

SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY

NEWSLETTERS

1976



110 Glen Argyle Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21212

IN MEMORIAM RICHARD C. HORNE, JR.

It is with great sadness that I report the passing on March 28 of the Society's President of longstanding, RICHARD C. HORNE, JR. in Washington, D.C. Mr. Horne had entered the Marsalle Convalescent Center in that city the previous week after intermittent illness from the beginning of the year. He has been President of the Shakespeare Oxford Society since the death in 1965 of the previous President, Francie Carmody. Mr. Horne's contribution to the Oxfordian cause, during a distinguished and manifold career as attorney, scholar, and quondam senior warden of the Falle Church in Virginia, is incalculable. A man of enormous zeal and energy, up to his final illnesses, Mr. Horne had acquired a prodigious knowledge of the Shakespearean authorship question, made frequent trips to England to pursue research and to recruit interested parties into his cherished belief that the true Shakespeare was to be found in the person of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford. He also acted as a humorous and good-natured gadfly to his many friends in the orthodox camp, particularly at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, where Mr. Horne was a frequent visitor and where he was allowed the freedom of its vast resources. His many talents in these directions will be sorely missed.

Mr. Horne's stewardship of the Shakespeare Oxford Society could best be described as single-handed. I doubt that any one person in our organization could combine the legal, financial, administrative, and investigative functions he could fulfill so ably during his term of office, and, for the Society to survive, the principle of "division of labor" must now be applied in generous helpings. It has fallen upon me, by request of Mr. Horne's son, Richard C. Horne, III, to gather up the Society's records and library, of which I have been custodian in part for the last year and a half. Mrs. Cyr and myself would welcome any suggestions from members about the future goals and directions of our organization. The next issue of the Newsletter will carry, among other things, a call for some kind of convocation of the membership to decide some of these vital matters, as well as to elect new officers. Any suggestions or voluntary offers along these lines will be more than gratefully received. I realize that we are all in the same boat as to time we can wrench from our busy schedules and careers to devote to such an avocation, but if the issue of the authorship of the world's greatest literature means anything to us at all, now is the time to stand up and be counted.

Sincerely Yours for E. Ver,

Gordon C. Cyr
President Pro Tem
and
Editor, Newsletter



110 Glen Argyle Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21212

EDITOR'S NOTE

Since the unfortunate death of Mr. Richard C. Horne, Jr. last March (announced in the Special Issue of the Newsletter in April, "In Memoriam Richard C. Horne, Jr."), Mrs. Cyr and I have been occupied principally in the necessary legal and financial steps to insure continuity of our Society's administration. To that end, we made a trip in April to Mr. Horne's Washington D.C. apartment (now occupied by his sister Dorothy Horne, who had lived with him there for many years), packed up all the files and papers we could find and carted them back to Baltimore, where we are engaged in the extremely slow process of sifting through, weeding out, and organizing the (approximately) ten cartons' worth of material.

The immediate goals of the Shakespeare Oxford Society, as I see them, include a National Conference to determine our long-range objectives and to elect new officers (see article immediately following), a cooperative approach to the Shakespearean Authorship Society of England (a very valuable source of Oxfordian and anti-Stratfordian research) and other anti-Stratfordian organizations, and a concerted media assault on the citadels of orthodoxy.

Mrs. Cyr and I are planning on a European trip this summer, of which the British leg will consist of meeting with British members of our own Society as well as with members of the Shakespearean Authorship Society to pursue both the second goal outlined above and any investigative leads developed by our former President. Other aspects and activities of the Society are described in various articles below.

Gordon C. Cyr, President pro tem.

S.O.S. FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE 1976

Since the death of former President R.C. Horne, Jr., the Society is being run on a temporary basis with the following officers: Gordon C. Cyr, President pro tem; Helen W. Cyr, Secretary and Treasurer; Dr. Francis G. Horne, Vice President; S. Colum Gilfillan, Vice President; H.W. Patience, Secretary, English branch. The last four of those named held the same titles while Mr. Horne was alive,

and the first (appointed by Mr. Horne as Editor of the Newsletter) held the present title for a few months in 1974 during one of Mr. Horne's illnesses.

As mentioned in our Special Issue, most of our organization's functions were handled by Mr. Horne himself, so that the roster previously listed was largely pro forma. To insure the Society's survival,

a meeting of all (or of as many as possible) members is needed to 1) elect new officers, 2) decide on future goals of the Society, 3) determine priorities for research into further evidence on the authorship of Shakespeare's poems and plays, and 4) develop recruitment tactics for new members and combat strategy on obscurantist orthodoxy. The overall policy of the Shakespeare Oxford Society needs a re-assessment, and input from members is extremely necessary at this critical time. All this is best achieved, we believe, through a face-to-face convocation of our membership.

A questionnaire is enclosed for your return in which you should indicate your preferences for: 1) the time of the conference, 2) its location, 3) the number of days duration. The fourth question asks of your intentions to attend the conference. The preference offered in the first three questions are necessarily limited, and the remainder of this article is devoted to our rationale for such limits.

For legal reasons, the conference must be held before December of this year, and the summer months are not recommended -- at least in any eastern or Midwestern environment. This leaves the three autumn months of (late) September, October, and November. The desirability of an eastern site is to be found in the geographical distribution of S.O.S. membership: West - 14 members; Midwest - 12; North East - 31; South - 21. As to the last category, the heaviest concentration of members is to be found in Maryland (3), the District of Columbia (5), and Virginia (5) -- all on the Atlantic Seaboard -- with other Southern states having one or two members at most. For a location, then, midway between the North East and South East, the three principal cities of the Washington - New York corridor (excluding New York City itself because of its high conference costs) have been proposed for your preference.

Without attempting unduly to "push" our own location, we might recommend Baltimore for its relatively less expensive hotels,

its wealth of historical associations, and its charming restaurants -- some of which are second to none in more highly-publicized "restaurant towns," such as New York or Washington, D.C. Mrs. Cyr would also be able to offer meeting room facilities at the Enoch Pratt Free Library, where she is head of the Audio-Visual Department. Washington is not a great distance from Baltimore (about a one-hour drive) and contains, of course, the Folger Shakespeare Library only a stone's throw from the great Library of Congress.

The number of days such a conference should last is listed for your preference in Question #3. We are aware that S.O.S. members are people with busy careers and probably cannot afford to spend as much as a week. If the maximum of three days were the majority option, the conference would most likely take place Friday through Saturday, unless a great number of specifications for another arrangement were expressed.

Please return your completed questionnaire at your earliest convenience.

SHAKESPEARE CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Editor's note: S.O.S. member Russell des Cognets attended three days of the Second International Shakespeare Association Congress held at the Statler-Hilton in Washington April 19-25. The following is Mr. des Cognets' report in part.

Though final decisions would come in the last three-day section of the six-day meet, during my attendance at the first three-day section the rumor was heard that the Third Congress might be stepped up to a three-year interval (from five) and likely would be held in England or Germany, depending perhaps on where the necessary \$50,000 could be found... At this first section I learned that registration of 800 had exceeded all expectations, at a charge of \$25 for three days, or \$40 for the full week, plus more for certain extras as plays, films, etc. Several lovely receptions for the delegates were given. I talked with

Shakespeare scholars and buffs from South Africa, Australia, Germany, Canada, and most numerous from Great Britain, plus our own U.S.A. Additionally, there were considerable students from everywhere, along with hobbyist devotees such as myself. A noted layman was Barry Bingham, owner of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

During the first three-day section, the most sensitive and perceptive (to me) of the various speakers were:

Monday - Alistair Cooke
 Tuesday - Dame Helen Gardner, University of Oxford
 Robert Arnstein, Case Western Reserve University
 Alvin B. Kernan, Princeton University
 L.C. Knights, University of Cambridge
 The Honorable Lord Hailsham, Former Lord Chancellor of England
 Joel Hurstfield, historian

Wednesday - This day's program left me cold. One of my objectives in attending, besides the sheer pleasure of soaking up more about the works of the great Genius, was to see in person and get a word in with some of the great names and scholars in the Shakespeare field. This I did. But perhaps my main purpose in going was to see whether I could gain any converts or disciples to our Oxfordian cause in this very dense Shakespearean scholarship. Indeed I found considerable open minds among many with whom I spoke and found a great deal more fellow ground ready to be seeded with some sensible circumstantial and proven evidence as against the weak and incredible evidence now propped up by the hierarchy at the Summit. I gave out some dozen of our Harvard Magazine containing the famous article on Shakespeare by Charlton Ogburn, Jr. to top scholars and leaders, or especially interested persons, who seemed receptive in prior conversations. They now have a collector's item -- if they knew it! It is my hope especially that we can stay in

touch with the many fine scholars such as these, who are flexible, inquiring, and dissatisfied with the dogma as long as there are still stones unturned, and that in months to come, perhaps we can gain their support for our Shakespeare Oxford Society and Cause.

QUIPS AND QUIDDITIES

Just received from S.O.S. member RHODA MESSNER of Cleveland, Ohio: a copy of her 1975 biographical novel of the 17th Earl of Oxford, entitled Absent Thee from Felicity. On our initial perusal, the book looks like a fine job. Oxfordians will surely wish to purchase this novel, which is published by Corinthian Press, Shaker Heights, Ohio.... The President pro tem met with two members of the Shakespeare Oxford Society in May: MICHAEL STEINBACH, M.D. of Palo Alto, California and CRAIG HUSTON (author of The Shakespeare Authorship Question, Dorrance, Philadelphia, 1971) in Philadelphia's Cricket Club, where Mr. Huston is a member...An article on Los Angeles member S. COLUM CILFILLAN and his support of the Oxfordian hypothesis has been published in the University of California at Los Angeles' student newspaper, the Daily Bruin, in the issue of April 14, 1976. This received prominent space as a page one feature and should prove valuable in acquainting students with some of our cause's more important evidence. Unfortunately the effect was somewhat vitiated by a "rebuttal" from the University's resident Shakespeare "authority," Prof. David Rhodes, whom the paper paraphrases to the effect that Shakespeare was "known to have had a fine education at the Stratford Grammar School" and is quoted as saying, "though he left there at age 16, he received the modern equivalent today of a masters in classics from Harvard"(!). This last elicited from our Society's President pro tem a letter to the Bruin's editor, which was published in its entirety in the May 10 issue! This will be discussed in detail in our next issue.

OXFORDIANS AS SCHOLARS
by Helen Cyr

The forthcoming national meeting of S.O.S. and the need for reassessment of work and goals that necessarily follows an organization's loss of leader prompt some reflections on the status of Oxfordian scholarship. At such a conference I would like to suggest that promotion of the authorship question and the recruitment of new members (hopefully young and from the academic world) be considered as primary matters for effort, but, unfortunately, there is a major difficulty that has to be overcome before we can proceed.

A recent rereading of a sizable quantity of anti-Stratfordian literature reminds me that zealous Oxfordians, often swept away with enthusiasm, are abandoning the careful language of scholarship in favor of the "is's," "was's," and other manifestations of fact in unwarranted cases. We certainly think Oxford was in some way involved in the writing of Shakespeare's works. We know that the evidence one would expect to find in support of the Stratford Shakespeare as author is oddly missing. We even feel we know why there is a Shakespeare problem. However, we still have to prove all these things positively. At present there are all hypotheses--strong ones at that--but the use of language that declares Oxford as proven author merely draws laughter from Shakespearean scholars. Granted, the latter frequently make silly, unfounded statements, but because they are of "the Establishment" they can get away with it. We can't. In order to win even their grudging respect and perhaps entice a few professors with open, questioning minds to join with us in our search for new facts, we must have a performance standard that is not just as good as that of our antagonists, but better.

If we ourselves demonstrate impeccable methods, we will be in a superior arguing position to point out their faulty statements which abound, despite the many "presumed to have been's," "undoubtedly's" and other expressions of conjecture that must rightly pass for fact in the many pages produced by the Shakespeare indus-

try. In fact, there are so many examples of careless investigation among the professors of Shakespearean orthodoxy that one wonders if their training ever involved the basic principles of evidence and research methodology. Has the competition for prestige and career building been so great and the facts so few that we're now in a state of "anything goes"? If not, why do such professors continue to form premature conclusions, mistake hypotheses for fact, ignore evidence contrary to their opinions, contain their thinking within a limited framework and without the open-mindedness required for scientific analysis, fail to seek all the pertinent facts and mistakes coincidence for cause-and-effect?

It would be wonderful if the intelligence of readers no longer had to be imposed upon by inaccurate declarations such as "he (Shakespeare) went to the excellent school at Stratford-on-Avon," "although Shakespeare did not seek the publication of his plays, publication came anyway," "before the year was out, Chettle makes his famous apology to Shakespeare," "yet the Groats-worth of Witte contains--no question--a desperate shaft directed at Shakespeare," "the new fact to be reckoned with is that the Sonnets are concentrated within a period of little more than three years." (Sources mercifully are withheld to spare embarrassment to their originators but are available upon request.)

I hope we will take care not to utter similar misjudgments, even if we've occasionally "slipped" in the past. I would even suggest that the time has come for both sides of the authorship question to declare a truce--even an uneasy one--built on a common acceptance of reasonable research standards and criteria for scientific reporting so that together we can hunt for new information or take a fresh look at old facts. Perhaps this can become one of the immediate objectives of S.O.S.

In the next issue I plan to discuss the details of specific research proposals submitted by members. If you have any to be considered, please mail them right away.

* * * *

BOOK REVIEW

"Shakespeare" Identified in Edward de Vere Seventeenth Earl of Oxford and The Poems of Edward de Vere. By J. Thomas Looney. 3rd edition (2 volumes), Ruth Loyd Miller, editor. Kennikat Press, 1975. \$35.

As Oxfordians doubtless know, it was a Gateshead schoolmaster, J. Thomas Looney, who originated the idea that the poetical Earl of Oxford was the author of Shakespeare's works. Mr. Looney's theory was first made public in 1920 with the first edition of "Shakespeare" Identified published by Cecil Palmer, a London enthusiast for the Shakespearean authorship controversy. The author had been impressed by the agnostic views of Sir George Granville Greenwood, distinguished lawyer and Member of Parliament, who in The Shakespeare Problem Restated (John Lans, 1908) and several subsequent works delivered a devastating critique to Stratfordianism. In Greenwood's day, the reigning candidate for skeptics of the orthodox attribution was Francis Bacon (whom Sir George wisely refrained from espousing), whose credentials have been pretty well demolished by the faithful, although they have left untouched the numerous objections to Stratfordianism. From the Shakespeare works themselves, Greenwood developed a picture of the author as a cultured aristocrat, one with probable close connections to the throne.

Looney proceeded from Greenwood's assumptions with no initial idea who the object of his search might be. Looney proposed a list of characteristics of personality to which "Shakespeare" through his writings appeared to conform, and he made a separate search for lyric poetry resembling the verse patterns of Shakespeare's earliest published poetry. Mr. Looney then planned to investigate the biographies of any authors he could find which might conform to his list of personality characteristics.

The result was the book presently under review in which the details of Looney's search are laid out in one of the most fascinating true adventure stories of the mind to have taken place in this century.

Looney's logic is so compelling that most anti-Stratfordians have adhered to his Oxfordian theory since his book's publication. But once having announced his candidate, Looney did little to advance the cause other than a subsequent publication of all of the known poetry of Edward de Vere, in which are included certain poems of unknown authorship for which he gives persuasive reasons for assigning them to Oxford. Looney was also one of the founders of the original Shakespeare Fellowship in England (with Greenwood as first, honorary, president) which at first accepted all candidates for Shakespearean authorship, but became in the 1930's devoted almost exclusively to the Oxford (or Oxford-Derby) cause. (The Shakespeare Fellowship is really the parent of our own Society as well as of the English Shakespearean Authorship Society which has gone back to the Fellowship's original objects and admitted anti-Stratfordians of all persuasions.)

This late Charles Wisner Barrell (see Newsletter, Fall/Winter 1975-76), an officer in the American Shakespeare Fellowship, was responsible for a second edition of "Shakespeare" Identified by Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1949. That edition contained some of Barrell's own invaluable research which further strengthened the case for de Vere. Both of the editions are now out of print.

Ruth Miller's new third edition in two volumes has been in the planning stages for half a decade, along with her new editions of three other Oxfordian classics mentioned in the last (regular) Newsletter. The importance of Mrs. Miller's own contribution to this indispensable work extends far beyond that of a mere re-issue. Even if you are among those few lucky Oxfordians who own a first or second edition of Looney's masterpiece, you'll want to own a copy of this third edition, even at the otherwise deterrent price tag of thirty-five dollars, and members are hereby advised to donate this book to their local or college libraries (and count this as a deduction on their Income Tax), or to persuade libraries to buy a copy with

their standard discount.

For this new edition includes — in one handy place — most of the research done in Oxford's cause since Mr. Looney's first book. In fact, Volume I comprises both Looney works: "Shakespeare" Identified and The Poems of Edward de Vere, as well as valuable appendices on the chronology of Oxford's life and on sources for The Tempest. In his own appendix, Looney, accepting the orthodox late date for that play's authorship, argues against Shakespeare having had a hand in its composition. Mrs. Miller gives excellent reasons for believing the play was written much earlier than the orthodox believe, and that Shakespeare need not have relied on the famous 1609 Strachey letter in order to have had first-hand knowledge of Bermuda storms (a point also well made by Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn, Jr. in Shakespeare: The Man Behind the Name, Morrow, 1962.)

It would stretch permissible space to detail the contents of Volume II, subtitled "Oxfordian Vistas." The editor has pulled together vast areas of research heretofore only to be found in generally unavailable Shakespeare Fellowship Newsletters (American).

One of the more fascinating stories related in the second volume is the portrait evidence developed by C.W. Barrell in 1939. In the January 1940 Scientific American magazine, Barrell's infra-red and X-ray photography of the "Ashbourne" portrait was given excellent coverage, but for reasons of space his parallel evidence for the "Janssen" and "Hampton Court" portraits was barely mentioned. Here there is a summary of his findings on all three putative "Shakespeare" portraits, accompanied by gorgeous color reproductions. (This edition's manifold color illustrations of extremely high quality are alone worth the asking price!) Following the portrait evidence is "The Ashbourne Goes to Court" (p. 419), a description of the suit for libel and slander Barrell initiated in 1948 against Dr. Giles Dawson, then an official of the Folger Library, who in a letter accused Barrell of doc-

umenting the "Ashbourns" negatives. Barrell retained Charlton Ogburn, Sr., legal counsel for the Shakespeare Fellowship (and father of the well-known author Charlton Ogburn, Jr.), who successfully defied several defense attempts to get the case dismissed. (Ogburn's name is strangely omitted in the editor's description of his role.)

It is a fair heartbreak for Oxfordians that this case never came to court. For the terms in which Barrell settled the case have allowed Dr. Dawson and later Folger officials several loopholes in their persistent contention since now that the original sitter for the "Ashbourne" portrait "cannot be identified" (!) In addition to other Barrell research in this new edition, there is an essay Mr. Barrell wrote before his death last summer on the pregnant silence of Dr. John Hall, Shakespeare's son-in-law, whose only comment on his famous relative was that the latter "died last Thursday."

It would be less than candid to imply that this publication is without flaws. Far from it. There are several annoying and confusing typographical errors. It is also clear that some of the latest (and best) evidence in orthodox scholarship has been ignored, e.g. the editor's statement on p. 344 (V.II) describing the play, The True Tragedy..., "...staunch Stratfordians maintain is not a Shakespearean play at all." Most Shakespeare scholars today regard both Contention plays as "bed quartos" of the Henry VI trilogy.

But all such errors added together do not detract from the overwhelming virtues of this new edition, and the Newsletter editor unhesitatingly recommends that all Oxfordians purchase it immediately.

G.C.C.

GOOD NEWS!

"An Oxfordian Reply to Two Harvard Professors," whose availability as a reprint was advertised in the May Herford Magazine, is receiving many requests.



110 Glen Argyle Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21212

EDITOR'S NOTE

The most important item of the Shakespeare Oxford Society's business is the National Conference this fall, details of which see below. We are awaiting shipment from Kennikat Press of Eva Turner Clark's Hidden Allusions in Shakespeare's Plays, the second in Ruth Loyd Miller's valuable series of re-issued Oxfordian classics, and our review of this will appear in our next issue. Meanwhile, we have substituted a review of Rhoda Messner's novel, Absent Thee from Felicity, and an order blank is included with this issue.

In order to devote more space in this issue to conference plans and projects, the promised discussion (in our last issue) of the UCLA Daily Bruin article on S.O.S. member S. Colum Gilfillan and attendant correspondence has been deferred until our Fall Newsletter.

In our last issue, the name of our English branch's vice-president was inadvertently omitted. He is Col. Ian Keelan, and his position was mentioned by Mr. Horne in the Newsletter of Winter-Spring 1975, page 3. The Newsletter regrets the error.

Gordon C. Cyr,
President pro tem.

CONFERENCE 1976

In the last issue of the Newsletter, the plan to hold the S.O.S.'s first national conference was announced, and subsequently a questionnaire was supplied to U.S. members for purposes of specifying their preference as to time, length, and location of the conference. Here are the results of the survey: 18 members plan to attend; 8 members indicate "maybe" they can attend; 7 members responded but do not plan to attend.

Several people indicated more than one preference for the city location. Baltimore won out over other locations whether we counted all responses or only those by persons definitely planning to attend the meeting. There were at least two write-ins — Norfolk, VA and San Francisco, CA. Washington, D.C. came in second, and Philadelphia (the much-publicized site of a recent "mystery illness") was third. A two-day time period was the top preference of respondents with the one-day and three-day choices in second and third places, respectively.

After a careful review of all possibilities suggested and a few compromises, we are announcing the following conference plans.

THE FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE
SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY

Saturday, September 25 - Sunday, September 26, 1976
With Pre-Conference Session, Friday, September 24, 1976

LORD BALTIMORE HOTEL
Baltimore and Hanover Ste.
Baltimore, Md. 21202
(301) 539-8400

(The Lord Baltimore Hotel is an old but recently renovated, superior hotel, conveniently located in downtown Baltimore across the street from the Hilton Hotel and two blocks from a large branch of the Holiday Inn for those who prefer other accommodations.)

Special Conference Room Rate: *
\$22 singles
\$28 twin or double

*Please mention the Shakespeare Oxford Society Conferences in your letter of request for room reservation in order to get special rate.

Suggested Agenda

(Details subject to change according to the wishes of the majority attending the meeting.)

All Meetings in Maryland Room

- | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|---|
| September 24 | 7:30 P.M. | PRE-CONFERENCE/MEMBERS FORUM |
| | | An open session for getting acquainted in which position papers submitted by absent members along with the points of view, concerns and suggestions of members present will be shared. |
| September 25 | 9:00 A.M. | CALL TO ORDER; Greetings by Gordon Cyr, President Pro Tem; Election of Preceding Conference Chairperson |
| | 9:30 A.M. -
12:00 NOON | THE FRAMEWORK OF S.O.S.
A working session in which proposed goals for S.O.S. are matched with suggestions for new by-laws to support the work of S.O.S. Includes selection of by-laws committee to write revision of S.O.S. constitution after the conference. |
| | 12:00 NOON -
2:00 P.M. | Lunch |
| | 2:00 P.M. -
5:30 P.M. | PROGRAM SESSION |

Brief addresses and discussion of

- "The Amherst Case"
- "The Shakespeare TV Series: What To Do?"
- "Our English Friends: The S.O.S. Branch and the Shakespearean Authorship Society"
- "New Techniques for Analysis of Over-Painting", Special Guest Speaker

September 25 5:30 P.M. - Dinner
(Continued) 7:30 P.M.

7:30 P.M. - BUSINESS MEETING
10:00 P.M.

Nominations of officers (Ballots will be mailed to all members immediately following the meeting.) Selections for other posts—directors, committee chairpersons, as needed. Other business.

September 26 9:30 A.M. - FOCUS ON RESEARCH, Part I
12:00 NOON

Talks and Discussion on
--Who Is Doing What?
--What Needs to Be Done?
--New Strategies for Getting Research Done

12:00 NOON - Lunch
1:30 P.M.

1:30 P.M. - FOCUS ON RESEARCH, Part II
3:00 P.M.

Adjournment

Transportation: (Air) Baltimore Washington International Airport (BWI)
Limousine services to Lord Baltimore Hotel

(Train) Via Antrak/Penn Station/10 minutes by city bus or
by cab to Lord Baltimore Hotel

(Bus) Baltimore is served by Greyhound and Continental
Trailways. (The latter is one block from the Lord
Baltimore Hotel.)

Registration: An advance registration form is enclosed.

Fees:

\$5.00 for total conference or
\$3.00 per day

Deadline:
September 20

BOOK REVIEW

Absent Thes from Felicity. By Rhoda Henry Messner. Corinthian Press, 1975. \$7.95.

At the outset of this review, I should perhaps confess to a skepticism toward historical/biographical novels. The genre bristles with difficulties, though this example is fairly successful in avoiding most possible pitfalls.

The primary problem of this kind of fiction is that the novelist is prevented by the impingement of historical facts from creating the world his or her personae inhabit, and in the biographical novel an author is additionally unable to create even the characters. Also, the problem of dialogue engaged in by historical personages from so long ago must be compounded in this instance by what, to this reviewer at least, must be the insurmountable task of imagining how such a one as "Shakespeare" talked! Mrs. Messner wisely avoids recourse to stilted archaisms or attempts at Shakespearean-style dialogue among her characters: the court and literary figures of Elizabeth I's reign with known connections to the Earl of Oxford.

Indeed, Absent Thes from Felicity (the title, of course, derived from Hamlet's dying request to Horatio) is an eminently readable example of this type of fiction, generally well-constructed and, most important, successful in bringing the period alive in an area in which so much necessary data are missing. Mrs. Messner's research into background facts has also been very thorough, and readers will find the book on the whole very informative.

Perhaps the large lacuna of hard facts about "Shakespeare" (responsible for all the horrendous speculation indulged in by orthodox commentators) has been a help to the author here in allowing her

more room to create the "novelist's universe" that is usually denied the historical fictioneer. But if, for this reason, one is allowed to speculate in more regions than normally, why not go "whole hog" and give Shakspeare of Stratford more of a role in this whole episode? That Shakspeare had something to do with the production of "Shakspeare's Worke" is evident from Jonson's patent references to the Stratford man in Every Man Out of His Humour, Poetaster, and, more than possibly, On Poet-Ape. In her interpretation of the so-called "War of the Theatres," Mrs. Messner opts to ascribe Jonson's "Cripinus" (in Poetaster) exclusively to Marston when there is good evidence that Jonson also aims a few barbs in this character at Shakspeare (see Greenwood, The Shakspeare Problem Restated, London, 1908, pp. 459-61), which, if true would make Oxford a less complacent bystander than he appears in the novel. (Also, I do not agree that the Parnassus plays attack or lampoon Jonson, as Mrs. Messner seems to have inferred.) But it is probably true that until we know more about the Stratford Shakspeare's connection with the Lord Chamberlain's Men (or Oxford's own connection for that matter), we will be unable to fathom what the "War of the Theatres" was really all about.

However, Oxfordians should enjoy this novel, and for the reasons mentioned earlier, are urged to buy themselves a copy and have themselves a "good read." Mrs. Messner has graciously agreed to donate \$3.00 to S.O.S. for every purchase made through our organization.

G.C.C.

IN MEMORIAM

ANTHONY WILLIAM DELLER passed away March 18 in Port Jarvis, NY. Mr. Deller was a retired patent attorney, engineer, author and lecturer, as well as a member of innumerable law and fraternal organizations. Mr. Deller was an enthusiastic Oxfordian.

THE WORK OF THE SOCIETY: RESEARCH OR SPECTATOR SPORT?

by Helen Cyr

As promised in the Spring 1976 issue of the Newsletter, this article provides an outline of research proposals, not necessarily in the order of importance, suggested by members. It is hoped that with the approach of the national conference of S.O.S. exposition of these ideas will stimulate thought and discussion about the Society's goals and priorities. Reactions to the following should be sent to the S.O.S. Office prior to September 24 to permit their consideration in the conference proceedings.

PROJECT/ OVER-PAINTING: There are at least three unidentified paintings, formerly and erroneously cited by Shakespearean scholars as representations of "Shakespeare," that are visibly overpainted in certain places even under the scrutiny of the naked eye. In the 1940's Charles Wiener Barrell analyzed these art works with X-ray and infra-red photography. His findings indicated the likelihood that the original works underneath in each case were paintings of the 17th Earl of Oxford. When were these canvases overpainted? Were they overpainted by the same hand in the same period? What traces are there in each that can definitely be ascribed to Edward de Vere? Would the use of the latest techniques under controlled conditions bring out more visible evidence than that available in Barrell's day? Shouldn't we try once and for all to establish the true significance of these paintings?

PROJECT/ PEDIGREE: At present there is study being done in England to trace the pedigree of the paintings described above. As articles in the Shakespearean Authorship Review will attest, there is at present sufficient evidence to suggest that these art works were in private hands throughout the seventeenth century and were in each case associated with people who had some connection with the 17th

Earl of Oxford or his family. Can't we join forces with our English friends to gather the additional evidence to establish the final necessary link? The successful resolution of this and the aforementioned projects would have such impact that perhaps even a few of the orthodox community might be sufficiently intrigued to make further independent investigations of their own.

PROJECT/ ARCHIVES: Many hypotheses abound — certainly too many to cite here — that are concerned with the possible existence of heretofore undiscovered papers that might shed light on the Stratford Shakespeare or the authorship question in general or even on the role of the 17th Earl of Oxford. Who did what and why is still the biggest unanswered question in this mystery. And there are many collections of archives in "mummers rooms" in some of the great English houses that have not been adequately studied, if at all. Can't we select a few of the most promising hypotheses, follow our leads, obtain permission to search through the most likely collections and hire a scholar with appropriate background to do the job? In England several of our colleagues are equipped with the necessary skills, including the ability to read the Elizabethan handwriting styles, Latin, Greek, and the like. Also, there are competent researchers available (for hire) to do such work under our direction.

PROJECT/ COMPUTER: The science of establishing authorship by statistical analysis of word frequency, word usage, sentence length and distinctive language patterns has been greatly improved thanks to the availability of computer programming. Courts of law are now using experts who have developed techniques to ascertain quite convincingly who did or did not compose specific writings. The same techniques have been applied by scholars re-

cently to resolve questions of authorship of past ages, e.g., Chettle's of Groatsworth of Wit to name one recent case. We must marshall our resources to sponsor a comparative analysis of the prose and poetry of Edward de Vere with equivalent work of Shakespeare. Perhaps among our members there are some who have special expertise or who know people in this field who could sponsor such research without recourse to grants-in-aid?

PROJECT/ LORD CHAMBERLAIN: Charles Wisner Barrell, A. Bronson Feldman, and Richard C. Horne, among others, had in recent years been actively seeking documentary proof that the 17th Earl of Oxford was the Lord Chamberlain who was the patron of the acting company who bore that name. The significance of this research is that it would establish a link between Lord Oxford and that group of players (often called "Shakespeare's Company") most intimately connected with the production of Shakespeare's dramas in Elizabeth's reign. Surely this important work should not go to waste. Who will continue these efforts? Shouldn't S.O.S. lend endorsement and backing to any further efforts in this vein?

At our "constitutional convention" we can establish the legal machinery to promote the realization of such projects efficiently and effectively. For whatever we do, we can't continue on our present course. We must organize ourselves to use the individual strengths of S.O.S. members wisely. Some of our people are enthusiastic but inordinately busy with their careers; they may choose to help by contributing funds to the support of specific projects. Others are doing research, but alone and without support make very slow progress. The majority, on the other hand, have neither the resources nor inclination to do research but through their zeal can help in promoting public interest and bringing in new membership — activities which directly support S.O.S.'s vital work. If we are to resolve some of these matters

in our respective lifetimes, no longer can the Society sit on its hands waiting for a few overworked stalwarts to make stabs at our monumental task.

Almost a decade ago Richard C. Horne summed up the situation with his usual humor and high style: "With a few honorable exceptions, from all outward signs, most of our members are Micawbers, waiting 'for something to turn up' to hasten the acceptance of Oxford as Shakespeare, and the rout of the orthodox Stratfordians. This is, of course, a pious wish, but 'wishing won't make it so.' If you are looking for the mass conversion of the English Professors and Literary Critics, or their renunciation of William of Stratford, forget it! They would have to be born again. By 'something' most mean, or hope for, documentary proof. It is a fair assumption that documents do exist which might be persuasive, but wishful thinking that, like the clod in the poem, each document is feeling a stir of might, an instinct that reaches and towers, and groping blindly before it for light, is going to climb to a soul in grass and flowers, is a bit unrealistic after nearly three hundred years of inertness. Some of us believe that they will have to be dug up, by intelligent, persistent, and resourceful research. What can you do to help? Don't let your membership participation turn into a mere spectator sport."

QUIPS AND QUIDDITIES

In the settlement of the late RICHARD C. HORNE, JR.'s estate, his sister DOROTHY HORNE has informed us that a large bequest had been earmarked by Mr. Horne for the Shakespeare Oxford Society ... The S.O.S. Office has been occupied this summer with updating membership forms and literature, and in obtaining a stamp — for all future mailings of our reprint of Enoch Powell's Address to the Shakespeare Club — which properly credits the source of the reprint as the Shakespearean Authorship Review No. 25, as requested by Miss Gwynneth Bowen.



110 Glan Argyle Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21212

EDITOR'S NOTE

Charlton Ogburn, Jr. was elected S.O.S. President at the Society's September conference. Oxfordians who know Ogburn only through his tireless efforts on behalf of the authorship case should be aware that he is the winner of the John Burrows Medal for best writing in natural history and that he is widely esteemed in that field through his The Winter Beach and other books. Just issued is The Adventure of Birds (Morrow), currently enjoying critical acclaim, most notably in the Saturday Review's November 13 issue. President Ogburn's remarks follow.

Gordon C. Cyr, Editor

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

It had been my hope and expectation that direction of the Society's affairs could remain in the hands of the Cyrs—Gordon and Helen, the imperial jointress of this warlike state—on whom the burden had devolved upon Richard C. Horna, Jr.'s death. They insisted, however, not unreasonably, that they could not continue carrying the whole load. Others who better than I could serve the interests of S.O.S. in the presidency were not available. I am thinking especially of Ruth and Minoa Millar, who have been, and continue to be, absorbed in the exhausting and invaluable labor of editing, enlarging upon and republishing the classic Oxford texts in magnificent form. What reconciled me to accepting this honor was the Cyre' agreement to continue as editor of the Newsletter and secretary/treasurer of the Society.

For the present, certainly, the Newsletter's publication must remain the most important of the Society's functions. What can be done in the Newsletter necessarily depends in large part on the size of our membership. A growing membership must continue to be a primary S.O.S. objective. In soliciting new members, what can we offer? They will be kept abreast through the Newsletter of discoveries and developments bearing upon the Shakespeare authorship, and they will have the opportunity through the same agency of making known to others any significant discoveries or activities of their own. They will have the satisfaction of enlisting in, and giving encouragement to, a fellowship disinterestedly concerned to help throw as much light as possible on the origin of our civilization's greatest literary works—not alone on the author's identity but on all that could have accounted for and entered into their creation.

Helen Cyr set forth in the Summer 1976 Newsletter the main directions she felt that research should take, and she was strongly seconded in these by the Board in its September conference. Certainly I heartily concur in these. I might add one other subject: Ben Jonson. References by Shakespeare's contemporaries to the Shakespeare authorship that suggest a human being behind the name—and there are not many—involva Ben Jonson in almost every case. Where the question of the authorship is concerned, nearly all roads seem to lead to Ben Jonson, and I judge that he was the man

most intimately involved in the dissembling. All his known writings and activities would seem to me to warrant close scrutiny.

If I may offer a view of where we stand it is this: the evidence against the Stratford man's authorship is overwhelming and decisive, that for Oxford's strong and presumptive; Oxford of all known figures is the only possible Shakespeare. The weakness of the orthodox case is attested not only by the facts but by the very behavior of its proponents. I am speaking of the refusal of the Stratfordians in academia, in any circumstances, to debate the issue with the dissenters and their consistent resort, in urging their case and maligning the dissenters, to misrepresentation and disregard of evidence, to fraud and mendacity, and to argumentum ad hominem carried to the point of slander and purposed character assassination—all this with the aim of so discrediting the dissenters that they will be denied a hearing. To succeed in this is the basis of all their hopes. We may reflect that reputable men such as our antagonists are—though I should not give a great deal for their professional reputations when the controversy has been played out—do not descend to dishonesty and libel without compelling reason. It may be recalled that when in the letters column of the Harvard Magazine's April 1975 issue, in which the Shakespeare authorship controversy was raging, Philip S. Weld (publisher of four Massachusetts newspapers) offered to pay the costs of a trial of Stratford vs. Oxford, not one of Stratford's partisans was willing to risk it and none came forward to make the trial possible.

This brings me to what I consider to be the Society's second purpose. Our concern is not only with the authorship of Shakespeare but with freedom of thought and expression. As the malefactors of Watergate showed how free political institutions may be subverted by those in power, so the English faculties, ebbed by a generally subservient press, show how far entrenched authority can outlaw and silence dissent in a supposedly free society. There is an important lesson here for a republic. We are dealing with an intellectual Watergate, and it greatly behooves us to expose it. How long the exposure will take depends on circumstances, but it is approaching and it will come. With that in mind, I think it important that we keep a strict account of how a shoddy, tacit conspiracy like this one works—of the contributions made to it by the Wrights, the Dawsons, the Murphys, the Mardere, the Schoenbaums, the Evanses and Levins and the rest. "Storm Troopers" was the term applied by President Kingman Brewster of Yale to those professors who refused to hear a speaker whose views they opposed and hooted him from the platform; and that is the mentality we are dealing with. Academia, to which we entrust the education of our youth, will have some answering to do, and that includes the academicians who dominate the great philanthropic foundations—Guggenheim, Ford, Rockefeller, Andrew W. Mellon, the National Foundation for the Humanities—where the purse strings are out for the Shakespeare establishment and its votaries but never for a dissenter, however his credentials may recommend him.

But so well as its roll of shame, the Shakespeare controversy has its roll of honor. It numbers those who have not been intimidated by the "blind, hysterical fury," as Day Thorpe, Book Editor of the Washington Star, has called it, with which the Stratfordian professors attack their adversaries, and who, in the face of a very real danger to themselves, have spoken up on the side of dissent or interceded to give dissent a chance to be heard. Among those in academia itself are Louis P. Benezet of Dartmouth College, William Yandell Eliot of Harvard Law School, Crane Printon of the Society of Fellows of Harvard University, Peter Sammartino of Fairleigh Dickinson University, S. Colum Gilfillan of the University of California, Hugh R. Trevor-Roper of Oxford University, Abel LeFranc of the University of France, and W. Barton Leach, one of the founders of the Shakespeare Authorship Society. Among publicists

there are Henry Seidel Canby, who, as editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, gave the American public its first introduction to the Oxford case; Fred D. McHugh, who, as executive editor of the Scientific American published Charles W. Barrell's revealing photograph of the Ashbourne portrait; Richard C. Bentley, who opened the pages of the American Bar Association Journal to spokesmen of contending points of view on the Shakespeare authorship; John K. Jassup, who stood up for dissent as chief editorialist of Life; William McPherson, Book Editor of the Washington Post, who in his paper has given dissent a chance to make its case against current books by Stratfordians; Day Thorpe, who has done as much in the Washington Star and has himself taken up the cudgels against a ruthless orthodoxy; Robert Schnayerson and Tony Jones of Harper's who published "The Mystery of the Shakespeare Manuscripts"; John T. Bethell and Christopher Reed of Harvard Magazine who ran a particularly grave risk in giving dissent the first full opportunity to make its case in an American periodical; and Howard Simons, Managing Editor of the Washington Post, to whom I am sure credit should go for the Harvard Magazine article reprint, somewhat abbreviated, as the leading article in the Post's Sunday editorial section.

George Orwell in his essay on "The Freedom of the Press" wrote that self-censorship could be expected from the British daily press and that "the same kind of veiled censorship also operates in books and periodicals" and added that "anyone who challenges the prevailing orthodoxy finds himself silenced with surprising effectiveness. A genuinely unfashionable opinion is almost never given a fair hearing."

We can surely testify to that. But our case is a sound and important one. Progress has already been made in bringing it before the public. We are warranted in believing that with persistence on our part the door braced shut against it, already more than a crack, will give way altogether. The day will come when the reading public will have an opportunity to judge for itself the relative merits of the case for Stratford and the case for Oxford under conditions that make the trial a full and fair one. It will require dragging our adversaries, resisting and maneuvering against it every inch of the way, into the match. But it will come. And when it does, we can anticipate that the controversy's history will be examined as virtually a laboratory demonstration of the kind of de facto censorship Orwell recognized. The more thoroughly this is understood, the better able society will be to protect itself against similar and more dangerous censorships. Let us make sure, then, that the record will speak informatively both of those in the public eye who have courageously stood out against the censorship and of those who betrayed morality and fairness to maintain it.

Chalton Ogburn, Jr.

Excerpt

REPORT ON S.O.S. NATIONAL
CONFERENCE, SEPTEMBER 24 - 26, 1976

by Helen Cyr

Twenty people (members and visitors) attended the national conference at the Lord Baltimore Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland. Fortunately, there was a healthy geographic representation from the South, West, Northeast, and Midwest. A spirit of team-

work and good fellowship reigned throughout the conference and could be observed also in the informal, non-scheduled moments with members continuing enthusiastic discussions in the hotel lobby and in coffee shops and restaurants.

At the first session on Friday night, participants were introduced to one another, ideas were shared, position papers read, and a letter of best wishes, sent by Eng-

lish S.O.S. member, Mrs. Verily Anderson, was presented. Discussion brought forth many ideas: S.O.S. should serve as a clearing house—a communication center—for on-going research projects and related activities; debating events should be encouraged and sponsored, and a manual provided for debaters; S.O.S. ought to encourage members to develop chapters; S.O.S. should play an active role in the dissemination of literature on the authorship question; S.O.S. can make greater efforts to recruit members and each member should be provided with help in this work.

At the Saturday morning meeting President pro tem, Gordon Cyr was elected Presiding Conference Chairman. Subsequent discussion centered on legal matters. Members in attendance were unanimously declared to be the new Board of Trustees (including absent officers). The new Board agreed to continue in operation with the present, incomplete by-laws, no complete copy ever having been found among former President Horne's papers.) A By-Laws Committee would be assigned to investigate the matter and make recommendations for needed changes. For tax exemption information, a copy of a letter from the Internal Revenue Service confirming S.O.S.'s tax exempt status would appear in a future newsletter.

A special program session was held on Saturday afternoon in which special addresses were given. Guest speaker, Peter Michaels, who is professor of Fine Arts at Goucher College, Conservator Emeritus of Walters Art Gallery, and Conservator for the Maryland Historical Society, the Capitol of the U.S., the Gummer Gallery of Art in Florida, and other institutions, talked about "New Techniques for Analysis of Over-Painting". (The details of this informative talk will be given in full in the Winter issue of the Newsletter.) Charlton Ogburn spoke about "The Shakespeare TV Series: What to Do?" in which he noted the kinds of things he has been doing to inform key people involved with the production of a new TV series, partly

sponsored by the National Geographic Society, about the anti-Stratfordian case. Gordon Cyr gave a report on "The Amherst Case", originally to have been given by Craig Huston who was absent. (As readers will recall, the trustees of Amherst College also function as trustees of the Folger Shakespeare Library.) Mr. Cyr reported how Mr. Huston in correspondence with the Amherst trustees questioned whether the intent of Henry Clay Folger's will was being properly served in the Library's displaying of the Ashbroume portrait without accurate identification of its subject and without noting the fact of its over-painting.

Saturday night's session opened with a presentation by Helen Cyr, "Our English Friends: The S.O.S. Branch and the Shakespearean Authorship Society" in which she described the nature, officers, and present work of the two English groups. S.O.S. conference participants vowed that they will make an effort to promote interest in the London-based S.A.S. organization and will encourage a closer working relationship with both S.A.S. and our own English branch. Gordon Cyr gave notice that he must decline to run for office at this time because of the press of other duties. The following officers were elected or re-elected. (A reading of extant by-laws indicated to the Trustees that elections could be made by the Board and did not have to be ratified by a general vote of the membership.)

President:	Charlton Ogburn, Jr.
1st Vice-President:	Francis Horne
2nd Vice-President:	S. Colum Gilfillan
Secretary-Treasurer:	Helen Cyr
Chairperson, By-Laws Committee:	John Kloefer
Chairperson, Research Committee:	Michael Steinbach
Chairperson, Public Relations Committee:	Warren Hope
Chairperson, Membership Committee:	Russell des Cognet
Chairperson, Publications Committee:	

(Editor, Newsletter):

Gordon Cyr

Craig Huston and Moree Johnson were appointed to the By-Laws Committee.

The English officers would continue as before.

Vice-President: Lt. Col. Ian Keelan
Secretary-Treasurer: Harold Patience

It was decided that the S.O.S. English branch ought to have an autonomous status—electing their own officers, and the like. The By-Laws Committee will consider this among other details when they make recommendations for revision.

The emphasis in the Sunday session was on research and future work of the organization. The form used for dues renewal and membership application was revised to provide a special fee for students (\$2) and to eliminate the Crispin Crispianship category. Several projects were outlined as top priorities for the Society's attention: (1) develop a bibliography of the important books on the Shakespearean Authorship question and the Oxford theory; (2) produce a concordance to Oxford's writings to facilitate research; (3) produce a reprint of Looney's "Merry Wives of Windsor" article and a revision of Ogburn's "Shakespeare and the Man from Stratford"; (4) organize debates with prize money offered; (5) study statistically (with computer analysis) the word use of Oxford as compared with the Shakespeare text; (Mr. and Mrs. Minos Miller preparing such a study now); (6) develop a New Member's Kit, which would include a brief history of the anti-Stratford position, the Oxford case, the history of the Oxfordian and other movements to date, a brief bibliography of anti-Stratfordian works and Oxfordian books; reprints, complete membership list, sample important issues of past Newsletters, brief statement about work in progress. A particularly interesting idea was discussed enthusiastically by all—sponsoring trips to England to motivate and encourage

research and other work on the Oxfordian cause. The conference was adjourned after the decision to meet again in one year, if possible in Washington, D.C.

SONNET CXL

EDWARD DE VERE, 17th EARL OF OXFORD
(1550 - 1604)

"A NEVER WRITER TO AN EVER READER"

Edward de Vere - "E.VER", Ned Vere, or
"NEVER" -
Great Earl of Oxford, with your silent
name!
Your star illumines "Shakespeare's" works
forEVER,
Though William Shaksper robs you of its
flame.
Skilled in the hunt, in falconry, and
dancing,
In jousts and fencing, languages, and
arts;
LOVER of literature, of horses prancing,
Of history, and all that moves men's
heerta: -
You sing to us in many a golden sonnet;
Your men and women march across our stage
In dateless drama with your seal upon it
Of words that shake their spears from
EVERy page,
To tell that you, if we would TRULY know,
Are Hamlet, Antony, and ROMEO ("E.O." -
"e.o.").

William Plumer Fowler
(Trustee, S.O.S.)

Copyright, 1976
William Plumer Fowler

ADDRESS OF SHAKESPEAREAN
AUTHORSHIP SOCIETY

The address of the English organisation is
c/o Mr. John Silberrad
11 Old Square
Lincoln's Inn
London WC2A 3TS
ENGLAND

Dues for overseas members: £1.50 or \$5.00
(includes subscription to THE BARD).

RHODA MESSNER ANSWERS DR. MARDER

In April 1963, Louis Marder, editor of The Shakespeare Newsletter, published in his journal a partial list of his answers to a challenge he had issued the previous November to anti-Stratfordians. Various doubters of the orthodox mythos answered, and Dr. Marder ultimately responded to seventeen questions put forward by G.M. Pares and Francis Carr of The Francis Bacon Society in England. Rhoda Messner, author of Absent Thus from Felicity, had corresponded with Dr. Marder, asking his permission to publish in our Newsletter his own responses along with her own rebuttal. Below appears the first installment of this exchange, along with the Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter's comments, given in footnotes. The editor wishes to thank Dr. Marder for the permission he has given to republish his material from The Shakespeare Newsletter.

1. Q. Is it positively known that the actor Will Shakspeare ever wrote a letter to anyone about anything?

Marder: No. None exist. If this were the case with Shakespeare alone, it might mean something, but considering the state of affairs at the time, and the absence of similar evidence for many other known dramatists, the question is not admissible as evidence, and the negative answer does not prove or disprove anything.

Messner: We don't ask for an existing letter from Will Shakspeare of Stratford, only for an indication that any letter of his ever existed. We know that Spenser wrote letters, Drayton wrote letters, Ben Jonson and many others. Shakespeare was not only the greatest poet and dramatist of his day, respected by his contemporaries and shareholder in his own theater. He left London as his permanent residence by 1612 or earlier. He was at the height of his fame, in good health and prosperous, and his plays were being produced continually in London while he lived and carried on a quantity of business in Stratford. This plan of living would seem to call for much correspondence and yet there is not the faintest trace of

a letter from his pen; or even one sent to him, with the exception of one from a fellow Stratfordian which has no connection whatsoever with literary matters.

2. Q. Is there any authentic record anywhere of Will Shakspeare's education at any school or university or by any private teacher?

L.M.: No. Nor is there any contemporary record for any other Stratford person. The records have all disappeared. But during the period of Shakespeare's youth Walter Roche, Simon Hunt and Thomas Jenkins, all Oxford graduates, were employed as masters in Stratford¹ and received a salary of 20 pounds a year at a time when Eton was paying 10 pounds. If the civic-minded² John Shakespeare had no education, it would be all the more reason to think that he would have assured one to his son.

R.M.: The most generous guesses give only a few years of schooling to Will Shakspeare before his father's bad luck forced him to leave school; and he was married at eighteen with a growing family to support. Even if Schoolmaster Roche, or Hunt, or Jenkins, failed to see or recognize his precociousness, how does it happen that later they did not brag of their famous pupil who had distinguished himself in London? There is not a single record, or even a tradition, of his early

¹But Roche quit the school in 1572, and Jenkins did not succeed Nunt until 1577, so if "tradition" is to be believed, the young Will could not have seen much of either Roche or Jenkins.

²It is characteristic of Stratfordians to squeeze "civic-mindedness" out of John Shakspeare's fulfillment of a term as bailiff, when it was the law of the town to do so, under penalty of a stiff fine for failure to serve (Halliwell-Phillips, Council Book of Stratford-on-Avon, Book A, p. 2, Sept. 1557). Dr. Marder's "civic-minded" citizen was earlier fined for keeping a muck-heap in front of his Henley Street house (Halliwell-Phillips: Outline of the Life of Shakespeare, 2nd edition, London, 1882, pp. 16 - 19.).

life suggestive of the student, or of a youth intellectually apart from those about him.

3. Q. Is there any positive evidence that John Shakspeare, father of William, could read or write?

L.M.: No positive evidence. Although there is evidence that other "marksmen" could write, I believe that John would have written his name if he could have.

R.M.: We seem to pretty well agree on both sides that John Shakspeare could not read or write. It's beside the question anyhow.

4. Q. Is there any evidence that Judith, daughter of William, was literate? Is it not true that she simply made her mark, as she could not write her name?

L.M.: There is no evidence that Judith could write, but Susanna could, and if Susanna went to school, she probably took Hamnet too. If Judith's illiteracy proves anything, then Susanna's literacy cancels it.³

R.M. Since Susanna was married to an educated man and a doctor, I'll concede that she could write. What interests me, however, is why neither Susanna nor her husband seem to have acquired any of her famous (?) father's books (if they existed, as they must have if he were Shakespeare). Dr. Hall's library is mentioned, but he does not claim to have in it any of his father-in-law's books.

5. Q. Is employment as a butcher's boy, as a youth, a likely training for the world's

³Dr. M.'s howling non sequitur aside, the existence of Susanna Hall's signature proves nothing about one's literacy, any more than do William's canonical six. Indeed, Halliwell-Phillips (Outlines, 1st ed. 1848, Vol. I, p. 252) records a conversation with one Dr. Cooke in 1642, which, as Halliwell says, "would appear to show that Mrs. Hall's education had not been of an enlarged character."

greatest dramatist?

L.M.: If it were his sole training, no. I must gratuitously add here that the same account that calls him a butcher (John Aubrey in Chambers, II, 252-3) also says that S. was "naturally inclined to poetry and acting," that "his Playes tooke well," that he came from Stratford, and that "he had been in his younger days a Schoolmaster in the Country."⁴ Moreover, Aubrey documents his information as coming from Mr. William Beeston, son of Christopher Beeston, one of the principal comedians with Shakespeare's company as early as 1598. If the butcher tradition must be accepted, so must the schoolmaster.

R.M.: This is a ridiculous question. Of course even a "butcher boy" might possibly become the world's greatest dramatist if he had evidenced extraordinary ambition for reading, studying and improving himself. If Shakspeare had, there would be traditions around Stratford marking him off from his fellows, other than the stories of killing a calf with a witty flourish, or writing doggerel verse after being caught poaching. Where are the traditions of the diligent young man ambitious for a better life? John Aubrey was untrustworthy; a notable goosip, and, in any case, his brief biographical information was written sixty-four years after Will Shakspeare's death.

6. Q. Is there extant a single authentic author's manuscript of any one of the Shakespeare Folio plays?

L.M.: No, but this proves nothing, because,

⁴Dr. Marder fails to mention that the "butcher boy" tradition has one other source: Dowdall (1693) writes of it before Aubrey's was published and is, presumably, independent of it. Aubrey, however, is the sole source for the schoolmaster story, and his reliability has been impeached by the orthodox themselves. (Cf. Halliwell-Phillips Outlines, 2nd ed., op. cit., pp. 141-2, 124, 263.)

except for a few by Beaumont and Fletcher, there are none for any major dramatist⁵ including Lyly, Kyd, Marlowe, Peele, Dekker, Chapman, Jonson, Marston, Middleton, Tourneur and Webster; nor for Thomas Heywood who claimed to have had either an entire hand or at least a main finger in about 220 plays.

R.H.: Yes, but for none of these major dramatists was a de luxe edition of his complete works published, including a large number of previously unpublished plays. The author Shakespeare, whoever he was, was dead and evidently someone had carefully guarded the manuscripts until the time of the 1623 Folio. What became of them after that? Sidney Lee says that the actors Hemmings and Condell "made pretensions to a larger responsibility for the enterprise than they probably incurred." There is no record of Will Shakspeare ever having been paid for a single play, so why should the actor or the playing company own the manuscript rather than the author or his heirs (whom no one claims had any part in this publication)? The only comparable project, Lee says, is Ben Jonson's: the 1616 Folio of nine of Jonson's previously published pieces. The Shakespeare Folio was an expensive edition selling for one pound a copy, very expensive for actors or mere friends to underwrite. Incidentally, one of the "noble and incomparable brethren" to whom the 1623 Folio was dedicated was the Earl of Oxford's son-in-law Phillip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery.

7. Q. Is it not a fact that from time to time an eminent author has adopted a pseudonym or pen-name for use on the title page of his books?

L.M.: Yes, frequently.

⁵This answer does not, of course, account for the disappearance of the entire Shakespeare literary holography, for which abundant materials exist in the case of some of the authors Marston mentions, notably Chapman and Jonson. Kyd, Marlowe, and Peele wrote in an earlier period (presumably before Shakespeare's) in which much

8. Q. Has this sometimes become an open secret, in other words, a convention?

L.M.: Yes, frequently. But this is not analogous⁶ to the Shakespeare situation.

R.M.: Of course pseudonyms have often been adopted and sometimes have become "open secrets". We all agree that for, but it may or may not be "analogous to the Shakespeare situation". It is too complicated to go into until we agree on a premise: that the orthodox Stratford theory is improbable and the Plays are, to all intents and purposes, anonymous.

(to be continued)

FUNDS NEEDED FOR SUPPORT OF MAJOR PROJECTS

Some members have expressed interest in contributing extra funds for specific projects. Are you one of these people? If so, won't you read through the suggestions given in column 1 of page 5 and give S.O.S. the necessary amount to accomplish one of them? Your own suggestions for projects are welcomed too. For example, another idea: someone has suggested funding an Oxfordian chair at a college or university. Estimate of costs given upon request.

Note: Mr. Russell des Cognets has just agreed to support a year's run of *ede* in two national magazines.

has been lost.

⁶Any lack of analogy to more familiar pseudonymous practices must be viewed in terms of the social conventions of the time. The nobility were discouraged from publishing verse and virtually proscribed from publishing plays.

STUDENT NEWSPAPER FEATURES S.O.S.
MEMBER AND OXFORD THEORY
by Gordon Cyr

Under a page one headline, "Author denies Shakespeare wrote plays," the student newspaper for the University of California at Los Angeles, the UCLA Daily Bruin, in its April 14 issue carried a feature story by Carol Starr on S.O.S. member and Vice-President S. Colum Gilfillan. This lead story took up most of the front page and was continued for two short columns on the inside. A brief biography of Dr. Gilfillan was presented, along with the fact that he is working on a book called Lead Poisoning Ruined Rome.

But the major portion of the interview is devoted to the Oxford theory and to Dr. Gilfillan's salty comments on the Stratford maltster and the improbability of his authorship of Shakespeare's works. Unfortunately, the Bruin's staff writer vitiates the effect of Dr. Gilfillan's remarks by some final commentary uttered by UCLA's resident Shakespearean "authority," Prof. David Rhodes: "I think Shakespeare's life was extraordinarily well-documented," and added that Shakespeare was known to have had a fine education at the Stratford Grammar School. "Though he left there at age 16, he received the modern equivalent today of a masters in classics from Harvard. [Emphasis mine]. Lying behind this desire to oust Shakespeare from his authorship is an academic snobbery. (People think) if you don't have a university education, you can't accomplish what Shakespeare wrote."

Another attempt to play down the effect of Gilfillan's views was published in the Bruin's April 20 "Opinion" section under the by-line of one Howard Posner, an associates editor of the paper. Mr. Posner, with characteristically heavy pro-Stratfordian humor, wrote a "rebuttal" entitled "Nobody really did anything," in which he attempted to show that various historical events did not really happen

the way they've been depicted.

The S.O.S. Newsletter editor fired off a letter both to Mr. Posner pointing out the errors in his suggested "parallels," and inviting him to correspond with our Society further if he were interested in the matter, and to the editors of the Daily Bruin. The letter, we are delighted to report, was published in its entirety in the May 10 "Opinion" section. The challenge both to Mr. Posner and to Prof. Rhodes (see below) have, as usual, met with a silence that is palpable. We reprint the letter to the Bruin below.

"TO BE OR NOT TO BE?"
by Gordon C. Cyr

Thank you very much for your courage in publishing Carol Starr's article on S. Colum Gilfillan and the Shakespeare authorship ... One need not accept the Earl of Oxford as author of Shakespeare's works to realize that Prof. Rhodes' absurdly weak rebuttal is riddled with factual errors, unsupported statements and elipshod logic.

How can it be "known" that Shakespeare of Stratford ... had a "fine education" at the Stratford Grammar School when neither evidence of his attendance nor of the school's curriculum exists? There is no reason to believe that a provincial school would even be in the running with the best of such schools in Elizabeth's time, nor to suppose, in the absence of all evidence, that such an institution could supply its graduates with the equivalent of a "masters in classics from Harvard," as Prof. Rhodes claims. (Readers should note that the Stratford Shakespeare's "extraordinarily well-documented" life does not extend to his putative education.)

And since it is only tradition that puts him in school in the first place, the same tradition has him leaving school at age 13, owing to his father's financial difficulties -- long before the young country

genius could have got down the necessary Ovid, Plautus, etc. which would provide the minimum qualifications for writing the Shakespeare canon. Prof. Rhodes, like most Stratfordians, selects only those parts of the myth that bolster his argument! Contrast all this with what the distinguished Oxford historian Hugh Trevor-Roper says about the Stratford Shakespeare: "As far as the records go, he was uneducated, had no literary friends, possessed at his death no books, and could not write." ...

I challenge Prof. Rhodes and all who share his belief in the Stratford candidate to find an affirmative answer to both of these questions, which form two halves of the Shakespearean authorship problem: (1) Can Prof. Rhodes (or anyone) find a single contemporary reference to Shakespeare as author which proves that he came from Stratford? (2) Can Prof. Rhodes (or anyone) find in the "extraordinarily well-documented" life of the Stratford Shakespeare a single contemporary document that proves he was an author?

Scholars of English literature, such as Prof. Rhodes, are not trained to examine historical evidence. So, rather than trying to argue from a lack of such evidence, they should stick to matters within their purview (e.g. textual analysis) and leave biographical determinations to historians, cultural anthropologists, or even lawyers.

BOOK REVIEW

Hidden Allusions in Shakespeare's Plays.
By Eva Turner Clark. 3rd Revised Edition,
Ruth Loyd Miller, ed. Kennikat Press,
1974. \$22.50.

This book is, of course, another in the invaluable series of Oxfordian classics reissues which Ruth Loyd Miller has undertaken in connection with Kennikat Press of Port Washington, NY. Like the Looney 3rd edition of Shakespeare Identified (reviewed in the Spring 1976 Newsletter),

this is no mere reprint, but a compilation of further research, not only by the original author but by Mrs. Miller, the late C.W. Barrell, and many others.

Eva Turner Clark published her original book in 1931 (issued later in England under the title, Shakespeare's Plays in the Order of Their Writing) when J.T. Looney's Oxfordian theory was barely known in this country. As a result, her radically revisionist findings as to the chronology of the Shakespeare canon have been either ridiculed or ignored in the orthodox camp, although some (e.g. Cairncross) have concluded that certain Shakespearean works were written earlier than had been supposed — and that the conjectures of that impregnable fortress of Stratfordian scholarship, E.K. Chambers, might not be pure gold after all.

Mrs. Clark at the outset plunges right into B.M. Ward's hypothesis (in a 1928 Review of English Studies article) that the early play The Famous Victories of Henry V was composed by Edward, Earl of Oxford, in 1574. Now, it is difficult for this reviewer, as it must be for Oxfordians, to conceive how Elizabethan scholars can fail to see the self-evident truth of this proposition — even after his long experience of the fact that, where Stratford is concerned, any obtuseness is possible! (1) It is known that the earl was a playwright; (2) the play contains (as does Shakespeare's I Henry IV) a clear reference to the Gadshill prank which Oxford's men had perpetrated on Burleigh's servants in 1573; and (3) the author of The Famous Victories distorts the historical contribution of an earlier Earl of Oxford out of all proportion to that assigned him by the play's obvious source: Hall's Chronicles, 1548 edition.

The reason for the Stratfordian blindness in this instance becomes clear, however, when one reads Mrs. Clark's expansion on Ward's unexceptionable premise. She follows step by step the metamorphosis by which this crude youthful effort is con-

verted into Shakespeare's great trilogy and shows convincingly why this transformation could only have been undertaken by the author of the original play. In the first place, if the Stratford man (or anyone other than Oxford) had been the Great Reviser, why retain the Gads Hill episode, even unto the date and place, when this had no historic parallel in Henry IV's time (and, of course, no place in either Hall's or Holinshed's accounts)? Why not also retain the distortion of the House of Oxford's role characteristic of the earlier play? If one posits Oxford as author also of the trilogy, there are two reasons he would wish to downgrade his ancestor's share: (1) He had matured as a writer since The Famous Victories, and such a gross family blurb would now offend his aesthetic sense; (2) the earl was by this time more conscious of the social proscriptions against noble playwrights, and his hand in the trilogy's authorship might be tipped.

So, Stratford was early on forced to turn a blind eye to any light cast on The Famous Victories, especially if the beam were to fall on that post-earl who represents to the orthodox the only really serious challenge to their candidate! One thing had become clear even to Stratfordians by this time: that Shakespeare had based his incomparably greater trilogy on this crude drama, and any further concession about the authorship of the source play would let in a foot in the door by the dread heretics. One innocent Stratfordian stumbled into this trap. Seymour Pitcher in his The Case for Shakespeare's Authorship of "The Famous Victories" (London, 1962) argues that this titular drama is the work of the Stratford man about the year 1586, at a time, presumably, when he'd barely shaken the Warwickshire mud off his boots! Oxfordians can agree with Dr. Pitcher that indeed "Shakespeare" is the author, but Pitcher's theory cannot account for where his writer got the Gads Hill episode nor for the Oxford family propaganda. Such are the conundrums faced by such pre-Copernican thinking in the Shakespeare realm.

I have dwelt on this one instance of Mrs. Clark's (cum Ward's) cogent reasoning because it represents one of the strongest challenges to Stratfordians, which, like others offered by Oxfordians, they are reluctant or unable to meet. Mrs. Clark's reasoning on the other plays' chronology is no less acute, and plenty of ammunition is available that can do more than demolish the orthodox concepts if members of our Society will buy this book and digest its contents well. And if the members will see to it that their local and university libraries acquire this important tome. Mrs. Miller has contributed a major share this present edition's effectiveness, both in updating many of Mrs. Clark's findings and in correlating research of others, principally Charles Wiener Barrell, heretofore available only in out-of-print journals.

One such particularly valuable appendix is that dealing with Barrell's findings on Thomas Nash's Epistle Dedicatory to his pamphlet Strange News. Addressed to "Gentle Master William," Barrell masterfully shows — through copious examples of Nashian word-play on the circumstances of Oxford's life — that the dedicatee can be none other than the playwrighting Earl of Oxford, thus providing an important link to the earl's probable use of this praenomen as a "pen name."

Two minor criticisms of this edition remain, however. Though the "typos" are far less abundant than in the Looney edition, in the repagination made necessary by the additional material, original footnotes have remained unaltered, making some of these nonsensical when the reference is to a page number in the original edition. Also, some of the type-size reduction is at the cornea-splitting level.

G.C.C.

MONUMENT VS. MONIMENT

When you are trying to locate someone who has been missing for a long time, many experienced searchers overlook the obvious place to start: the telephone directory.

Similarly, the dictionary provides a starting point for all sorts of information. Take, for example, the word "moniment." This is taken to be, and is, a variation of "monument." But there is more to this than meets the eye, if I may be permitted a pretty poor pun.

"Moniment" is used twice in the parerga (that word ought to send folks scampering for their Websters') of the First Folio, viz., Jonson, "Thou art a moniment without a tomb," and Digbee, "And time dissolves thy Stratford moniment."

One day while browsing through a 1934 edition of Webster's International Unabridged Dictionary I happened upon the word "monument". Of the several definitions, one reads as follows:

8. Chiefly in the form moniment. a ridiculous thing or person; a spectacle; fool. Scot.

This is repeated in the 1950 and 1959 editions, where it is listed as definition #9. The 1966 and subsequent editions give "moniment" its own listing as follows:

MONIMENT (Alter. of monument) Scot: A person whose behavior and actions provoke ridicule.

It would be interesting to know if the word was used in this sense in the early seventeenth century. If we speculate that it was used thus, we realize that in that one word Jonson was telling everyone that the First Folio and particularly its alleged author is a colossal hoax, and is meant to be recognized as such.

John G. Kloepper
(Trustee, S.O.S.)

IN OUR NEXT ISSUE

Book reviews of A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres, ed. by Ruth Loyd Miller and Secrete of Shakepeare by Bronson Feldman.

Part II of "Rhoda Mesner Answers Dr. Marder."

Activities of the English branch of the Shakespeare Oxford Society.

A REQUEST

Mrs. Ruth Miller requests that if any readers have bibliographies of subjects pertaining to the Earl of Oxford or to related research, to please mail a copy to her at the following address:

Mrs. Ruth Loyd Miller
P.O. Drawer 1309
Jennings, LA 70546

ARE YOU A MEMBER
OF THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY?

Join us in our research
and related activities.

Membership Dues

Student member/\$2.00 per annum
Regular member/\$10.00 per annum
Donating member/\$25.00 per annum
or more

Your Shakespeare Oxford Society
dues are tax-deductible.

Write to:

SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY
110 Glen Argyle Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21212



110 Glen Argyle Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21212

EDITOR'S NOTE

There is a correction to be made in the Fall 1976 issue of the Newsletter, p. 2, next-to-last line. W. Barton Leach was one of the founders of the Shakespeare Oxford Society not the Shakespearean Authorship Society. A typographical error. Also, p. 1, line 3 should be Burroughs not Burrows.

Gordon Cyr, Editor

RUSSELL DES COGNETS PROMOTES MEMBERSHIP

Russell des Cognets, newly appointed chairperson of the Membership Committee, at his own expense has placed notices which will run for an indefinite time in The Shakespeare Newsletter, Harvard Magazine and Saturday Review concerning the Society's offer to send informative literature about the Shakespearean authorship question, the 17th Earl of Oxford, and membership in the Shakespeare Oxford Society. Initially, a number of inquiries has been received and, according to des Cognets, more continue to arrive in the mail. Requests for information are forwarded to the Society's office in Baltimore for attention. Interested persons receive a mailing that includes a brief history of the anti-Stratfordian movement to date, an outline of the case for Oxford, a beginner's reading list on related subjects, a short history of the Shakespeare Oxford Society and the status of its current research, a copy of a recent Newsletter, plus the newly revised membership form and addressed return envelope.

Russell des Cognets's plan and the specific pieces of literature itemized above are several of the high priority activities endorsed by the Society's Board of Trustees at the national conference in September 1976. And, by the way, this is not Mr. des Cognets's first act of generosity for this Society. He is also responsible for the purchase of hundreds of extra copies

of Harvard Magazine, November 1974,* for the Society's use.

Credit is also due to Betty Taylor, Trustee, who proposed that a packet of such literature be developed for distribution to new members and others seeking information. New members, of course, would upon joining also receive copies of leaflets on the 17th Earl of Oxford, back issues of the Newsletter, a complete membership list, and other literature on hand, e.g., a copy of Harvard Magazine, November 1974.

The new materials have been prepared by Secretary-Treasurer, Helen Cyr and Newsletter Editor, Gordon Cyr according to the guidelines established by the Trustees.

Do you know someone who ought to receive this mailing?

*The November 1974 issue contains Charlton Ogburn's article, "The Man Who Shakespeare Was Not."

A "MUST" FOR EVERY OXFORDIAN'S LIBRARY

A valuable compendium of discussion on the authorship question is SHAKESPEARE CROSS-EXAMINATION published by the American Bar Association Journal, 1155 E. 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637. The price is \$4.25 and well worth it.

Back in 1959, when an article by Richard Bentley, "Elizabethan Whodunit: Who Was 'William Shake-Speare'?", appeared in the Journal, subsequent articles and letters that poured in were so interesting that the best of the lot were published in book form. The slim green volume that resulted has been "in print" ever since and is now being sold in its third printing.

Lawyers, of course, realize that the identity of the Shakespeare canon is not only a literary problem but one of evidence as well. (Perhaps that's why our Society has so many lawyer members.)

The authorship question, pro and con, is examined by able legal minds and Oxfordian, Baconian, and Marlovian theories are considered in individual articles.

Readers will find this volume refreshing for its logic and clarity, particularly by contrast with the writings of certain Shakespearean scholars who seem to have difficulty in dealing with evidence.

NEWS FROM THE ENGLISH BRANCH

Again, thanks to Assistant Secretary, Harold Patience (Braintree, Essex) the Society's chief correspondent from England, the American Branch has been informed of activities across the Atlantic.

The English group has welcomed a new member, Mr. A. Lyell of Chiddingfold, Surrey. We welcome him too.

Also, American Oxfordians will be pleased to know that Rhoda Henry Messner's new book, Absent Thee from Felicity, was reviewed by English member, Stanley Hayes for the Braintree and Witham Times in late October 1976. Mr. Hayes seems to have been particularly pleased with Mrs. Messner's familiarity with, and understanding of, places in East Anglia, such as Castle Hedingham, Belchamp St. Pauls, Colchester, Earls Colne and Wivenhoe. He says, "Mrs. Messner has performed for

Essex people a service in her long and painstaking research and for leading us into a deeper understanding of a local family of which all too little is known, except for the ancient keep at Castle Hedingham."

Mr. Patience reports that a copy of the book has been presented by him to the public library in Braintree. Unfortunately, a bad fire recently destroyed all books in that library, but the good news is that Mrs. Messner's book escaped damage --it had been loaned out in the interim. Meanwhile a second copy is being circulated privately among English members.

Mr. Patience also has mentioned that Daphne du Maurier, the famous English writer who is a Baconian, has just produced a new book, The Winding Stair, a life of Francis Bacon. By the way, advance publicity about the American printing of the book indicates that the work is a straightforward treatment of Bacon's life, not a tract on the authorship question.

In the past year, as usual, Harold Patience has been busy on behalf of the Society in a variety of promotional activities, such as giving speeches to local groups and writing letters of information or concern to newspapers and organizations, as needed.

The short commentary that follows was submitted by Mr. Patience.

HENSLOWE'S DIARY

by Harold Patience

In his excellent, painstakingly prepared, Chronological Record of Elizabethan Era, Captain J. P. Kirton (a member of the British Chapter of our Society) mentions a performance of a play, on 26 May 1592, entitled Tanner of Denmark. Drawing your attention to the Graveyard Scene in Hamlet, I venture to suggest that this was either an early version of Shakespeare's masterpiece or the play as we know it.

(5.i.163). First Clown: A tanner will last you nine year.

Henslowe himself had been involved in the trade of tanner and dyer earlier in his career. When writing up his receipts, the Clown's remark about a "tanner" would have naturally lodged in his mind?

As regards the performance of Harry of Cornwall six days earlier, I believe it has already been surmised that this is Shakespeare's Henry V. Attention has been drawn to the meeting with Pistol.

(4.i.50). Pistol: Le Roy! a Cornish name; art thou of Cornish crew?
King: No, I am a Welshman.

RHODA MESSNER ANSWERS DR. MARDER

(PART II)

In April 1963, Louis Marder, editor of The Shakespeare Newsletter, published in his journal a partial list of his answers to a challenge he had issued the previous November to anti-Stratfordians. Various doubters of the orthodox mythos answered, and Dr. Marder ultimately responded to seventeen questions put forward by G. M. Pares and Francis Carr of the Francis Bacon Society in England. Rhoda Messner, author of Absent Thee from Felicity, had corresponded with Dr. Marder, asking his permission to publish in our Newsletter his own responses along with her own rebuttal. In the Fall 1976 Issue of the Newsletter, Dr. Marder's answers and Mrs. Messner's comments for questions #1 through #8 were published. Similar material for questions #9 through #12 is published in the Winter Issue. (The remainder will be presented in spring 1977.)

9. Q. Why did Cuthbert Burbage and his sister-in-law Winifred (widow of the actor's friend Richard Burbage) make no mention of William as a playwright or author when they addressed their peti-

tion in 1635 to the Earl of Pembroke to whom the first Folio had been dedicated? The fame of the Shakespearean drama was by then well established. Is it not strange therefore that Will Shakspeare should be referred to in this petition simply as a "deserving man" and a "man-player", not as a dramatist or poet? Does this not suggest that the Earl of Pembroke knew very well that William was nothing more than one of the actors?

Marder: It suggests nothing of the kind. It might rather prove that he was so well-known a playwright that it had no need to be mentioned. Cuthbert and Winifred are giving a history of their rights in the Blackfriars theatre and Shakespeare (spelled Shakspeare, Shakespeare and Shakspeare in the Globe documents) is mentioned as part of the history and an important member of the company. This is a business not a literary document and Shakespeare is mentioned as one of the "partners in the profittes". This and similar documents showing Shakespeare's share in the Globe theatre prove that Shakespeare was a so-fully-integrated member of the company that it is utterly fantastic to think that he could have been at the same time an unknown or permanently concealed front for some other author.

Messner: If Will Shakspeare had been such an "important" and "fully integrated member of the company" as well as the well-known poet-playwright, why should the Burbage petition have to identify him at all? Why not just mention him as William Shakespeare? Pembroke knew the name well enough, since the handsome folio edition of Shakespeare's works had been dedicated to him and his brother just twelve years before. No doubt Will Shakspeare of Stratford was an actor (minor) and a partner in the Globe theatre, but is there any (recorded) evidence that any play written by Will Shakspeare of Stratford was ever produced in the Globe theatre or anywhere else?

10. Q. Does not the hyphen inserted thus "Shake-speare" on the title pages of the early quartos and the first three editions

of the Sonnets, 1609, 1640, and 1766) and as the running title on every leaf of the 1609 Sonnets, almost proclaim the use of a pseudonym?

L.M.: Absolutely not! The recorded evidence is directly opposite. The hyphenation means, once and for all, absolutely nothing. And the reason that it means nothing is that it is not constant! Moreover analysis of this problem gives absolute and irrevocable evidence that Shakspeare was Shakespeare. If Shakspeare is a pseudonym, it should be constant

The intermixture of all spellings, including the Shak (short a) and Shake (long a) forms, with hyphenated and unhyphenated forms for the same works completely disproves any theory based on it. To cite no other examples of carelessness with names Ben Jonson signed Jonson or Johnson and was addressed in either manner.

R.M.: The hyphen argument for the pseudonym Shake-speare is to me suggestive but not very important. There are other arguments for the pseudonym that I would like to go into with you: "the first heir of my invention" item, for one; and all the various reasons and probabilities for the Earl of Oxford assuming this name for his pseudonym.

11. Q. According to Shakespeare's biographer Halliwell-Phillipps the name Shakespeare or Shakspere was a fairly common one in England in Elizabethan times. Is it not likely therefore that there was more than one Will Shakspere living at that time who bore no relation to "William Shake-speare"?

L.M.: Yes, it is extremely possible. But the Shakespeare of Stratford in his will pays special homage to and leave gifts for members of his acting company in London which proves that both the London and Stratford Shakespeares were one and the same man. The bequests are interlined,

but borne out as it is by their references to him, and similar bequests to him by other actors, and other references to Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon in the First Folio, the relationship is seen to be mutual and reciprocal.

R.M.: Your answer about Shakspeare's will only suggests that his (interlined) bequest to his fellow actors was used to bolster up Heminge's and Con-dell's part in the publication of the First Folio. There is a strong theory that the references to Shakspeare of Stratford-on-Avon in the First Folio are a fully-cooked up and fishy affair. Up to then (1623) the William Shakespeare of the literary works seems to have been simply a name. No one spoke of talking to him, of eating or drinking with him (except in Ward's apocryphal story of Jonson's and Drayton's fatal dinner with him), or seeing him act in a play. Now, suddenly, seven years after his death (the year his wife died and also Richard Field the London printer from Stratford who printed the VENUS and the LUCRECE) all kinds of interesting things come to light: Shakespeare is listed first with Richard Burbage among the principal actors in the plays he wrote, a claim quite unjustified by the record or even by tradition; it states that the plays are printed "according to the true original copies" and that "what Shakespeare thought, he uttered with that easiness that we have scarce received from him a blot in his papers" (from the two actors' letter to the Reader prefacing the First Folio) - a claim that even the orthodox Stratfordians ridicule; and Ben Jonson, who later wrote that he "loved the man, on this side idolatry as much as any" proclaims his love and idolatry in the coldest, most ambiguous verse ever written (the one under the Droeshout engraving) which, even so, was the first tribute from his pen since his 'idol's' death seven years before. Everyone must admit that there are inaccuracies and mysteries connected with the publication of the First Folio.

12. Q. Dr. Johnson wrote as follows: "Nature gives no man knowledge...Shakespeare, however favoured by Nature, could only impart what he had learned." To what are we to attribute the wide range of knowledge exhibited in the Shakespeare drama: historical, philosophical, classical and even technical knowledge of many kinds? Was this due to learning? If so, is it not strange that there is no record whatsoever of where, or from whom, he acquired this knowledge?

L.M.: It has been proved time and again that there is nothing so specialized in Shakespeare that it could not have been learned through reading, observation, and conversations with friends. Impartial lawyers have shown that Jonson and half a dozen other dramatists used more law than Shakespeare did and a lot of it more complex. Classic lore he got from his own Stratford education and Elizabethan handbooks. Music he could have learned in a barber shop where a chest of viols rather than the Police Gazette was standard equipment. Historical and miscellaneous information he took directly from his sources, even as Bacon, a notorious borrower did. If we remember that Shakespeare did not live in a vacuum, that the plays reveal evidence of acute powers of observation and understanding, then all things are possible and probable - and so, as the plays reveal.

R.M.: What reading? What conversation? What friends? Above all, when did he have time for all this reading, observation and conversation, of which there is not the slightest indication or record?

Yes, Shakespeare was a genius but even a genius if he begins as an ignorant obscure country boy must leave some traces of the process by which he becomes the greatest poet and dramatist who ever lived.

I am amazed that you should minimize his legal knowledge and the extent of legal imagery in his Works. "Three eminent English lawyers", I am told on good authority, "tell us that the plays of Shake-

speare display an expert knowledge of law such as Will Shakspeare could hardly be expected to possess". Even counting this as possibly an exaggeration, or at least arguable, could Will Shakspeare have acquired this wealth of legal imagery from his own simple and sordid lawsuits? (Compare Oxford's months spent at Gray's Inn and the legal terms and references in his letters, which are full of all manner of Shakespearean imagery.)

I am amazed that you think Will Shakespeare got his classical knowledge from his Stratford schooling and from handbooks. His schooling at Stratford was doubtful and brief at best. The leading feature of Shakespeare's learning seems to have been in the direction of classic poetry; especially, as most agree, was he steeped in Ovid's Metamorphosis, both in the original and in Arthur Golding's translation. (Arthur Golding was Oxford's uncle and tutor and he was working on his Ovid translation at the very time he was teaching Latin to young Oxford.) The scholars disagree on everything except this intimacy with Ovid; they range from R.C. Churchill's statement that in classical allusions Shakespeare uses only ones that were "household words in the 16th century" to Churton Collins who says that "Shakespeare's knowledge of the classics of Greece and Rome was remarkably extensive".

Shakespeare learned his music in a barber shop? And you call us heretics! I can only quote to you from Edward J. Dent, page 152 in the Granville-Barker and Harrison Companion to Shakespeare Studies: "There can be no doubt whatever that Shakespeare himself had a very considerable knowledge of music. His poems and plays are full of allusions to the art; not only does he speak of music plainly and directly but he very often mentions technical musical terms in a metaphorical sense. But whereas writers of the 19th century seldom mention music without committing some ridiculous error, Shakespeare never makes a mistake, even when he alludes to theoretical details of a difficult and obscure kind." Does this sound

like casual barber shop knowledge of music?

I agree that historical and miscellaneous information might be taken directly from its sources but there is no indication of how Will Shakspeare had access to these sources. (Compare Oxford's purchase of a Geneva Bible, a Chaucer, Plutarch's works in French, Tully and Plato, 'with other books, paper, nibs', all these in his 20th year alone.)

(to be continued)

BOOK REVIEWS

A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres: From the Original Edition of 1573. With an Introduction by Captain Bernard Mordaunt Ward, and Additional Notes by the Editor and Others. 2nd edition, Ruth Loyd Miller, ed. Kennikat Press, 1975. \$15.00

A publication that attracted little notice in 1926 was the edition of a pseudonymous anthology of Elizabethan verse prepared by the indefatigable literary investigator and biographer of the 17th Earl of Oxford, Captain Bernard M. Ward. A brief review of the long-forgotten circumstances surrounding the original publication of this anthology may be in order for our readers, especially those more recent converts to the Oxfordian cause who are less familiar with the more tangential evidence in the cause's favor.

In 1573 a book of poetry and prose called A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres was issued with a pseudonym Meritum petere, grave, and containing "the Devises of sundry Gentlemen." Each poem is signed by one of a number of different pseudonyms, or "posies," to use the Elizabethan term. These different "posies" presumably reflect the "sundry gentlemen" alleged on the title page to be the authors of the various poems within.

Adding to the puzzle is the fact that two

years later, this anthology was republished with significant changes (including both omissions and new material) as The Posies of George Gascoigne, and the title page contained the heavy hint that the entire collection was really the work of one author--George Gascoigne, to wit.

Also compounding the mystery is the clear evidence that the later publication is a corrupt text of the greatly superior reading afforded by the 1573 anthology. With his characteristic mastery of facts and logic (amply acknowledged in earlier Newsletters), Captain Ward marshalled impressive evidence to the effect that: 1) the pseudonymous Meritum petere, grave is the "posie" of Edward de Vere, the poetical earl who was demonstrably addicted to not making his "doings...public with the rest," for a number of good reasons. Indeed, as Ward ably shows, the embarrassment that many other courtier-versifiers must have felt in having their own more intimate lyrical effusions so boldly set forth to the public without their permission--even though a semblance of anonymity was preserved--formed the apparent cause of the later publication, with its attendant alterations and its spurious claims of having been "corrected, perfected, and augmented by the authour," all in aid of further disguising the highly-placed origins of the earlier issue.

This intriguing literary mystery is well-developed in Ward's 1926 edition of Flowres, which is substantially intact in this new edition by Ruth Miller, and, as in the other Kennikat Oxfordian classics reviewed in previous Newsletters, much valuable supplementary material is included. One aspect of the evidence Ward had developed that is of special interest to Oxfordians is the discovery of Sir Christopher Hatton's "posie" in the 1573 edition: Si fortunatus infoelix--"fortunate unhappy," which is the signature used in Twelfth Night on the forged letter used to embarrass Malvolio. But S.O.S members must really read this book to judge for themselves the cogency of Ward's

rather involved chain of reasoning.

It only remains to be said that the typographical problems appear to be less than those of the other two volumes in the Ken-nikat series and the index Mrs. Miller has provided is only one of the many improvements over the 1926 edition which grace this invaluable contribution to the available literature on the 17th Earl of Oxford.

G.C.C.

Secrets of Shakespeare; Four Chapters from a Subversive History. By Bronson Feldman. Lovelore Press, Philadelphia, 1972.

The Shakespeare Oxford Society was recently graced by the re-enrollment to its ranks of A. Bronson Feldman, a veteran of the Oxfordian cause from the days of the Shakespeare Fellowship (American branch), to whose newsletter he was a frequent and knowledgeable contributor. Feldman's career as a professor of English literature at a prominent university in Philadelphia was shamefully aborted many years ago when it was discovered that he was an adherent to an anti-Stratfordian cause, and he thus became an early casualty of the academic Mafia described by Shakespeare Oxford Society President Charlton Ogburn in our preceding issue.

A measure of Dr. Feldman's stature is that he has remained undaunted by any justifiable bitterness acquired from this disgraceful episode, and has continued to write and publish the results of his invaluable scholarship on Shakespearean subjects. He now holds a professorship in history at a more modest college in Pennsylvania, where he doubtless keeps his Oxfordian persuasion to himself, and remains quite active on the side as author and publisher of articles and books of informed and informative wisdom. Interested readers should obtain the book under review as well as his other numerous writings from: Dr. A. Bronson Feldman, 7844 Montgomery Avenue, Elkins Park, PA 19117.

It is a rare pleasure to find a book of interest to Oxfordians that is both as readable and as scholarly as is the present volume. Feldman's inferences, arguable though they may be, are reasonable as well as fascinating, and he presents solid documentation for many of his novel suppositions.

As the subtitle indicates, the book comprises four "chapters"—really essays—on as many aspects of the peculiar relationship that Edward de Vere held to the characters in Shakespeare's plays. The first of these chapters, called "The Woman Tamer," describes the part that both Oxford's half-sister Kathryn and his own unhappy marriage to Anne Cecil must have had in the creation of Kate in The Taming of the Shrew. "Helen of Rose-Ilion" adds further information to that of Looney and Eva Turner Clark and shows conclusively, in this reviewer's opinion, that the changes from Boccaccio that Shakespeare made in All's Well that Ends Well can only be made to fit the Earl's own circumstances.

In "Kit Sly and the Unknown Lord," Feldman contends, again with an abundance of evidence, that the Induction to The Taming of the Shrew was later added to this very early play at a time when William Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon must have first become associated with the London theater and when, probably concurrently the poet-earl had adopted the name of "William Shakespeare" as his final nom de plume. The last chapter, "The Making of William Shakespeare," continues the thread from the previous essay and constructs the most reasonable hypothesis I have read so far of the probable origins of the connection between Edward de Vere and the Stratford horse-holder.

There is here, of course, plenty of material to enrage the Stratfordians and to call down on Dr. Feldman's and our own heads all the snide epithets and ridicule of which the orthodox are past and present masters. But the sciolists of Stratford

will have a hard time refuting this author's facts, and his controversial deductions have the further authority of deriving from another of this polymath's quondam specialties: psychology.

It remain only to be said that each chapter is followed by copious footnotes, from a variety of both primary and secondary sources. The only sour note in this review is occasioned through no fault of Dr. Feldman's: it is a pity that this book could not be available in a printed format, instead of the mimeographed issue in which it presently appears, disfigured by typos and numerous strike-overs.

G.C.C.

Note: This mailing of the Winter 1976-77 Newsletter is accompanied by a copy of the membership form and an addressed return envelope. Send us a new member today!

ACTIVITIES OF SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY MEMBERS IN LOS ANGELES

Vice-President S. Colum Gilfillan and Mrs. Constance E. Charles have reported on the many activities of our Society's members in the Los Angeles Chapter. Although additional space will be devoted to matters in Los Angeles in the next issue of the Newsletter, the need to reprint details of a recent ambitious program is irresistible for its usefulness as a model to inspire the rest of us:

THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY in Los Angeles

DINNER MEETING, TUES., NOVEMBER 30, 1976

PROGRAM: Richard P. Roe, Esq. will discuss and illustrate Edward de Vere's (Oxford's, the real Shakespeare's) Adventures with Italian Art and Law. With commissioned photograph slides,

just received, of fresco in the Trojan Apartments, Mantua, N. Italy.

To refresh your memory, you may want to read first:

The Rape of Lucrece, lines 1366-1464, also et seq.

Winter's Tale, Act V, Scene 2 (references to the artist, Giulio Romano)
As You Like It, Act II, Scene 7, lines 139-166 (re "Seven Ages of Man")

Inspired by the possible correlation, in the Rape of Lucrece, of a narrative description of an Italian painting, with art works reported to be in the Trojan Apartments in the Ducal Palace in Mantua, Mr. and Mrs. Roe commissioned special pictures by a professional photographer there. Just received from Italy, these photographs will form a part of Mr. Roe's presentation, in the UCLA Faculty Club at the entrance to the UCLA campus, at Hilgard Avenue at the hill-top...

Dinner at 6:30 p.m., \$4 per person, payable to Dr. Gilfillan, followed by a

Meeting with illustrated lecture by Mr. Roe, open free to all people, at 8 p.m. in the Playa Room of the Club.

ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY?

Join us in our research
and related activities.

Membership Dues

Student member/\$2.00 per annum
Regular member/\$10.00 per annum
Donating member/\$25.00 per annum
or more

Your Shakespeare Oxford Society
dues are tax-deductible.

Write to:

SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY
110 Glen Argyle Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21212