendee, an aha! point often made triumphantly by Stratfordians.

Originality

With typical originality, Fox takes on both positions, using skill and humor. He argues, contrary to orthodox Oxfordianism, that the petty (elementary) and grammar schools, including Stratford's, were actually pretty good and more than capable of producing competent classical

scholars. Without false modesty he cites himself, an English grammar-school product still able to translate Latin on the fly, observing that

by the time he left for London [Shakspere] could have been perfectly well equipped in the classical languages and literatures.

There is also evidence in the plays—among them *Henry VIII*, *2 Henry VI*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Julius Caesar*, *Richard II, Part One* and, most notably, *Love's Labor's Lost*—that the author understood the English grammar-school system well enough to mockingly portray pedants like Holofernes and his stumbling pupils (later modified by the example of the *Commedia dell'Arte*). The question then for Oxfordians is how an earl, regardless of the quality of his education, could describe these relationships in such detail, right down to the schoolboys dragging themselves unwillingly to school.

Fox notes that the standard curriculum was so pervasive and highly regarded that the aristocracy, and even royalty itself, followed it. In addition, Oxford was associated with such schools will thus have known their curriculum intimately. Among Fox's best sections are those describing the coursework itself and the places in which it was taught. A related section, which Fox feels strengthens the case for Oxford as Shakespeare, deals with the pronunciation debate referred to in *Love's Labor's Lost*:

Holofernes: He draweth out the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument. I abhor such fanatical phantasimes, such insociable and point-devise companions; such rackers of orthography, as to speak *dout*, fine, when he should say *doubt*; *det*, when he should pronounce *debt*,--d, e, b, t, not d, e, t: he clepeth a calf, *cauf*; half, *hauf*; neighbour vocatur *nebor*; neigh abbreviated *ne*. This is abhominable,—which he would call *abbominable*: it insinuateth me of insanie: *anne intelligis, domine?* to make frantic, lunatic. (V.i.19-29).

Fox claims that Oxford was more likely to have known about and been involved in such issues than Shakspere of Stratford. He was deeply associated with Lily, Sir Thomas Smith, and Sir John Cheke of Cambridge, all major participants. "Thus, the men who were at the centre of the debate," Fox concludes, "were those who surrounded Oxford in his childhood

and youth, and were responsible for his education."

More than Schools

But *Shakespeare's Education* is more than a study of Elizabethan schools and education. Subtle though the morphing is, Fox smoothly moves on to the general question of *de Vere* as Shakespeare, and even finds space for his well-known essay on the absence of a *History of Henry VII* in Shakespeare (given that the chronicle sequence now runs complete, with this single exception, from *Edward III* followed by the two *Richard II* plays and then on to *Henry VIII*).

Richmond's absence, except for a brief appearance at the end of *Richard III*, is an excellent question, typical of Fox's eye for intellectual problems. Unfortunately his answer is disappointing: "Henry Tudor, as king," he writes, "was not the stuff to excite a playwright like the author of the histories."

Yet Fox's own summary of the reign suggests that Henry VII was precisely the kind of monarch Shakespeare loved to explore—"the first truly modern king: a realist and a pragmatist" who brought the country together after a disastrous civil war. His objective was to limit and restrain the old nobility, and advance the rise of the so-called "new men," the embryonic bourgeoisie later so influential in Elizabeth's court. Fox believes that they were anathema to the aristocratic Oxford, perhaps adding to his reluctance to write about the king. However, he adds:

We had to wait until Louis XIV in France to see such another successful attempt...[Henry VII] represented the wave of the future, of the dominance of the rule of law and the centrality of trade that spelled the beginning of the end of feudal society, with its rigid hierarchies and its familial loyalties.

Additionally, Henry had the wit to marry a Yorkist princess and so institute the Tudor peace. A good husband and father, he is nonetheless reputed to have slept with over 300 women and impregnated 273. He cleverly managed parliament, instituted a new justice system, elements of which, Fox notes, "persist to this day." Henry VII also negotiated skillfully with the

pope and other European monarchs. Fox concludes:

As the common verdict has it, he may not have been a great king, but he was an astonishingly successful one.

Quite frankly this sounds like rich Shakespearean territory. The answer to Fox's question may be simply that *Henry VIII* was arbitrarily renamed and included by the editors of the 1623 Folio under "Histories." But it was actually called *All Is True* and likely rewritten, perhaps collaboratively, from an earlier work never intended for the Wars of the Roses sequence. *King John* likewise stands outside the central narrative.

On the other hand, Fox masterfully demonstrates that *Timon of Athens* could have been—must have been—written by Oxford. This essay is, in our judgment, his major contribution to the specifics of the authorship debate: it will stand the test of time. Generously crediting Earl Showerman and other scholars, Fox overwhelm-

ingly demonstrates his thesis that Timon's story reflects Oxford's later years. The discussion spills over into a number of related areas, including parallels with Oedipus, the origins of the name Shylock, the myth of Robin Hood, and Elizabethan real-property laws, all of which connect to Fox's proposition that the earl is our man.

In a famous quote which Fox cites more than once, Orson Welles remarked:

I think Oxford wrote Shakespeare. If you don't agree, there are some awfully funny coincidences to explain away.

Rather than explain them away, Fox integrates them. *Shakespeare's Education*, though less spectacular, deserves to stand alongside Richard Roe's *The Shakespeare Guide to Italy* as one of the significant SAQ studies of recent years.

A Message from SOS President, John Hamill

Happy New Year!

This is to thank those of you have renewed your memberships and donated before the end of 2012. To those who haven't, please make it a New Year's resolution to do so. See the renewal form on the back of this issue.

The Shakespeare Oxford Society depends on the dues and generosity of its membership to maintain the publication of the *Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter* and our annual scholarly journal, *The Oxfordian*. This helps us plan our activities for the year. We hope to make some new exciting changes soon, including further educational outreach, and need the financial capability to do so. Among our other goals for the coming year is continuing our coordination with the Shakespeare Fellowship and assisting the Shakespeare Authorship Coalition in its challenge to the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust. We are also planning to issue a book on the case for Oxford as the real author of Shakespeare. I will have more information on this for the next issue of the Newsletter. Thank all of you for being such faithful members. I look forward to working with and for you in this New Year!

A Comparison of Shakespeare's and Florio's Wills

Lamberto Tassinari

The great majority of Shakespeare's readers have never read his will, a document easily found on the internet but regularly omitted in editions of Shakespeare's plays and poems and seldom found in the ever-growing number of the Bard's biographies. Why? Because it is an embarrassing, dissonant document. Since its discovery in 1737, scholars have tried in vain to come to terms with this very un-Shakespearian piece of literature.

Shaksper's Will

Actually there is nothing Shakespearian about William Shaksper's will. For an interesting and revelatory analysis of its problems and inconsistencies, see *Shakespeare's Will... Considered Too Curiously*, by Bonner Miller Cutting. She writes:

Viewing the will in the best possible light, the exalted 19th-century authority James Halliwell sums it up as "the testimonies we may cherish of his last faltering accents to the world he was leaving." Failing such eloquence, many scholars are resigned to accepting the Stratford Will more simply as "an enigma." A closer look may show that the will is not an enigma; it is disaster. (*Brief Chronicles*, Vol. I, 2009, 205-236).

The will is written in a formulaic, flat prose without style. As for its content, money, property and "household stuff" are the testator's sole preoccupation. There is not a single mention of books, not even the Bible. Nothing about culture, theatre, poetry. Nothing about the funding of his grand-children's education. Beyond all the chronological incongruities and controversial legal aspects of the will which Bonner Miller Cutting discusses with logic acumen and wit, what is fundamental and unquestionable is that

nothing in this document indicates that the testator led a cultured life or even possessed a cultivated intellect. There are no books, papers, writings, manuscripts, musical instruments, art, tapestries, maps, shares in a theatrical company, theatrical attire or memorabilia. He did not provide for the education of

his heirs—or for anyone else. His failure to provide for the maintenance of his unnamed surviving spouse is more deplorable than the bequest of his second-best bed. There is nothing suggestive of civic pride such as bequests to schools, colleges, almshouses, hospitals, and churches, nor did he think to give to civic projects such as the repair of roads and bridges. Such bequests as these are missing despite the fact that he had accumulated a sizeable estate with five homes and had considerable income from additional property.

The names of people of high rank are also absent, surprising in the last will of a dramatist who supposedly was one of the most successful and loved playwrights at the English court.

Below, in my transcription of this "disaster" are the overwhelming references to property and material goods, money, domestic stuff or land, rendered in bold characters. In italics bold is an endless, exhausting passage whose objective was to make sure the property would remain within the Shaksper's family up to seven heirs male of his daughter Susanna. Cutting comments this passage:

Where in the world are these seven "heirs male" supposed to come from? It is a strange litany to find in a will when all of the heirs thus enumerated are yet to be born.

The infamous second-best bed the supposed great dramatist left to his wife is in stark contrast to the tender affection showed by Florio towards his wife, mentioned five times with great affection in his will:

my deerly beloved wife Rose Florio, most heartily greiving and ever sorrowing, that I cannot give or leave her more, in requitall of her tender love, loving care, painfull dilligence, and continuall labour, to mee, and of mee in all my Fortunes, and many sicknesses, then whome never had husband a more loving wife, painfull nurse, or comfortable consort.

Bonner Miller Cutting, who believes de

Vere was Shakespeare, has examined “over 2,000 wills and an extensive bibliography dealing with will-making in early modern England,” but I’m certain she failed to read the beautiful will of John Florio, the author overlooked by Stratfordians as well as by Oxfordians, Marlovians, and Baconians.

Florio’s High Style

Had she done so she would have experienced several Shakespearian shivers! Remove dates from the wills, make the identity of the two testators disappear, and it is certain that no scholar would have any doubt identifying Shakespeare’s will. Florio’s “written every sillable with myne owne hand “as he states twice, is in fact replete with particularly refined, elegant and mannered Shakespearian words.

Many, in bold type in my transcript, can indeed be traced to Shakespeare’s works. Between brackets is the number of times they appear in the canon. The words in italics indicate when the spelling is slightly different from the one appearing in Shakespeare’s printed books.

Florio’s prose is characterized by a remarkable high style. Subjects which, in some respect, possess a particular Shakespearian relevance are underlined. With eloquent and passionate accents, Florio mentions Queen Anne four times and Ferdinando, Great Duke of Tuscany, once.

Florio meticulously refers three times to his own books and writings. William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, the Lord Chamberlain, is named once as one of the executors of the will. Florio bequeathed to him all his 340 Italian, French and Spanish books (“to accept of them as of a signe and token of my service and affection to his honor”). No need to remember the prominent role Pembroke played as one of the sponsors of the 1623 First Folio.

Florio’s English books, very probably in a greater number than the foreign ones, were bequeathed to his wife.

Unfortunately, Florio’s 340 non-English books never reached Wilton or Baynards Castle at London, “the executors named in the Will for certain reasons renouncing execution,” according to the will’s sibiline closing line. But why didn’t William Herbert,

“as hee once promised mee” keep his word to Florio? Why did the aristocrat who played such a fundamental role in the promotion of the works of William Shakespeare, step aside two years later and refuse to execute Florio’s will? Historians, and biographers of the Pembroke family, have nothing to say.

We have also lost track of the English books left by Florio to his wife, except for one, a copy of *Volpone* with an autographed dedication to Florio by Jonson himself, Shakespeare’s literary midwife:

To his loving Father and worthy Friend
Master John Florio. Ayde of his Muses.
Ben Jonson seales this testimony of
Friendship and Love.

A Significant Loss

Florio’s entire library has since disappeared. His Italian, French and Spanish books would have been of decisive importance in resolving the Shakespeare authorship question. But not a single scholar has paid the slightest attention to such a disgraceful loss. In a recent list of book owners compiled by David Pearson there is not one reference to Florio’s phantom library.*

A conspiracy is not necessarily a plot implying top politicians and secret agents. The “national interest” alone, promoted by mainstream scholars and authorities for centuries, suffices to obliterate the truth. As someone wrote “it is a sort of Niagara Falls of history, there is no conspiracy but everything *conspires* in the sense that everything *respires* in the same direction.”

Note: In the transcript below of John Florio’s testament, **bold type** indicates words found in Shakespeare, and *italics* slight spelling variants. Bracketed figures note the number of times a word appears in the canon. A hapax legomenon or hapax, is a word which occurs only once in the canon. Subjects which possess a particular Shakespearian relevance are underlined.

* David Pearson: *English Book owners in the Seventeenth Century. A work in Progress* (July 2011).

WILL OF JOHN FLORIO

PROVED IN THE PREROGATIVE COURT OF CANTERBURY 1625

In the blessed name of God the Father my **gracious** (199) Creator & Maker, of God the sonne Jesus Christ my **mercifull** (*merciful*, 20) Savyor and in Unity & Trinity my most loving **Comforter** (5) and **preserver** (3) Amen. I John Florio of Fullham in the Countie of Middlesex Esquire, being of good health of sound minde & perfecte memory, **heartly** (9) thanks bee ever **ascribed** (3) and given therfore unto Allmighty God And well remembring & knowing that nothing is more certayne unto mortall man then death, and noe one thing more uncertayne then is the houre therof, doe make appoint pronounce and declare this my Testament, therein fully contayning my last direct & unrevocable will and intention **in manner and forme following** (*in manner and form following*, 2, LLL 1,1, 201) That is to say First & principally as duty and Christianity willeth mee, I most heartily and **penetently** (*penitently*, 1 hapax, *Measure* IV.ii.147) **sorrowfull** (*sorrowful*, 4) for all my sinnes committ and recommend my soule into the mercifull hands of Almighty God, **assuredly** (4) trusting and Faythfully beleaving by the onely meritts bitter passion, precious bloud, and glorious death of the immaculate Lambe Jesus Christ his sonne, to have full remission, and absolute Forgiveness of all my sinnes whatsoever, and after this transitory life, to live and raigne with him in his most blessed kingdome of heaven. As for my wretched Body, I commit to the same as earth to earth and dust to dust, to bee buried in such decent order, as to my deare Wife, and by my Executors heere undernamed shalbee thought meete and convenient. And as touching the disposing and ordering of all and whatsoever such goods, Cattle, chattle, Leases, monie, plate, Jewells, bookes, apparrell, bedding, hangins, peawter, brasse, houshold stuffe moveables, immoveables, and all other things whatsoever named, or unnamed, **specifide** (*specify*, 3), or unspecifide wherwith my most gracious God, hath beene pleased to endowe mee with, or hereafter shall of his infinite mercy bee pleased to bestowe or conferre upon me in this transitory life, I will appoint, give order dispose, & bequeath all, and evary part, and parcell of the same **firmely** (*firmly*, 9) and unalterably to stand in manner and forme following That is to say, Item, I give and bequeath unto my daughter Aurelia Molins the Wedding Ring wherewith I married her mother, being **aggrieved** (1, hapax, *Henry* V, IV.vii.170) at my very heart, that by reason of my poverty I am not able to leave her anything els. Item I give and bequeath as a poore token of my love to my sonne in law James Molins, a Faire blacke velvett deske, embroidered with seede pearles, and with a silver and guilt inkehorne and dust box therin, that was Queene Annes. Item, I give and bequeath unto the right honourable, my singulare, & ever honored good Lord William Earle of Pembroke Lord Chambérleine: to the Kings most excellent Majestie, and one of his royall counsell of state (if at my death hee shall then bee living) all my Italian, French and Spanish bookes, as well printed as unprinted, being in number about Three hundred and Fortie, namely my new and perfect Dictionary, as also my, tenn Dialogues in Italian and English, and my unbound volume of divers written Collections and rapsodies, most heartilie entreating his Honourable Lordshippe (as hee once promised mee) to accept of them as of a signe and token of my service and affection to his honor, and for my sake to place them in his library, eyther at Wilton or els at Baynards Castle at London, humbly desiring him to give way and favourable assistance that my Dic-tionarie and Dialogues may be printed and the profitt therof accrud unto my wife. Item, I doe likewise give and bequeat unto his noble Lordshippe the Corinne stone as a jewell fitt for a Prince which Ferdinando the great Duke of Tuscanie sent as a most precious gift (among divers others) unto Queene Anne of blessed memory; the use & vertue wherof is written in two peeces of paper both in Italian and English bring in a little box with the stone, most humbly beseeching his honor (as I right, **confidently** (2) hope & trust hee will in charity doe if neede require) to take my poore and deere wife into his protection, & not suffer her to be **wrongfully** (8) molested by any enemi of myne, as also in her extremity to affoorde her his helpe, good word and assistance to my Lord Treasurer, that shee may bee paid my wages, and the arrearages of that which is unpaid or shal bee behinde at my death. The rest, the residue & remainder, of all whatsoever and singular my goods, cattles, chattles, jewells, plate; debts Leases, money, or monie worth, houseould stuffe, utensills, English bookes, moveables, or immove-ables, named or not named, and things whatsoever, by mee before not given, disposed or bequeathed most heartily greiving and ever sorrowing, that I cannot give or leave her more, in requitall of her tender

love, loving care, painfull **dilligence** (*diligence*, 11), and **continuall** (*continual*, 15) labour, to mee, and (provided that my debts bee paid and my Funerall discharged) I woolly give, fully bequeath, absolutely leave, assigne, & unalterably consigne unto my deerly beloved wife Rose Florio, of mee in all my Fortunes, and many sicknesses, then whome never had husband a more loving wife, painfull nurse, or **comfortable** (13) consorter, And I doe make institute, ordaine, appoint & name the right Reverend Father in God, Theophilus Feild, Lord bishoppe of Landaffe, and Mr Richard Cluet Doctor of divinity, Vicar, and preacher of the Word of God at Fulham, both my much esteemed, dearely beloved, & truely honest good Friends my sole and onely Executors and overseers; And I doe give to each of them for their paines an ould greene velvett deske with a silver inke and dust box in each of them, that were sometymes Queene Annes my Sovereigne Mistrisse, entreating both to accept of them, as a token of my hearty affection towards them, and to excuse my poverty which **disableth** (*disable*, 2) mee to **requite** (25) the trouble, paines, and courtesie, which I confidently beleeeve they will charitably and for Gods sake undergoe in advising directing and helping my poore and deere wife in executing of this my last and unrevocable will and Testament, if any should bee soe **malicious** (12) or **unnaturall** (*unnatural*, 39) as to crosse or question the same; And I doe utterly **revoke** (4), and for ever **renounce** (5), **frustrate** (5), disanull, **cancell** (*cancel*, 6), and make void, all and whatsoever former Wills, legacies, bequests, promises, guifts, executors or overseers (if it should happen that anie bee forged or suggested for until this tyme, I never writt made or finished any but this onely) And I will appoint & ordaine that this, & none but this onely written all with mine owne hand, shall stand in full force and **vigor** (*vigour*, 12) for my last and unrevocable Will and Testament, and none other nor otherwise. As for the debts that I owe, the greatest, and onelie is upon an obligatory Writing of myne owne hand, which my daughter Aurelia Molins with **importunity** (3) wrested from of about threescore pound, wheras the truth, and my conscience telleth mee, & soe knoweth her **conscience** (126), it is but Thirty Foure pound or therabouts. But let that passe, since I was soe **unheedy** (1 hapax, *Midsummer*, I. xii.37), as to make and acknowledge the said writing, I am willing that it bee paid and discharged in this forme and manner, My sonne in lawe (as my daughter his Wife knoweth full well) hath in his hands as a pawne a faire gold ring of mine, with thirteen Faire table diamonds therein enchased; which cost Queene Anne my gracious Mistrisse seaven and Forty pounds starline, and for which I might many tymes have had forty pounds readie money: upon the said ring my sonne in the presence of his wife lent mee Tenne pounds, I desire him and pray him to take the overplus of the said Ring in parte of payment, as also a leaden Ceasterne which hee hath of myne standing in his yard at his London-house that cost mee at a porte-sale Fortie shillings, as also a silver candle cup with a cover worth about Forty shillings which I left at his house being sicke there; desiring my sonne and daughter, that their whole debt may bee made up, & they satisfied with selling the Lease of my house in Shoe-Lane, and soe **acquitt** (*acquit*, 10) and **discharge** (32) my poore wife who as yet knoweth nothing of this debt. Moreover I entreat my deare wife that if at my death my servant Artur [*blank*] shall chance to be with mee, & in my service, that for my sake shee give him, such poore doublets, breeches, hattes, and bootes as I shall leave, and there withall one of my ould cloakes soe it bee not lyned with velvett. In Witnesse whereof I the said John Florio to this my last Will & Testament (written every sillable with myne owne hand, and with long and mature deliberacon (deliberation? *Deliberate* vb) digested, contayning foure shieetes of paper, the First of eight and twenty lynes, the second of nyne & twenty, the third of nine & twenty and the Fourth of six lines), have putt, sett, written and affixed my name, and usual seale of my armes. The twentieth day of July in the Yeare of our Lord and Savyour Jesus Christ 1625 and in the First yeare of the raigne of our Sovereigne Lord and King (whom God preserve) Charles the First of that name of England, Scotland, France and Ireland King. By mee John Florio being, thankes bee ever given to my most gracious God in perfect sence and memory.

Proved 1 June 1626 by Rose Florio the relict, the executors named in the Will for certain reasons renouncing execution.

Note: In the interests of space we are not reproducing Shakespeare's well-known will. It may be viewed online at <http://www.william-shakespeare.info/william-shakespeare-the-will.htm>

The Big Six Candidates for Shakespeare's Crown

Stephanie Hopkins Hughes

Over the years, the Shakespeare authorship argument has moved from one candidate to another, starting with Bacon in the late 19th century, then to Marlowe (1895), then to Oxford (1920). Perhaps due to a gradual weakening of the Stratford scenario, today almost anyone in the 16th century who left evidence of travels to France or Italy, or published something, or was ever mentioned in some connection with the London stage has a book, or at least a website, where he or she is touted as the real Shakespeare. Hopefully this is simply a phase in the long slow turn away from the Stratford myth, first conjured up by Ben Jonson for the King's Men in 1623.

As it stands at the moment, there are six candidates who have inspired at least one book, some several (William hundreds, Bacon dozens), and whose credentials are currently being furiously hashed over online and in print. Just going by what I get from Google alerts, blogs and comments, book reviews, etc., I'd say that Oxford remains in the lead with Bacon second, Marlowe third, and trailing but still with some interest, Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, Emilia Bassano Lanier, and William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby.

Of all the advocates for these six candidates, I know of none but myself in favor of *all of them*. It's been my view for some time now that the entire group (minus Derby but plus Philip Sidney) belong in the pantheon of heroes when it comes to the cultural phenomenon known as the English Literary Renaissance, but not as contributors to the Shakespeare canon. All but Derby wrote their own stuff in their own particular styles. What's caused so much confusion and misunderstanding is that three of them, Oxford, Bacon, and Mary Sidney, published some or most of what they wrote under other names. As for the group theory, i.e., that all of these gifted writers had a hand in some or all of Shakespeare's plays, what genius level creator would, or even could, share the agonies and ecstasies of creation, particularly at the

subliminal level at which these masterpieces operate?

Elizabethans were fond of the metaphor that compared the creation of a work of literature to a mother bearing a child. Like all mothers, literary mothers need support (editors, publishers, and agents today; in Shakespeare's time, secretaries, printers, and patrons). As with the mothers of human offspring, the creation and polishing of a great writer's mental children always was and always will be a solitary experience, inseminated by a muse perhaps, but developed in secret collaboration with no one but the writer's own soul.

Nevertheless, it's true that other hands are evident in some of Shakespeare's plays, particularly the weaker ones. I tend to accept Brian Vickers's argument in *Shakespeare Co-author* that George Peele wrote some of *Titus Andronicus*, though where Vickers posits collaboration between Stratford and Peele, I see *Titus* as one of Oxford's earliest plays, written in his teens as an exercise in Senecan tragedy, the kind that was popular at the time, then revised during his Fisher's Folly period by Peele for the Queen's Men or some other company. Of all the plays, it shows the least connection with Oxford's personal life.

Vickers's use of the term "co-author" suggests the kind of collaboration shared by Gilbert and Sullivan or Rogers and Hammerstein. Although I respect his ear and his conclusion that there are two hands at work on these lesser plays. But since he refuses to acknowledge the anti-Stratfordian thesis that stand-ins were used, he doesn't deal with the possibility that Wilkins, who is firmly in the camp of those Elizabethans who lack a writer's biography, was a name used by an upmarket Jacobean who felt it necessary to hide his (or her) identity. (I am equally suspicious of John Fletcher.) And because Vickers refuses to consider the Oxfordian thesis, with its corollary of weak early versions rewritten during Oxford's mature "Shakespeare" period, he can't deal with the likelihood that the

“other hand,” the one that doesn’t “sound like” Shakespeare, was in fact Shakespeare’s own juvenile effort, later turned over to Peele, Oxford having lost interest in it.

Finally, once Oxford was dead, the acting companies, eager to capitalize as much as possible on anything he ever wrote, had some of his earliest plays revised by Jacobean.

The King’s Men had *Two Noble Kinsmen* revised, possibly by Fletcher, while Philip Henslowe had *The Spanish Tragedy* revised by Ben Jonson. And, as trained scholars have shown, editors did make changes of various sorts to the plays before the First Folio was published in 1623. But while those who were most likely to have had a hand in editing Oxford’s plays were themselves members of this group of artists (I propose Mary Sidney and Francis Bacon), the sum total of their editing could never have approached a level that could be considered *co-authoring*. What I am advocating is a group theory, not for the creation of Shakespeare, but for the creation of the “English Fourth Estate,” including the London Stage and the English periodical press, and the start to the long tradition of English literature, the outpouring of poetry and novels for which the English have been lauded ever since. Each of these six writers created their own canons, some under their own names, some under the names of proxies. Of these six, five are now the leading candidates for authorship of the Shakespeare canon. The sixth, Philip Sidney, would certainly be on that list had he not died too early (and too publicly) to be included. There is a seventh, Sir Walter Raleigh, who’s got to be considered for his great literary gifts, but the fog that surrounds so many of the works of this period is still too thick around him to see clearly enough where he fits in.

Cultural Revolutions

Putting the pieces together, what I see is a group of artists, much like the one in the 19th century that created the first important style in painting that can be considered modern art, the French Impressionists. We observe a group of painters of very differing styles, more or less forced to band together to show their work when they were rejected by the Royal Academy. The basic group consisted of five men and one woman: Monet, Renoir, Pissaro, Sisley, Degas and Berthe Morisot.

No revolution, whether cultural or political, can succeed without a handful of energetic (reckless?) individuals in positions to make things happen, and it seems that six is often the magic number. Sometimes they work together, sometimes they just arrive at the same place at the same time. Think of the six original members of the Austin High gang in the twenties, the early six in the Bebop of the forties (Charlie Parker, Dizzy Gillespie, Ray Brown, Milt Jackson, Kenny Clarke, John Lewis), the Beatles in the sixties (four plus the ghosts of Brian Epstein and Pete Best), the six members of Monte Python in the seventies.

At other times they arrive one after the other, with periods of overlap, like the big three of the Italian Literary Renaissance: Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, or the big three of 17th-century French drama: Corneille, Moliere, and Racine.

Sidney, Bacon, Marlowe

There are other such groups, usually with a large fringe of lesser doers (*makers*, as they were known then, from the Greek *poirein*) and their fans, linked not only by the styles they adopted, but also by their relationships with each other. Artists, scientists, engineers, cooks, all *creators* make the best critics and most stimulating rivals for each other. They not only make the most discriminating audiences, they are good at re-evaluating their predecessors, as Alexander Pope in his time and Coleridge in his, did for Shakespeare.

The leader of this particular group of *makers*, and the oldest, was the Earl of Oxford. Arranged around him were the three who had the most influence on him during his pre-Shakespeare years, and he on them: Philip Sidney, his junior by four years; Francis Bacon, his junior by eleven years; and Christopher Marlowe, his junior by fourteen years. He was influenced by the women. Mary and Emilia, but not until his final period, the one we call Shakespeare.

- Stephanie Hopkins Hughes’ authorship blog may be viewed at <http://politicworm.com/>

Eighth Annual Conference Report

Richard Joyrich

The Eighth Annual Joint Authorship Conference convened at the Old Town Marriott Hotel in Pasadena, California, October 18-21, 2012.

Thursday, October 18

At a special 1:00 pm exhibition at the Huntington Library, attendees were treated to a display of several books from the time of Edward de Vere. Of the sixteen on display, fifteen were dedicated to de Vere (often as Edward Oxenford). These included two translated by Arthur Golding, two by Anthony Munday and one by John Lyly. The only book on display not dedicated to Oxford was *The paradise of daynty deuises*, an anthology containing several of his poems.

Alex McNeil

Later that afternoon at the conference hotel, Alex McNeil kicked off with an introductory “Authorship 101.” Alex reviewed the case against William of Stratford and for Edward de Vere. It was a great talk to get us going.

Lynda Taylor

Lynda Taylor discussed the accepted images of Shakespeare. She quickly dispensed with the idea that the Stratford Monument was any kind of real likeness, suggesting that the original, a man holding a woollack, was probably closer to what William of Stratford actually looked like. This was partly based on the apparent death mask of William, digitally enhanced. The Droeshout engraving is full of oddities, but since he was otherwise very good, these are probably purposeful. Engravers always worked from paintings or drawings: where are the original paintings of Shakespeare? Lynda reviewed some of the images brought forward in the past, and showed how they all have problems. The newest claimant, the Cobbe portrait, is either a copy of the Janssen or its original. Lynda demonstrated how this attribution also fails.

Helen Gordon

The last talk of the day was by Helen Gordon, who argued that Henry Wriothesley, 3rd Earl of Southampton, was the “love child” of Oxford and Elizabeth. She felt the evidence was strongly against the so-called Prince Tudor 2 theory that Oxford was himself the son of the Queen. Shakespeare’s *Sonnets* suggest that the 3rd Earl of Southampton was his son by Elizabeth.

Friday, October 19

Annual Meeting of the Shakespeare Oxford Society. Later the Board of Trustees elected John Hamill President of the Society.

Jennifer Newton

After the meeting, the program for the day began. Jennifer Newton introduced her new website, The Shakespeare Underground (www.theshakespeareunderground.com). It currently contains podcast interviews with Bonner Cutting, Tom Regnier, Earl Showerman, Sabrina Feldman, and Richard Whalen. More are planned.

Sabrina Feldman

Sabrina Feldman asked: “Did William Shakespeare write the Shakespeare Apocrypha?” And by “William Shakespeare” Sabrina meant Will Shaksper of Stratford. There were many plays published in Elizabethan times under the name “William Shakespeare” or “WS” which are not currently felt to be by the author of the First Folio (plus, to some extent, *Pericles*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and maybe *Edward III*).

The London Prodigal, *The History of Thomas Lord Cromwell*, *The Yorkshire Tragedy*, *Sir John Oldcastle*, *The Puritan*, and *Lochrine*, were published in the Third Folio of 1664. Others, such as *Mucedorus*, *Fair Em*, and *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* were published only in quarto form. Other plays seemed to be either early forms or derivative forms of canonical plays, e.g., *King Leir* and *The Taming of A Shrew*.

Feldman argued that these plays all share a similar literary style and were actually written by William Shaksper of Stratford. The canonical plays were authored by someone else. (She actually favors Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, although this attribution was not part of her talk). Feldman's ideas are elucidated in her book, *The Apocryphal William Shakespeare* (2012).

Roger Stritmatter

Roger Stritmatter repeated the talk he gave last April at Concordia. An extensively annotated copy of the 1563 edition of Seneca has surfaced. Roger is investigating whether the annotator can be shown to be de Vere. Since Seneca is a well-known source for several of the Shakespeare plays, this annotated copy could join the Geneva Bible as evidence for Oxford's authorship.

Lunch with Michael York

At lunch we welcomed a special guest, the actor Michael York, an outspoken advocate for de Vere and a signatory of the Declaration of Reasonable Doubt. He was given a "Lifetime Achievement Award" from our two societies. Mr York thanked the conference graciously and urged us to continue our quest for the truth.

Earl Showerman

Earl Showerman spoke on Shakespeare's medical knowledge, an expanded version of his presentation last April at Concordia. Shakespeare often describes death and near-death, resuscitation, infectious disease (mostly syphilis), mental illness, toxicology, and the ongoing battle, in Elizabethan times, between the Galen tradition and the new Paracelcian approach. He was well versed in the medical knowledge of his day, something that Edward de Vere was well positioned to acquire.

Don Rubin

Don Rubin spoke about the difficulties he encountered when he proposed a course on the Shakespeare Authorship Question at York University, Toronto. It was finally approved and turned out to a big success, including a final, one-day public conference on the topic.

John Hamill

Who was the Rival Poet of the sonnets? John provided evidence that it was Robert Devereux,

2nd Earl of Essex. Henry Wriothesley, 3rd Earl of Southampton was of course the Fair Youth. Essex and Southampton were always together and were involved with each other (and with others in the Essex Circle) in homosexual relationships.

Michael Dunn

On a lighter note, Michael Dunn, filling in for Alan Green, performed a brilliantly revised version of his one-man show, Charles Dickens on the Authorship Question. It was well performed, hilarious and enthusiastically received.

Sylvia Holmes

Following Michael Dunn, Sylvia Holmes and three choral singers performed songs from Elizabethan times. They were accompanied by Betzi Roe, daughter of Richard and Jane, and four of her teenage dance students. The songs and dances were well received.

Last Will. & Testament

After a break for private dinners attendees carpooled to the Beckman Institute at Caltech to see a showing of *Last Will. & Testament*. It was given a great reception, and was followed by a short Q and A with the directors, Laura and Lisa Wilson.

Saturday, October 20

Annual Meeting of the Shakespeare Fellowship. Tom Regnier was elected President.

Lisa and Laura Wilson

The twin sisters discussed some outtakes from *Last Will. & Testament*. They also showed montages, with music, of the set of *Anonymous*, the locations in England used in their film, Stratford-Upon-Avon, rare portraits of Looney, and several original letters by Edward de Vere. We also saw some outtakes from the film, including expanded versions of interviews used in the final movie. There were also clips of Earl Showerman and Roland Emmerich, who don't appear at all in the final version, and some of the 1997 interview Lisa and Laura did with Charlton Ogburn, Jr.

Bonner Cutting

Bonner Cutting spoke about the large painting by Van Dyck of the family of Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, at Wilton House. It shows

him sitting next to his countess and surrounded by his children and their spouses. The question is, which of the two countesses is the one in the picture: Pembroke's first wife, Susan Vere (daughter of Edward de Vere), or his second wife, Lady Anne Clifford? The official catalog of Wilton House identifies her as Lady Anne, but Bonner presented evidence that it is really the first wife, Susan Vere, who was already dead at the time the painting was done.

Bonner postulates that the reason for Susan Vere's being "written out" of the painting is that the family wanted to distance itself from Edward de Vere. Bonner believes that Susan Vere was the conduit that supplied her father's manuscripts to the Herbert brothers and Ben Jonson for the First Folio.

Jack Shuttleworth

Jack has completed his work on the Oxfordian edition of *Hamlet*. He noted seven quotations showing Oxford's imprint. Jack did not focus on the play's "biographical" elements, but instead on the use of rare words from Montaigne (who was well known to de Vere), detailed allusions to travel, the pirate incident, and the unusual ending when Hamlet speaks to Horatio.

Tony Pointon

Keynote Speaker Tony Pointon, author of *The Man Who Was Never Shakespeare*, talked about Ben Jonson and his relationship to and with Shakespeare. Jonson never really knew the man from Stratford as the author of the plays and was the primary instigator of the "First Folio hoax." Some of his earlier references to "Shakespeare" were to the author, but not to Shakspeare. His famous six signatures were really written by a clerk in a "disguised hand," a known practice at the time, in which persons needing to sign a document can then swear that a "signature" is theirs.

Cheryl Eagan-Donovan

Cheryl Eagan-Donovan, is still looking for funding to finish her documentary, *Nothing Truer Than Truth*. After some remarks about homophobia at Harvard and some of the professors and theater people she approached to appear in her film, Cheryl treated us to a 45-minute rough-cut version of its opening. It seems like it will be very nice when it is fully finished. The part we saw dealt with de Vere's trip to Venice

and how the city would have appeared in those days.

Katherine Chiljan

Katherine noted that before the First Folio came out in 1623, references to the author Shakespeare, though cryptic, were of someone who wrote anonymously or with a pen name, was of high social status, worked in the 1570s and 80s and was dead by 1609. She argued that the First Folio was an orchestrated hoax by the Herbert brothers and Ben Jonson to "reinvent" Shakespeare as a "rare and accomplished monster" (a phrase used by Jonson in *Every Man in His Humor*), meaning an individual of unexplained "natural genius." This was done by combining a made-up picture of Shakespeare to act as an "icon," plus ambiguous praises in the Preface to the Folio. These were all written by Jonson (although purportedly by Hemmings and Condell). Katherine thinks the idea was hatched ca. 1615 and may even have already begun with the attempt to make Shakespeare appear to be the author of *A Funeral Elegy* (1612, now attributed to John Ford) and, like the epistle attached to the 1609 quarto of *Troilus and Cressida* ("A Never Writer to an Ever Reader") to convince people that Shakespeare was still alive in 1609.

John Shahan

The final talk was by John Shahan with a suggestive strategy to engage the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust. The SBT is planning a book to explain why they believe there is no legitimacy to the Authorship Question and we will need a response to it.

Rose Bruce

The last day of the conference began with a fun talk by Rose Bruce a high-school student. She is interested in astrology and she talked about its history and how important it was in Elizabethan times. Oxford was probably involved in astrology since he likely knew John Dee and was associated with Raleigh's School of Night.

Rose then showed us a detailed horoscope for Edward de Vere (taking his birthday as April 12, 1550, corrected for what it would be in the Gregorian calendar). It was very detailed and I could not understand much of what she said (she promised to send me her PowerPoint presentation). de Vere was a Taurus with Sagittarius rising and thus ruled by Jupiter. This

indicates a strong aspect of divine genius. He is also strong in his 9th house (literary), the 6th house (mental power and personal magnetism) and the 5th house (creativity). His main weakness (I'm not sure in which house) indicates a weakness in money matters and fickleness.

Rose said that she has also done charts for Shakspeare, Queen Elizabeth and others to see what interpersonal relationships might exist, but she will save discussion on these for a later talk.

During the question period she was asked if she had looked at a chart for someone born around June, 1548 (when Oxford would have had to be born if he was the secret child of Queen Elizabeth and Thomas Seymour). Rose said she had done this and it showed someone much less lacking in creativity and mental power.

Lance Fogan

Lance Fogan, a retired neurologist, spoke on Neurology in Shakespeare. This was well done, confirming what Earl had told us on Friday. Interestingly, the Detroit Medical and Library Society published an article in 1893 saying that Shakespeare must have been a neurologist.

Dr. Fogan listed many references in the works of Shakespeare to epilepsy, memory, spinal deformity, headache, muscle cramps, deafness, and other neurologic-type diseases (including the neurologic symptoms of advanced syphilis). He also told us that doctors with other medical specialties have published articles about Shakespeare's knowledge of their particular fields.

Unlike Earl, Dr. Fogan did not really go into how Shakespeare could have acquired this knowledge and experience (a lot easier to explain when we know he is Oxford).

Tom Regnier

Tom Regnier on Shakespeare's use of law is always fascinating. In this case he concentrated on *The Merchant of Venice* and *Measure for Measure* and how they show the distinction between Law and Equity (strict legalism vs. the "spirit of the law"). This theme can be seen in Act V of *Merchant* (the rings), not only in the trial scene.

I hope that Tom will be able to come to our joint conference next year and do this talk again. We are planning a day trip to see one or two plays at Stratford, Ontario, including *The*

Merchant of Venice and *Measure for Measure*.

James Ulmer

James Ulmer did a very nice survey of how Shakespeare has been handled by Hollywood over the years. He showed clips from movies, including *Hamlet 2000*, Baz Luhrman's *Romeo and Juliet*, the recent *Coriolanus*, a silent movie (the first Shakespeare film made) of *King John*, the 1935 version of *Midsummer Night's Dream* (with Mickey Rooney as Puck), a 1936 *Romeo and Juliet*, *Looking for Richard* (Al Pacino), the 1942 *To Be or Not to Be* (with Jack Benny), Olivier's *Hamlet*, *Richard III*, and *Henry V*, Kenneth Branough's *Henry V* and *Hamlet*, Ian McKellen's *Richard III*, Zefereilli's *Taming of the Shrew* (with Elizabeth Taylor and Richard Burton), his *Romeo and Juliet*, and *West Side Story*, Trevor Nunn's *Twelfth Night* (with Ben Kingsley as Feste), Orson Wells' *Othello* and *Chimes at Midnight*, *My Private Idaho* and finally the 2010 Stratford, Ontario production of *The Tempest* with Christopher Plummer.

James briefly talked about each of these films (and others as well that he didn't show us) along with his critical comments (he is a professional film columnist and critic). It was very well received.

Awards Banquet Lunch

The Oxfordian of the Year Award went to John Shahan for his work with the Shakespeare Authorship Coalition and the Declaration of Reasonable Doubt.

Media Panel

The conference finished up with a media panel, made up of James Ulmer, Jennifer Newton, Cheryl Eagan-Donovan, and Michael Dunn, on how we can use the new digital and media-oriented age to get our message out. Some interesting ideas were brought up.

This conference will certainly be remembered as one of our best. There seems to be much hope for the future

**The Next Conference
Will be Held in
Toronto, Canada.**



Shakespeare Oxford Society

Have You Renewed Your Membership for 2013?

Membership in the Shakespeare Oxford Society is on a calendar-year basis. The address label on this newsletter's mailing envelope shows when your current membership expires. If it says EXP 12/31/2012, you haven't renewed (as of January 21, 2013). *If you haven't yet renewed, please do so now!* Renew **online** at www.shakespeare-oxford.com or by **mail**, on this form or a photocopy.

Membership Renewal and Donation Form 2013

Name: _____

Street: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Country: _____

Email: _____

Membership Categories (check one) Basic memberships include the Newsletter; the other categories include both the Newsletter and The Oxfordian research journal.

- Basic (\$50 US/Canada; \$65 foreign)
 Regular (\$65 US/Canada; \$80 foreign)
 Family (\$100 US/Canada; \$115 foreign) Name of Additional Family Member: _____
 Student (Basic) (\$30 US/Canada; \$45 foreign) Student's School: _____
 Sponsor (\$125 US/Canada; \$140/foreign) *
 Contributor (\$250 US/Canada/foreign) *
 Patron (\$500 US/Canada/foreign) *
 Benefactor (\$1000+ US/Canada/foreign) *

* Includes a tax-deductible donation for the amount paid in excess of the *Regular Membership* of \$65.

- Yes, I would like to make a tax deductible donation of \$ _____

Total Payment Amount \$ _____ [] Check enclosed [] Visa [] MasterCard
[] Amex

Card Number _____ Exp. Date _____

Name on Card _____

Signature _____

Telephone _____

Please mail to Shakespeare Oxford Society, PO Box 808, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598-0808