Globe’s Authorship Conference Roundly Successful

The Shakespearean Authorship Trust’s Sold-Out Event at London’s Globe Sparks Future Plans

By Gerit Quealy

One thing Mark Rylance knows how to do is put on a show. This stands to reason as he is not only the Chairman of the Shakespearean Authorship Trust (SAT), sponsor of this conference at the Globe, he is also the artistic director and primary actor of the famed theater.

So the morning of Saturday, June 14 began with a symbolic gesture to solemnize the occasion: the lighting of a candle. And the reading of a sonnet. Mr. Rylance acknowledges that he often turns to Shakespeare for wisdom and inspiration in the moment, flipping through the sonnets and letting fate choose the page. This time fate chose Sonnet XCVIII: From you have I been absent in the spring... subtly suitable for the subject at hand — and the ensuing proceedings were thus dedicated to the work of Shakespeare, whomever he may be.

Much like an acting exercise, participants were invited to close their eyes and picture in their minds eye what the writer might look like: hair, proportion of chin to head, Shakespeare’s eyes, what he looks like laughing; in short, a highly individualized image, designed to try and take a fresh look at the subject — and “the miracle of his work,” Mr. Rylance explained, which is different from any other writer, such as Tennessee Williams or Harold Pinter. Rylance asserted that there is an intentional

The Ten Restless Ghosts of Mantua

Shakespeare’s Specter Lingers over the Italian City

By John Hamill

One-third of Shakespeare’s plays are set in Italian cities, and many scholars have written about the author’s remarkable knowledge of Italy. There is no record, however, that Shakspere of Stratford went there or even left England. It is an enigma that haunts academia and feeds the polemical Shakespeare authorship debate. To explain it, many orthodox scholars maintain that Shakespeare’s knowledge of Italy is general and in some cases erroneous. It is usually ignored or downplayed because the Stratford Man’s known biography does not support it, and it detracts from his claim to the authorship.

Even more damaging to the Stratfordian theory is the fact that some of Shakespeare’s Italian references require knowledge of Italian and Latin languages, and access to places open only to the nobility. Mantua and the Forest of Mantua are specified settings in two Shakespeare plays: The Two Gentlemen of Verona (Act IV, scene 1 and Act V, scene 3), and Romeo and Juliet (Act V, scene 1), and are the only direct references to Mantua in the canon. This two-part article will uncover ten indirect allusions to, or particular details about, the city of Mantua in Shakespeare that suggest he traveled there, or would have had reason to travel there. How Shakespeare obtained this information remains a mystery, but for Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, leading candidate for the Shakespeare authorship, it is explainable. Oxford toured Italy for almost one year (1575-1576) and although we have
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SOS Conference Update

New York City, October 23-26

Don’t miss this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity! This year, the 27th Annual Shakespeare-Oxford Society conference will be held October 23-26th in New York City, capital of the theater world and publishing industries, hence the theme: Performance & Publishing. This year marks the 400th anniversary of Queen Elizabeth’s death and the eve of the 400th anniversary of the death of Edward de Vere in June of 1604. A number of luminaries from the worlds of theater and the media will be on hand to lend support to the events.

The conference kicks off with a debate Thursday night, October 23rd, moderated by Lewis Lapham, Harper’s magazine’s renowned editor who published the 1999 article, “The Ghosts of Shakespeare,” in which a number of our speakers participated. The panelists include Prof. Alan Nelson (with his newly published biography of Edward de Vere, Monstrous Adversary, on hand), and Irvin Matus, author of Shakespeare, In Fact. Oxfordian writer and researcher Robert Brazil and author Hank Whittemore will take them on in the debate.

The Board of Avon, a play involving the Shakespeare Authorship Question, will debut in NYC at the end of October. We are fortunate to have the playwright, Amy Freed, tentatively scheduled to be our luncheon speaker on Saturday, October 25th.

We have an extraordinary lineup of speakers appearing at the beautiful 19th century historic landmark, the National Arts Club, in Gramercy Park: Peter Dickson tackles the impact of Michael Woods’ new biography of Shakespeare, the Catholic question and Derby’s involvement. Daniel Wright, Ph.D, will be unveiling further evidence of chicanery in early authorship research as well as an exploration of the Shakespeare history plays as regards character and plot. Best-selling author Sarah Smith, Ph.D, will discuss her new novel, Chasing Shakespeare, and its impact on audiences as regards the authorship question. New York Times writer and editor William Niederkorn, author of the 2002 article on the authorship question, will give a visual presentation of the Gray Lady’s coverage of the authorship issue over the years. Journalist Mark Anderson will reveal research from his upcoming biography of De Vere as regards the earl’s European travels.

Richard Whalen, author of Shakespeare: Who Was He?, explores Shakespeare’s audience—who were the plays really written and performed for? Authorress Robin Williams will present her compelling theory and research on Mary Sidney as the possible Bard. Robert Brazil looks at the paper trail of key Elizabethan publications linking Edward de Vere to Shakespeare’s name and works. John Shahan outlines his plan for accelerating a paradigm shift in authorship research. Bill Farina, co-founder of the Chicago Oxford Society, will explain the direct links between the Earl of Oxford and the Elizabethan theater world. Ron Hess will outline his research concerning Anthony Munday’s involvement in the Shakespeare publishing “empire.” Christopher Paul unveils his astounding research into the silence at Oxford’s death and the impact of Philip Sidney’s Oueranta on the authorship question. We will have a sumptuous award banquet with musical entertainment illuminating Oxford’s early poetry, as well as some surprise guests!

Sunday’s lineup at The Producers Club in the heart of Times Square has a performance bent: Richard Desper, Ph.D., will discuss the connections to Oxford in Much Ado About Nothing. Hank Whittemore appears again to take us on his wild ride through Ben Jonson’s involvement in the Shakespeare mystery. Ramon Jiménez examines Edmund Ironside as an early Shakespeare/Oxford play, with actors illustrating his points in various excerpts from the text.

And the final event is a theater panel discussing what effects exploring the authorship question have on understanding the text, characters and story. Moderating the panel will be author and teacher Kristin Linklater, theater chair at Columbia University, joined by Broadway producer Edgar Lansbury and Caleen Jennings.
Aeolian Stinking Pitch: Tempestuous Shipwreck on the Island of Vulcano

Another Oxfordian View on The Tempest’s Locale

By Paul H. Altrocchi, MD

The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch,
But that the sea, mounting to th’ welkin’s cheek,
Dashes the fire out. —The Tempest (I.2.3)

Shakespeare’s The Tempest is difficult to understand for playgoers and readers alike, so pervasive is the symbolism. Yet we are pulled back again and again by certain unforgettable passages. What human who has ever loved, or imagined love, isn’t captivated by these entrancing lines of Ferdinand?

For several virtues
Have I liked several women; never any
With so full soul but some defect in her
Did quarrel with the noblest grace she owed
And put it to the foil. But you, O you, So perfect and so peerless, are created Of every creature’s best. (III.1.A2)

Who isn’t beguiled by the loving response of Miranda?

How features are abroad
I am skilless of; but, by my modesty,
The jewel in my dower, I would not wish
Any companion in the world but you; Nor can imagination form a shape Besides yourself to like of. (III.2.53)

The Tempest begins with a disastrous shipwreck, casting the survivors on an unnamed island. Taking the lines, “Mercy on us! We split, we split!” as his jumping off place, John Barton recently suggested that the mysterious isle is his own native Mersea Island off the English coast of Essex.1

It was Richard Roe, premier Oxfordian Italianate, who told this author with conviction in 1994 that the island Edward de Vere describes in The Tempest is Vulcano, one of seven Aeolian Islands in the lower Tyrrenhian Sea off the upper coast of Sicily.2 The other Aeolian islands are Stromboli, Lipari, Salina, Panarea, Filicudi and Alicudi. All are volcanic, with Stromboli constantly spewing lava and Vulcano full of hot bubbling mud and steaming sulfurous fumaroles but without lava dramatics recently. Charlton Ogburn, Jr. also thought the shipwreck island was one of the Aeolians, named after Aeolus, Greek god of winds. Even some English professors have bolted away from the Stratfordian Bermuda hypothesis and believe the shipwreck island is somewhere between Tunis and Naples.3 The location of The Tempest’s shipwreck island is the subject of this article, based upon clear and repeated statements within the play itself.

Geographical Clues in The Tempest

In 1549, William Thomas’ History of Italy was published, telling the story of Prospero Adorni, a lieutenant of the Duke of Milan, who rose to be governor of Milan through the help of Ferdinando, King of Naples. De Vere modified the story line in The Tempest but uses similar Italian names, e.g.: Prospero, the rightful Duke of Milan; Antonio, the usurping Duke of Milan, brother of Prospero; Alonso, King of Naples; Ferdinand, Alonso’s son; Gonzalo, an honest old counselor of Naples. How often are cities of Italy mentioned? Milan eighteen times and Naples sixteen. Cities in North Africa? Tunis seven times, Carthage four, Algiers twice. De Vere tells us exactly where the ship was headed:

Ariel: And for the rest o’th’fleet, Which I dispersed, they have all met again, And are upon the Mediterranean float Bound sadly home for Naples, Supposing that they saw the King’s With so full soul but some defect in her Did quarrel with the noblest grace she owed And put it to the foil. But you, O you, So perfect and so peerless, are created Of every creature’s best. (III.1.A2)

So the ships were on their way to Naples. From whence?

Gonzalo: Methinks our garments are now as fresh as when we put them on in Afric, at the marriage of the King’s fair daughter Claribel to the King of Tunis. (II.1.73-76)

Where in Tunisia?

Adrian: Widow Dido said you? You make me study of that: She was of Carthage, not of Tunis. Gonzalo: This Tunis, sir, was Carthage. Adrian: Carthage? Gonzalo: I assure you, Carthage. (II.1.86-90)

De Vere reminds us again in Act 2:

Antonio: . . . How shall that Claribel Measure us back to Naples? Keep in Tunis, And let Sebastian wake! (II.1.264-266)

(cont’d on p. 18)
masking of these plays, and that “that masking is to be respected. That he [the writer] loves to be known as much as he loves to be not known.” And who better to explain that the “plays above everything else include the exquisite timing of when things are hidden and when they are revealed.” In short, Mr. Rylance established what the thrust of the meeting was to be—an open-minded exploration of the question—undertaken with reverent, expansiveness and an understanding heart.

In concluding his opening remarks, Mr. Rylance felt the need to underscore that the Globe itself takes no position regarding authorship and that the SAT was a separate entity renting space there for the event. He also stressed, as a preface to introducing the speakers, that he was keen that the conference be non-adversarial and that each representative speak positively about their candidate.

Professor William Rubinstein began, somewhat tongue in cheek if anyone is familiar with his August, 2001 History Today article, by saying it was “paradoxical and insulting” that anyone should have to defend the Stratford man, delineating 12 reasons why “any rational person should not doubt” his authorship. The reasons included the standard name on the title page of the First Folio; the puns on the name Will in several of the sonnets; Shakspere’s neighbor Hamnet Sadler and Katherine Hamnet’s drowning near Stratford as connections to Hamlet; Sonnet CXLV, “I hate from hate away she threw...” referring to Anne Hathaway and so on. Reasons requiring more of a stretch included that an actor could have easily learned the craft of playwriting, that the accumulated knowledge was unusual but not impossible, and that that many scholars can’t be wrong.

And one strong point: How could the secret be kept for so long? Wouldn’t people have noticed that he couldn’t answer questions about the plays? That his handwriting was different than the plays, and why would the deception continue? It all “strains credulity,” he concluded.

Edward de Vere was up next, his case explicated by Nicholas Hagger, one of the SAT trustees. He offered a synthesis of why the Oxfordian case is “strong and compelling” citing Oxford’s many biographical parallels in the works, the advantage of his early schooling/knowledge/tutors, access to extensive libraries and opportunities to acquire knowledge including the fact that his uncle and tutor was Arthur Golding, the first translator of Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Hagger noted Oxford’s foreign travel, especially in Italy, his titles, court position, and connections with other playwrights of the day. And the curious prologue in the second edition of the first Quarto (1609) of Troilus & Cressida which mentions the Grand Possessors (suggesting that they were other than the King’s Men).

Peter Dawkins of the Francis Bacon Research Trust spoke gently and eloquently on Francis Bacon’s candidacy for authorship, citing Bacon’s “love of life, all life,” his predilection for philosophy, the Kabala and the Hermetic Stream, and positing that Bacon’s writings and involvement were part of the whole Renaissance movement to better humanity, alluding to the possibility that the plays represent an integral part of that movement. He noted that Bacon was recognized as a poet and playwright, mentioned his connections to the Inns of Court, Gray’s Inn, and the Rosicrucians, stressing that things can be kept secret. Among his many points, Dawkins also addressed the issue of the “purposely” enigmatic inscription on the Stratford effigy and its connection to Bacon.

The Chairman of The Marlowe Society, Mike Frohnsdorff, rounded out the day with his advocacy of Christopher Marlowe, noting that the preceding speakers reinforced his own view that all the candidates “played a part in Shakespeare’s works in some way.” He addressed the primary Marlovian stumbling block of the writer’s death in 1593, noting that the recent window erected for the playwright in Westminster Abbey placed a question mark in lieu of a date for Marlowe’s death. Frohnsdorff extolled the extensive research of Calvin Hoffman and especially Dolly Wraight on the sonnets, expressing the belief that the sonnets “fit as the work of an exile,” and cited research indicating computer analysis “cannot tell the difference between Marlowe and Shakespeare.”

Mr. Rylance set the tone for the day with the extraordinary quality of his attention to each speaker and moderated questions from the audience, which comprised various supporters of each candidate such as De Vere Society members, Baconians, Marlovians, Stratfordians, as well as newcomers to the question and some members of the press. Thus concluded the first day’s program and many of the
attendants rushed off to enjoy the Globe’s presentation of Richard II that evening, with Mr. Rylance giving an excellent performance, both humorous and heart-breaking, in the lead role. The event was made especially poignant in that it was preceded by a birthday commemoration of Sam Wanamaker, the Globe’s founder, which included awards presented to two theater companies by Mr. Wanamaker’s brother, William.

Sunday’s program began with a similar ritual of candle lighting and sonnet reading by Mr. Rylance preceding the panel discussion. All the previous day’s speakers assembled to discuss why Richard II was written from the point of view of their respective candidates. A lively discussion ensued between the speakers and the audience, resulting in some surprise moments, such as several people announcing that they had new candidates for the authorship.

A late addition to the program was Robin Williams, authoress of a new book proposing Mary Sidney Herbert as the most probable candidate. Ms. Williams gave a compelling overview for her thesis, citing how she came to investigate and develop this theory, positing that the “procreation sonnets were written by Mary to her brother Philip Sidney,” that Mary’s estate, Wilton House, was on the Avon River (see related article, page 6) and that she also was known as the Swan (cf. her portrait wearing a lace ruff with embroidered swans). Attendees to this year’s annual SOS Conference in New York City on October 23-26 will be treated to a more extensive presentation (with visuals) of her research.

In the flurry of excitement that developed as members of the audience and speakers alike expostulated on their respective theories and ideas, Mark Rylance poured oil on the waters by acknowledging the power of the issue. He pointed out that “an unfortunate byproduct of this issue” is the Stratfordian insistence that they “know better,” but begged the audience’s indulgence by brilliantly illustrating what is at stake for these scholars with a physical slide down the wall, “keep in mind [that you’re asking them] to give up, give over their whole lives. ‘My degree, my books, my profession, my life, my wife, my children . . .’”

In looking towards the future, Mr. Rylance announced that he was “particularly pleased that the ISGC (International Shakespeare Globe Center) has been so open” to the authorship question, citing that the display on the issue included in the Globe Exhibition has been so popular that “they’ve come back and asked for a larger exhibit.” In addition, the playbill includes a page discussing the authorship question and candidates, which will henceforth be a regular feature in the program. Since over 200,000 people a year come to Shakespeare’s Globe, this is an enormous coup for spreading the word. Mr. Rylance looks forward to creating a “proper center of study for authorship,” explaining that the “working life of ‘Shakespeare’ in London is more helpful to me than that of the Stratford life.” In the end, he concluded, that “my life has been very much enriched” by investigating this question and that he is “very hopeful” because “we haven’t gotten to the bottom of all the evidence in this case.” No one present could disagree with that and it was suggested that if all the various candidates worked together, we might be able to accelerate the timetable for changing the status quo.

In view of the enthusiastic response (the event was sold out), discussion has begun on making the conference an annual event. “We learned a great deal from this first one,” reported Jasmine Lawrence, Secretary to the Shakespearean Authorship Trust. “We have started talking about the next conference – it will be quite different from this one,” she stated, explaining that they are still in the preliminary planning stages for next year’s event. “We will hold the conference in a different room as we were at full capacity and turning people away at the door,” said Ms. Lawrence. “And the tickets were more expensive than we had hoped.” So next year’s attendees can look for a more affordable ticket price as well.

In fact, plans are underway to dovetail the SAT conference with a celebration by the UK’s De Vere Society for the 400th anniversary of Edward de Vere’s death. By connecting the programs, Oxfordians will be able to attend both events and a wider audience will be introduced to the celebratory intention for Oxford himself.
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The Temple in Lord Pembroke’s Garden
The Truth about the Wilton Shakespeare Shrine

By Gerit Quealy

Wilton House, the ancestral home of the Herbert family, has long been a source of fascination for Oxfordians for several reasons. The estate, situated about an hour and a half outside London by train, was the home of Mary Sidney from 1577, at her marriage to Henry Herbert, 2nd Earl of Pembroke until his death. Many believe Mary to be a significant key in unraveling the Shakespeare mystery.

One of the primary points of interest in this aspect of the mystery is a legend of a letter. This legend was well explored in a recent article by David Roper in Shakespeare Matters. The letter, supposedly stating that “we have the man Shakespeare with us,” was purportedly written in 1603 by Mary Sidney to her son Philip, and makes mention of a visit to Wilton House for a performance of As You Like It – the author’s presence being an obvious enticement. The problem is that the letter is a third-hand account by William Cory in his diary on a visit to Wilton House more than 250 years later, in 1865. Cory chronicled his visit, reporting that the then Lady Pembroke, Elizabeth Herbert, told him about the letter. Roper provides the following citation from Extracts from the Letters and Journals of William Cory, published five years after Cory’s death:

Aug. 5. The house (Lady Herbert said) is full of interest: above us is Wolsey’s room; we have a letter, never printed, from Lady Pembroke to her son, telling him to bring James I from Salisbury to see As You Like It; ‘we have the man Shakespeare with us.’ She wanted to cajole the king in Raleigh’s behalf – he came.

Faith Compton Mackenzie, a descendant and mid-20th century biographer of William Cory, reports the incident of the conversation about the letter, adding:

That would have been an agreeable occasion. The excellent play, the author present, and the King lured from Salisbury. To commemorate it a temple was built at Wilton, and known as Shakespeare’s House.

This excerpt leads understandably to the hypothesis that the temple was built in the early 17th century, roughly concurrent with the 1603 visit, as Roper alludes to in his article, but a closer reassessment of the excerpt indicates that it is unclear as to when the temple would have been erected. To further complicate matters, Roper cites an excerpt from a piece by Edward Rose in the August 6, 1887 Illustrated London News: “a visiting feature writer, who was received at Wilton House some years after Cory, described both the temple and its approach:

Straight from the terrace leads a pretty walk, between trees of infinite shades of delicate green; to its right is the great green-house; to its left the gardens slope gently to the little river. At the end of the shady walk is a little building which has been christened by Wilton . . . Shakespeare’s House. For there is a story, in no way improbable, that once upon a time Shakespeare and his actors “gave a play” at Wilton House – before what a company one may imagine!

In memory of this a little temple has been built: classic as to its pillars, feudal as to the devices of arms above, with portrait busts, and an inscription on the wall from the wonderful lines in Macbeth – Life’s but a walking shadow: a poor player/That struts and frets his hour upon the stage/And then is heard no more . . .

Close to Shakespeare’s House passes one of the three little rivers which pass through the park – not, as it might appropriately have been, the Avon, but the less romantic Nadder. An Avon is, however, the chief of the three streams, the other two being its tributaries . . .”

Roper alludes to possible obfuscation by Wilton House about the shrine, stating, “Wilton House remains strangely subdued about this particular connection with Shakespeare.” Regarding the letter, he adds that it “remains, to this day, unprinted. Possibly it has since been lost or, even, inadvertently destroyed. But whatever reason the family had for keeping the letter secret in the past, Lady Herbert’s chance conversation with William Cory, and the interest that followed publication of what he had been shown, has done nothing to change the importance of its content. Currently, the House remains noncommittal about the letter. . .”

So what is the truth about the letter? Although scholars have questioned the actual existence of this letter, historians at Wilton House today believe it to exist and have recommenced the search for it – despite the fact that Michael Brennan was allowed to examine the 17th Earl of Pembroke’s archives and private library in the mid-1980s and found nothing. In his 1986 article, Brennan wrote: “When the incident about the Cory letter became known in 1897, the 14th Earl reported that it could not be found at Wilton. E. K. Chambers himself looked into the matter, and reported on it in his William Shakespeare: Facts & Problems.”

There is documentary evidence that the Earl of Pembroke entertained King James at Wilton House between September and December of 1603, and that the King’s Men were paid for performing there in early December. This evidence was known in 1865, so Lady Herbert was aware of it. The only evidence for the name of the play is Cory’s recollection of Lady Herbert’s recollection of the contents of the letter. According to Sir Hugh Trevor-Roper, Lady Herbert was “an ingenious lady, much addicted to Shakespeare fantasies” who “had a fertile imagination.”

And what about the shrine? When questioned about the shrine on the property, Will Herbert (Lord William as he is referred to by the staff), a recent graduate of Sheffield Hallam University and heir to the Pembroke title, was genuinely unaware of the legend or the existence of a shrine. “I know of no shrine to Shakespeare on the property. . .”
he said in recent email, and very kindly set up a personal tour to investigate.\textsuperscript{11}

In fact, there was a “shrine” to Shakespeare, which very well could have been termed “Shakespeare’s House,” but it came into existence in the 19th century. The confusion could have resulted from the following: In 1743, Henry Herbert, 9th Earl of Pembroke commissioned Flemish sculptor Peter Scheemakers (1691-1770) to copy\textsuperscript{12} the Shakespeare statue in Westminster Abbey erected in 1740. The statue was placed in what is called the Holbein Porch.\textsuperscript{13} Erected circa 1556, the Holbein Porch originally stood in the courtyard against the north side of the oldest façade of the house. It is considered to be a particularly fine piece of English early Renaissance architecture, carved at the top with busts and the coat of arms of the 1st Earl and his legendary ancestors, as well as the Knight of the Garter motto: \textit{Honi Soit Qui Mal y Pense}, roughly translated, “Shame (be) to him who thinks evil of it” (i.e., the Order of the Garter).

Entry to the porch was gained by going under the archway of what Roper calls the Wolsey Tower,\textsuperscript{14} but what historians at Wilton call the Tudor Tower. In the early 19th century, James Wyatt was commissioned to provide a way of getting around the house without going from room to room, as well as to provide some privacy from servants and “house-gazers.” He added the Cloisters to the inner courtyard of the house, which meant dismantling the Holbein Porch. In 1812, \textit{The Gentleman’s Magazine} reported that it “has lately been destroyed,” but in fact the Holbein Porch was taken apart brick by brick, numbered and stored to make way for the renovations.

When Wyatt restyled the West Front, he suggested “If that part which forms a Stage in front of the Library is to be devoted to a Flower Garden, a piece of good sculpture might be selected for the centre and a central walk start from the Library window.” At the far west was an old “grove or shrubbery (that) partakes so much of both as not to be decidedly either; openings in it are wanted to views into the Park across the River; and a better seat, or a building or some finish, at the western end.” Lord Pembroke agreed and the Holbein Porch was re-erected to the right of the house in the private gardens in 1826, with a room built behind it where the commissioned copy of the Shakespeare statue was placed, behind the great wooden door.

So indeed, when Edward Rose visited in the summer of 1887 (and perhaps William Cory, too, in 1865, although Cory does not seem to directly mention the temple), he would have gone, “Straight from the terrace [on] a pretty walk, between trees of infinite shades of delicate green. . . At the end of the shady walk is a little building which has been christened by Wilton . . . Shakespeare’s House.” He would have stepped into the Holbein Porch erected there several decades before and seen the Westminster copy inside. The Shakespeare statue was removed from that place in the 1900s to what is now the front entrance of the house. It does indeed have the inscription from \textit{Macbeth} – differing from the statue in Westminster Abbey, which has an adapted excerpt from the \textit{Tempest}. The remnants of the Holbein Porch remain on the private grounds, with the room where the statue once stood sadly gaping at the back.

Thus resolves the mystery of the Shakespeare shrine at Wilton House, but the mystery of the letter still remains – not only the whereabouts of the letter (many still have high hopes that the original will be found) but its implications. Scholars of all stripes would be pleased to find the letter – tangible evidence of a live playwright named Shakespeare. Aside from Chambers, J. Dover Wilson and M. C. Bradbrook thought the story to be true, although Sidney Lee doubted it. As Roper accurately states, if Shakespeare “was with” Lady Mary, did he come through the back door as a “poore player” or was he a proper guest, meaning that he would have had to have been of noble rank. And if he was, then who was he?

(cont’d on p. 8)
The Temple (cont'd from p. 7)

Addendum: Visitors to Wilton House can glimpse the porch from the far end of the gardens near the Palladian bridge, but would need special permission for a closer look. However, there are a number of other treasures and mysteries still open to contemplation at Wilton House. There are portraits of Philip Sidney, Oxford's tennis court “rival” as well as a portrait of Henry de Vere, Oxford's son by Elizabeth Trentham, who would have been the youngest daughter Susan's half-brother. Susan Vere married Philip Herbert, 4th Earl of Pembroke and one of the “Incomparable Paire of brethren” to whom the First Folio is dedicated, in December 1604. Dominating the Double Cube room is the large group portrait of Philip and his family painted by Van Dyck in 1634-35. Portrait scholars are divided as to whether the woman depicted in the painting is Philip's second wife Anne Clifford, or a posthumous depiction of his beloved first wife Susan who was the mother of the five children appearing in the portrait.

Additionally Roper mentions: “...when Ben Jonson subsequently came to the House, and a room was set aside for his use, would he not have been moved to moments of reflection upon seeing the “Shakespeare House” standing nearby, and the time spent at Wilton by the man he loved and did honour “(on this side Idolatry) as much as any”? Was it, then, to that “memory,” he addressed his immortal epitaph: ‘SWEET SWAN OF AVON’?" Obviously, with this information, Jonson would not have seen the temple because it wasn't there yet. And there are rumors that there is a Jonson room in he house, to which historians at Wilton reply: “There isn’t a Ben Jonson room. He was a visitor to the House though."

Notes
1. David Roper, “We Have the Man Shakespeare: Edward de Vere and the Lost Letter of Wilton,”

Scheemakers' copy of the Westminster Abbey statue of Shakespeare (commissioned by the 9th Earl of Pembroke in 1743) was moved from the Holbein Porch in the early 1900s to the front entrance of Wilton House.

2. From private correspondence with Robin Williams, author of Mary Sidney, Sweet Swan of Avon.
3. William Cory (1823-1892) established an enviable reputation as both translator and lyric poet. He is still noted for having written The Eton Boating Song (1865) and for having later published the much acclaimed, Heraclius in Ionia. His Guide to Modern English History was not a commercial success, although critically described as “unrivalled for luminous appreciation of character.” See footnote 1.
10. Correspondence with Ramon Jiménez.
12. At a cost of £100 18s 4 1/2 d.
13. It is not known whether Holbein himself was directly involved with the design of the Porch. However, it is thought that the Porch was used as a stage for plays in its original location, and could very well have been where As You Like It and/or Twelfth Night was performed in the early 17th century. If so, then how incredibly fitting that it later contained the statue of “Shakespeare” as a sort of shrine.
14. There is a Wolsey room although historians at Wilton don’t seem to know why it is so called. Ramon Jiménez notes that “Cardinal Wolsey died 14 years before the 1st Earl of Pembroke acquired the property in 1544 and built the house,” and speculates that “it is conceivable that a portrait or some other artifact relating to Wolsey was housed in a particular room in the house in the 19th century, and it came to be called the Wolsey Room.”

SOS Conference (cont’d from p. 2)

theater professor at American University in Washington D.C., and actor James Newcombe of the Oregon Shakespeare Festival in Ashland.

Register now at www.shakespeare-oxford.com and click on 27th Annual Conference – spaces are limited. We have amazing hotel rates (for NYC): The Hampton Inn-Chelsea (a 10-minute walk to Gramercy Park) has a special conference rate of $129 until October 15. Call 1-800-HAMPTON and please mention the Shakespeare Oxford Society. The Gramercy Park Hotel (around the corner from the National Arts Club) is offering conference attendees a special rate of $140. Call 800-221-4083, and again, don’t forget to mention the Conference.

Nearest airports: JFK, LaGuardia, and Newark. Jackets and ties required at the National Arts Club.

And it’s autumn in New York — hope to see you all at this landmark event!
New Evidence Identifies Stratford Man as Actor Only

Dr. Paul H. Altrocchi has discovered a heretofore-unknown reference to William of Stratford that possibly was written less than twenty years after his death. Last April, at Concordia University’s Edward de Vere Studies Conference, Dr. Altrocchi revealed that an annotator—presumably the Rev’d Richard Hunt, a Warwickshire vicar and near-contemporary of the Stratford Man—had marginalized a reference to “Shakespear” in a 1590 edition of William Camden’s Britannia. Dr. Altrocchi discovered the annotation while he was studying a microfilm copy of Camden’s work at the University of Hawaii (the annotated copy is owned by the Huntington Library in San Marino, California).

The annotation was written next to Camden’s brief description of Stratford-upon-Avon and its two famous sons: John de Stratford, an Archbishop of Canterbury; and Hugh Clopton. The not-entirely-clearly penned Latin annotation has invited months of examination by both Oxfordian and Stratfordian scholars, most of whom agree that it reads, “Et Gulielmo Shakespear Roscio planè nostro,” which is best interpreted as: “And to William Shakespeare, our very own Roscius.”

Why is this of such monumental importance to Oxfordians? For two reasons: the Rev’d Hunt was apparently adding to Camden’s list the name of another Stratford notable. Secondly, Roscius, who lived in the first century B.C., rose from lowly beginnings to become an acclaimed and honored actor and retired a wealthy man. Roscius’s professional biography bears strong resemblance to that of the Stratford Man who, similarly, began life in fiscally constrained circumstances, became an actor, won a bit of notoriety, and retired from the stage in prosperity.

Whether the Rev’d Hunt was alluding to these associations with Roscius’s career when he compared him to “Shakespear” is something we may never know, but even if Hunt’s comparisons were unintended, it is important to note what Hunt does make clear with his remarks. In associating “Shakespear” with Roscius, he identifies him as an actor—not a playwright. He doesn’t, in any way, associate him with the dramatic world as a writer. In this respect, Hunt’s annotation reinforces all the evidence that ever has been amassed about Stratford Will: he was, at best, in his public involvement with the theater, an actor—not a playwright—and, moreover, Hunt’s annotation confirms that it was as an actor that the Stratford Man was known by people who may have been acquainted with him personally.

Stratfordians want to suggest the annotation proves that the Stratford Man was the playwright Shakespeare, but it does nothing of the kind; in fact, it argues strongly against it. The annotation can no more be used to argue that Stratford Will was a playwright than a modern reference indicating Charles Bronson was an actor can be used to argue that Bronson was a playwright. The Hunt annotation, accordingly, is important proof that even in his own time, the Stratford Man elicited no recognition as England’s celebrated poet and playwright from people who knew him best and who, as neighbors, were in a position to boast of his achievements if they were. The Stratford Man’s acclaim, the Hunt annotation confirms, was acclaim for an actor—not for a poet, and certainly not for a playwright. —Daniel Wright, Ph.D

Nelson’s Oxford Bio is Out!

Prof. Alan H. Nelson’s long-awaited new work, Monstrous Adversary, The Life of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford has become available. The publisher, Liverpool University Press, describes the biography as “the first documentary biography of an Elizabethan Court poet who since 1920 has lived a notorious second, wholly illegitimate life as the putative author of the poems and plays of William Shakespeare. The work reconstructs Oxford’s life, assesses his poetic works, and demonstrates the absurdity of attributing Shakespeare’s works to him.” Nelson’s work will be only the second complete Oxford biography, the first being B.M. Ward’s, The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, published in 1928. Expected to enflame the authorship debate for years to come, Nelson’s book can be ordered directly from the publisher’s website (www.liverpool-unipress.co.uk/home.html) or through International Specialized Book Services (800) 944-6190 ($32.00 paperbound, $85.00 clothbound).
Elizabeth Exhibited
The National Maritime Museum outside London presents the largest exhibit honoring the Tudor Queen

As you step into the great red room that begins the most comprehensive collection ever exhibited to mark the 400th anniversary of the Tudor Queen’s death in 1603, you are greeted by a large, sparkling replica of her royal signature emblazoned in gold across a mesh metal wall. From there, seven rooms display in succession the 69-year span of her life and her nearly 45-year reign with letters, documents, books, musical instruments, objets d’art, paintings, portraits, clothes and jewels. David Starkey, the historian whose BBC productions and attendant books on her life have been quite popular, guest curated the exhibit.

The journey through Elizabeth’s remarkable life begins with the well-known backstory of Henry VIII’s dissolution of marriage with Katharine of Aragon, and the split with the Roman Catholic church, to marry Anne Boleyn. A chalk drawing of a woman identified as “probably Anna Boleyn (1507-1536)” has the accompanying description by a contemporary: as of “middle stature, swarthy complexion [with] eyes which are black and beautiful.” Accompanying trinkets complete the display including a remarkably small locket ring of rubies and diamonds which opens to reveal enameled tiny portraits of Queen Elizabeth and Anne Boleyn.

Other items on display in the first room depicting Elizabeth’s young life include armor belonging to William Herbert, 1st Earl of Pembroke; toys and clothes that would have belonged to wealthy young children of the era; a manuscript with embroidered cover of Elizabeth’s translations into Latin, French and Italian, as well as the Latin preface to the only surviving letter from Elizabeth to her father referring to her royal decent and family relationship to Henry. The prayers and meditations of Henry’s last wife, Katharine Parr are also in this section, also with a portrait, previously identified as lady Jane Grey, which looks remarkably like the 1940s actress Gloria Graham.

In fact, the exhibition is filled with portraits of the Tudor family, Elizabeth’s doctored (c.1600) coronation portrait, portraits of her sister Mary, and Edward VI, as well as her lady in waiting Kat Ashley and documents pertaining to the allegations of sexual misconduct between the young princess and Thomas Seymour.

Subsequent rooms address the political climate, the religious issue, and the tremendous strides made during her reign on everything from stabilizing the money and a standardizing system of weights and measures to the many shipping ventures undertaken under her reign, as well as the Spanish Armada event, all of which led to England becoming a global imperial power.

Cecil’s copy of the first commonwealth atlas is in this section. Open to the page with America, it is filled with his annotations revealing his extreme intelligence-gathering operation and foreign policy, one of his responsibilities being detailing expenditures such as Frobisher’s third voyage to artic Canada in 1578. As in the Folger exhibit, there is another copy of the Bishop’s Bible, with a mention regarding the 1560 Geneva Bible – that Queen Elizabeth felt was too extreme in its Calvinist commentary.

Much is made of the many marriage negotiations Queen Elizabeth was involved in including a letter to the Duke of Anjou, Cecil’s 1567 manuscript recounting the advantages of her marriage to Archduke Charles of Austria, and portraits of Robert Dudley, including his last letter to her before he died six days later, leaving her a jewel of emeralds and diamonds and a rope of some 600 pearls. She kept this letter in a casket by her bed for the rest of her life.

Other letters include those from Sir Christopher Hatton, one of Elizabeth’s principal favorites, according to Starkey who, “typically wrote to her in the language of a lover.” A cipher at the beginning of the letter refers to Hatton as “lids” a “pet name [perhaps] because he had unusual eyelids.” He signs off with Ever to bring out her initials, Elizabeth Regina.

The 1588 New Year’s Gift Roll on display reveals a present “By the Countess of Oxford,” a “bodkin [a hair ornament] with a pendant of 3 opals, 4 rubies, and 2 little diamonds. Triangle (?) pendant and one little diamond in the middle.” Queen Elizabeth reportedly liked gold because it...
could be melted down into plate — as such she may be the inventor of "regifting."

An inventory dated July, 1600 documents "her clothes, jewels, &c.," listing over 1200 items in the Great Wardrobe including crowns, scepter, clocks, cups, bowls, candlesticks, fans, and mirrors. The record includes items damaged, given away or eaten by rats. The inventory lists 99 robes, 260 gowns, 125 petticoats, and more. Several items of clothing contemporary to the period on are on display such as sleeves embroidered with glass beads [bugle beads] and boots of leather and cork, with the explanation: Prominent Elizabethans enjoyed spending vast sums on their wardrobes which entailed rich fabrics, detailed embroidery, jeweled decorations to suggest the wearer's status; interchangeable pieces like ruffs, sleeves, panels and kirtles.

Several hundred portraits of the Queen have survived and many of them are on view here: Queen Elizabeth with the pelican emblem which symbolized her loving care for her subjects, and the Armada and Ditchley portraits, as well as pictures of other prominent figures in her court like Sir Walter Raleigh. Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, is pictured all in black with the shock of a white hand displaying a thumb ring and its very detailed depiction of his crest. And nearby, a letter from Elizabeth to Cecil regarding Howard's execution in June 1572. There is also a letter from John Dee to the Queen from Bohemia where he was living in 1588. A large room is dedicated to Mary, Queen of Scots and the threat she posed to Elizabeth's reign. And the last room is devoted to the rise and fall of the Earl of Essex, along with a huge book depicting her funeral procession.

All in all, it is a very comprehensive study of the life of the Queen. But something's missing. There is virtually no mention of Shakespeare or the Elizabethan theater world. An article on the exhibit in the July 23 Arts section of The New York Times perpetuates the myth that the Merry Wives of Windsor was commissioned by the Queen because she was so fond of the Falstaff character, although this is not in the exhibition. There is only a small card next to a Hilliard miniature of the young Earl of Southampton (from the Fitzwilliam collection) that notes he was Shakespeare's patron. That is all. —G.Q.
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Ten Restless Ghosts (cont'd from cover)

no direct evidence that he visited Mantua, his known travels in northern Italy extended to Genoa, Milan, Venice, Padua, Florence and Siena, and Mantua is on a main road in close proximity to these cities.

Mantua, the birthplace of Virgil, would have been a prime stopping point for Englishmen touring Renaissance Italy, especially noblemen with a penchant for literature, theater, and art. During the Renaissance, Mantua was a major cultural hub featuring art and architecture of international fame, including the Cathedral, the Church of Sant' Andrea, the Ducal Palace, the largest palace in Europe after the Vatican, and especially the Palazzo Te, a masterpiece of the late Renaissance style called Mannerism. The ruling family of Mantua was the Gonzaga, whose court rivaled those of Rome, Venice, Florence, Urbino, and Milan. The Gonzaga patronized schools, the theater, and artists, including Mantegna, Correggio, Parmigianino, and Rubens. Writers and artists with whom we know Shakespeare was familiar — Baldassare Castiglione, Pietro Aretino, and Giulio Romano, known as Giulio — all lived and worked in Mantua.

Just as a ghost may call attention to a crime, these ten restless ghosts of Mantua suggest the presence of Shakespeare in Mantua. Part one will reveal Shakespeare's knowledge of the works of Giulio and Aretino that were specific to Mantua. Part two will emphasize Shakespeare's knowledge of Castiglione and the Gonzaga family.

Part One — Giulio Romano and Pietro Aretino in Mantua

1. Winter's Tale — Giulio's Sculptures in Mantua

The only direct reference Shakespeare makes to a Renaissance artist is in The Winter's Tale, where the statue of Hermione is said to have been “A piece many years in doing, and now newly performed by that rare Italian master, Julio Romano.” (V.2.96-8) The artist is further described as someone “...who, had he himself eternity, and could put breath into his work, would beguile Nature of her custom, so perfectly is he her ape; he so near to Hermione, hath done Hermione that they say one would speak to her and stand in hope of an answer.” (V.2.109) In the next scene, Leontes and Polixenes discuss the statue:

Leontes: See my lord,
Would you not deem it breathed?
And that those veins
Did verily bear blood?
Polixenes: Masterly done!
The very life seems warm upon her lip. (V.3.63-65)

Giulio Romano (1492-1546) was considered the most brilliantly gifted of Raphael’s many pupils, and succeeded him as the Vatican's court painter after his death. His fame during Shakespeare’s time rested on his paintings, palatial architecture, and his illustrations in Aretino’s Postures (see below), but Shakespeare praised him as a sculptor. Even today, his reputation as a sculptor is not well known, although the early art historian Giorgio Vasari made mention of his life-like sculptures. But Vasari’s work was not translated into English until 1850, so how would Shakespeare know that Giulio was a sculptor? Why would Shakespeare praise him as a sculptor when there was Michelangelo, Cellini and Sansovino? The implication is that he was specifically aware of Giulio’s sculptures, and almost all of them happened to be in Mantua. The Pietro Strozzi monument, for example, with four caryatids supporting his tomb at the church of Sant' Andrea, is one of Giulio’s most famous works.

But Shakespeare’s details go a step further. The Winter’s Tale describes the statue of Hermione, in a chapel setting, as so life-like that Perdita says, “Give me that hand of yours to kiss,” only to be prevented by Paulina: “O, patience! The statue is but newly fixed, the color's Not dry.” (V.3.46-48) The implication is that the “statue” was painted. Giulio was one of the few Renaissance artists who also worked in realistic painted wax funeral statues. What would be more life-like than a painted wax statue to inspire Leontes’ line: “The very life seems warm upon her lip.” Giulio’s most renowned wax figure was probably of Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, in his 1540 funeral monument, later destroyed by the French. The Church of Santa Maria delle Grazie was so full of polychrome statues that it would remind “the visitor of the figures of Madame Tussaud’s Museum, making the church a theatrical and spectacular place.”

“We came to see the statue of our queen: your gallery have we passed through, not without much content in many singularities” (V.2.9-12), says Leontes, a line that could describe the Mantuan church. Perhaps the reason Giulio is identified as “that rare Italian master” is because he was one of the few sculptors who, besides working in marble, terracotta and plaster, also created wax polychrome statues, statues seen only by visitors to Mantua. Ironically, many orthodox scholars claim that Shakespeare’s misunderstanding of Giulio’s artistic reputation is proof of his inferior knowledge of Italy. Boyce repeats the still common perception “that Shakespeare... should mistakenly make him (Romano) a sculptor suggests that the playwright and presumably his audience did not know his work very well.”

There is further evidence of Shakespeare’s knowledge of Giulio in The
Winter's Tale. Giulio’s notoriety during the Renaissance and later rested on the erotic frescoes he painted in Rome and Mantua. It is alleged that in 1524, perhaps over a payment dispute, Giulio painted at the Vatican sixteen murals of different sexual postures, Called I Modi, the murals were remarkable for their sexual explicitness. A set of engravings based on them became the first widespread commercial erotic art in Europe. Their notoriety spread after Aretino published The Postures (1527), a group of licentious sonnets that described them. In Volpone and The Alchemist, Ben Jonson made explicit references to these sonnets.

In Act V, scene 2 of The Winter's Tale, Shakespeare mentions Giulio Romano, as noted above; in the following scene, after Hermione is revealed as a statue, Leontes exclaims, “Her natural posture! Chide me, dear stone, that I may say indeed/Thou art Hermione (V.3.23)." Giulio Romano and "posture" - a word that Shakespeare introduced to the English language - both placed so closely within the play, were clearly a reference to Aretino’s Postures, which only became available in England in the late 16th century. Shakespeare also used “posture” with clear sexual innuendo in Antony and Cleopatra: “I shall see Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness/ I' the posture of a whore. (V.2.221)

After the publication and scandal of I Modi, Giulio traveled to Mantua with his friend, Count Baldassare Castiglione, who arranged his patronage by Federigo, Duke of Mantua. Castiglione had seen in Giulio the ideal painter-architect for the libertine Duke. "While in Mantua, Giulio was engaged for more than twenty years in filling Federigo's palaces and retreats with traditional erotic subjects as well as more individual renderings of cuddling harvesters, affectionate putti, and pederastic gods." More than any other artist, Giulio helped propagate the erotic style of art so fashionable during the seventeenth century, and it is mainly through his influence that religious painting in Europe declined after 1600. As a result, Mantua, Giulio's city, rather than Rome, became the artistic focus of the seventeenth century. It is ironic that Giulio is largely overlooked today, and considered a second-rank artist.

No puritan himself, the author probably identified with Giulio’s pseudo-classical, half-pagan, erotic style, full of sexual innuendoes and practically void of religious themes – “Shakespeare’s vivid and extensive interest in sexual material is well known.” For someone coming from a country that had just destroyed much of its artwork and was heading towards iconoclasm and puritanism, the vigorous sensuality of Giulio’s art could have been a revelation. Giulio's works also reflected an extensive knowledge of classical mythology, especially Ovid’s Metamorphoses, an interest he shared with Shakespeare.

2. The Rape of Lucrece – The Trojan Mural in the Ducal Palace of Mantua

In the long poem, The Rape of Lucrece, Shakespeare included twenty-six verses (202 lines) in which Lucrece describes at length and in minute detail a painting depicting many scenes from the fall of Troy. "At last she calls to mind where hangs a piece / Of skilful painting, made for Priam’s Troy! / Before which is drawn the power of Greece." Later Lucrece "throws her eyes about the painting round, / And whom she finds forlorn she doth lament." This digression has nothing to do with the plot except in the vaguest way: Lucrece has been despoiled, as was Troy. It is clear that Shakespeare’s descriptions of the fall of Troy were based on Virgil’s Aeneid, Ovid’s Fasti and Metamorphoses, and Homer’s Iliad, but what inspired the lengthy description of a painting?

Sir Walter Ralegh, the famous 17th century English professor, in writing about both The Rape of Lucrece and Venus and Adonis stated: "It would not be rash to say that these two poems were suggested by pictures, and that they should be read and appreciated in the light of this fact." The only room in Europe completely dedicated to scenes from the Trojan War is in the Ducal Palace in Mantua, rendered by Giulio in 1538. The frescoes not only surround all four walls but also extend to the ceiling. The visual impact on someone already familiar with the story of the Trojan War would have been dramatic. Art historian Frederick Hartt describes Giulio’s achievement: “The idea of a battle raging around the entire cornice as in real space is a new and immensely influential stage in the development of illusionism in the late Renaissance and Baroque.” Hartt believed that Giulio’s fantastic depiction “would have been the wonder of the young Rubens when he came to Mantua” in 1600.

The first scholar to make the connection between the Trojan Room and Lucrece, among other Shakespeare allusions to Italian paintings, appears to have been Gregor Sarrazin in 1894. Henry Reed’s 1952 play, The Great Desire I Had, puts Shakespeare in Italy for inspiration to write an epic on the Siege of Troy. In the final scene, Shakespeare is in the Trojan Room amidst Giulio’s huge frescoes, The Duke of Mantua advises him to quit the Trojan epic and write about the frescoes, resulting in Lucrece. Reed’s play recognizes the need to have Shakespeare physically in Mantua to study this particular group of paintings. In The Italian Influence in English Poetry (1955), A. Lytton Sells agreed with this analysis: “... basing ourselves only on established facts, we may be allowed to suppose that the passage in Lucrece was founded on Giulio Romano’s pictures and that Shakespeare took certain additional details from Virgil.” No single painting could account for the various scenes that Lucrece describes, but they are reflected in the Trojan Room murals in the palace at Mantua.

Over a century later, the Trojan Room connection with Lucrece is still being observed. Professor Michael Delahoyde believes that Giulio’s Trojan Room and the painting description in Lucrece are too close for mere coincidence. Furthermore, he notes that the Trojan Room had served as a guest room for visiting nobility. A commoner, much less an actor, would never have had access to it. Hilda Amphlett conjectured, "at the home of the Gonzagas [Oxford] would have seen Romano’s paintings of the Siege of Troy; so rich in their imaginative beauty and newly painted colour that the memory would have remained indelibly on his mind until at length it had to find verbal outlet." 20
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Ten Restless Ghosts (cont’d from p. 13)

Two passages from Lucrece, in which Lucrece’s thoughts evoke paintings in the Trojan Room are juxtaposed with the scene that may have inspired them:

1. Show me the strumpet that began this stir,
   That with my nails her beauty I may tear.
   Thy heat of lust, fond Paris, did incur
   This load of wrath that burning Troy doth bear... (lines 1471-75)

2. The well-skill’d workman this mild image drew
   for perjur’d Sinon, whose enchanting story
   the credulous old Priam after slew... (lines 1520-22)

3. Venus and Adonis –
The Hall of the Horses,
Palazzo Te, Mantua

Shakespeare also describes a painting in his other long poem, Venus and Adonis. Here he again digresses, this time for thirteen verses, to describe a blood-stock mare and stallion that have little to do with the plot of the poem.

Look when a painter would surpass the life
In limning out a well-proportioned steed, His art with nature’s workmanship at strife,
As if the dead living should exceed:
So did this horse excel a common one
In shape, in courage, color, pace and bone.
Round-hoofed, short-jointed, fetlock shag and long,
Broad breast, full eye, small head, and nostril wide,
High crest, short ears, straight legs and passing strong,
Thick mane, thick tail, broad buttock, tender hide:
Look, what a horse should have he did not lack,
Save a proud rider on so proud a back.
(lines 290-301)

It appears that the Palazzo Te in Mantua, considered by many to be Giulio’s architectural masterpiece, inspired Shakespeare. The Palazzo’s main entrance, called “Loggia of the Muses,” leads to the “Hall of the Horses,” the main reception room and the palazzo’s largest room. Featured on all
four walls are life-size paintings by Giulio and his assistants of racehorses, riding horses, and fine Barbary steeds. The racehorses or "Barberi" are believed to be ancestors of today's thoroughbred racehorse.

Mantua was well known for producing fine horses and the Palazzo Te was originally a stable. It was later rebuilt as a pleasure retreat for the mistress of Federigo, Duke of Mantua, and designed as a showplace of dramatic and sensuous art. It also served as a residence for important visitors. The most famous visitors were Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor and King of Spain, who stayed there twice in the 1530s, and Duke Ludwig X of Bavaria, who was so impressed after his visit there that he had a replica built in Bavaria in 1542.

In his 1930 article on Shakespeare's knowledge of Aretino, J. Lothian identified several parallels between the horse passages in Venus and Adonis and Aretino's play, Orazia. Aretino, who greatly admired Giulio and visited Mantua often, seems to be describing the same painting.

The following is one example, three lines from Orazia, followed by three corresponding lines from Venus and Adonis:

He quivers, snorts, kicks and neighs aloud,
Then after some dextrous and strong leaps,
Shakes the strong and furious path (verse 47)

And forth she rushes, snorts, and neighs aloud (line 262)
Imperiously he leaps, he neighs, he bounds (line 265)
The bearing earth with his hard hoofs he wounds (line 267)

But this play was only available in Italian, and because Shakespeare is not known to have visited Italy, or understood Italian, the Venus and Adonis connection with the Palazzo Te murals is usually overlooked by academia and consequently has become another restless ghost.

Oxfordians J.J. Dwyer and Amphlett also noted the close correspondence between Venus and Adonis and Barbary steed paintings "so photographically life-like that they are a marvel of chiaroscuro . . . These fine horses had been reared in the stud of the Marquis of Mantua, Francesco Gonzaga, who at one time owned as many as three hundred of them, and from whose stables Barbary horses were bought for all the courts of Europe." Oxford's interest in horses is well known. He won at least two jousting tournaments before Queen Elizabeth in 1571 and 1581, and he issued a jousting challenge in Palermo in 1576. Oxford's excellent horsemanship was often noted by his contemporaries, including Giles Fletcher and John Soothern.

4. Love's Labour's Lost

The Hall of the Giants, Palazzo Te, Mantua

In Love's Labour's Lost, Berowne describes Cupid: "This wimpled, whining, purblind boy/This senior-junior giant dwarf, Dan Cupid" (III.1.182).

Unfortunately, the second line has been altered by modern editors of Shakespeare. The First Folio line (page 129 of the Comedies section), which borrowed text from the 1598 first quarto edition, read: "This signior Junios gyant drawfe, don Cupid . . ." Rev. Henry Wellesley in his Stray Notes on the Text of Shakespeare (1865) read it as: "This Signior Giulio's giant dwarf, Don Cupid." "Signior Giulio" Romano portrayed Gradasso Berrettai, nicknamed "Don Cupid," the dwarf of Cardinal Ippolito dei Medici, in the Hall of the Giants, Palazzo Te. Giulio previously featured the same dwarf in "The Vision of Constantine" at the Vatican. The Hall of the Giants is considered the most dramatic of Giulio-decorated rooms in the Palazzo. To the visitor upon entering, the room appears to be collapsing. It is Jove destroying the Titans, "hideous giants crushed among their crashing, broken temples. Dickens called it an apoplectic performance, which had the effect of a violent rush of blood to the head." John Upton in Critical Observations on Shakespeare (1742) was the first critic, followed by Wellesley, to associate "signor Junio's giant Cupid" with a Giulio painting.

Shakespeare's reference to the dwarf seems to be a stray comment, since it has no association with the story in Love's Labour's Lost. Just like the statue of Hermione, the Trojan Mural and the description of the horse, these lines appear to be allusions to the works of Giulio. In 1874 the orthodox Shakespearean scholar Karl Elze noted the still current dilemma: "either Shakespeare must have studied Vasari, (in Italian and Latin to learn that Romano was a sculptor and a painter) or he had been in Mantua and had there seen Romano's works." Dwyer believes Oxford's "head was full of Romano after all he had seen in Mantua," which spilled forth onto his plays.

(cont'd on p. 16)
5. Twelfth Night – Aretino in Mantua

While he was in Mantua from 1523-27, Pietro Aretino wrote the bawdy comedy Il Marescalco, published in 1533, based on an actual event at the Gonzaga court of Federigo, Duke of Mantua, and set in the Palazzo Te. The story involves the courtiers’ strenuous efforts to make the Duke’s Master of the Horse, Marescalco, who was “reluctant with women,” comply with the Duke’s command to take a wife. The Duke and the court played a trick on the officer, dressing the Duke’s page, Carlo, as a girl and arranging that Marescalco be forced to marry the boy. The dismayed Marescalco is led to believe that he must take a wife in order to please his prince. His increasingly frantic efforts to escape such a fate culminate in a public declaration of impotence and he tries to escape. To Marescalco’s relief, the Duke finally reveals that the bride is a boy. A similar but slightly different trick based on cross-dressing occurs in Twelfth Night: Viola pretends to be a man called Cesario in order to woo a woman (Olvia) for Duke Orsino. At the same time the Duke is attracted to Cesario and is relieved at the end to learn he is a she, and they marry. Besides influencing Twelfth Night, Il Marescalco is an accepted source for the sexual ambiguity in Ben Jonson’s Epicoene, which was also influenced by Twelfth Night. It is worth noting that Il Marescalco makes specific mention of Giulio. It seems that Shakespeare and Aretino were the only Renaissance playwrights to mention Giulio in a play.

Lothian discovered language parallels between Il Marescalco and Twelfth Night: “In the Marescalco, where the speaker described the method pursued in wooing and how he would act the part of ‘uno assasinato d’Amore’, ‘I will build a escarment of velvet for you at your feet,’ ‘I will write madrigals in your praise,’ ‘I will compose to the fields loyal songs to you.’ This is not very remote from Viola’s account of how she would woo—‘Make me a willow cabin at your gate,’ ‘Write loyal cantons of contemned love,’ ‘Halloo your name to the reverberated hills,’ etc. (I.V.287 ff.).”

Aretino, Giulio’s close friend and collaborator, was one of the most famous wits and dissolutes of the Italian Renaissance.

He fearlessly satirized emperors, popes, kings and cardinals by revealing their personal scandals and peccadilloes in printed plays and poems that were immediately distributed throughout Europe. The scandalous Postures crossed the limit with Pope Clement VII and it became prudent for Aretino and Giulio to leave Rome and find refuge in Mantua.

None of Aretino’s plays was translated into English in Shakespeare’s time. However, four Italian-language comedies, including Il Marescalco, were published together by John Wolfe in England in 1588. Oxford, who was fluent in Italian and Latin, was accused by Henry Howard and Charles Arundel in 1580/81 of being familiar with the “bawdy” content of Aretino’s Postures. In many of Shakespeare’s plays and poems, direct allusions to passages in Aretino’s plays attest to his influence on Shakespeare. Shakespeare’s knowledge of Aretino and other untranslanted Italian works convinced Lothian that “Shakespeare knew Italian.” To this we may add that he also knew Mantua, and took from it a host of indelible impressions that found their way into his plays and poems.

In part two, five more ghosts of Shakespeare’s knowledge of Mantua will reveal themselves, and await recognition—ghosts involving Castiglione and the Gonzaga family of Mantua.

Notes
6. Ibid., p. 409.
12. The Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. IX.
33. Ibid., p. 654.
Westminster Abbey Memorial to Oxford

Professor Daniel Wright announced at last April’s Edward de Vere Studies Conference at Concordia University that contributors provided over $10,000 in donations to fund a memorial window to Edward de Vere in the Poets’ Corner at Westminster Abbey. In June, Prof. Wright met with the Dean of the Abbey, and presented him with news of the successful fundraising for the memorial as well as letters of endorsement from Concordia University President Dr. Charles Schlumpert, Prof. Steven May, Dr. Roger Stritmatter, Prof. Ken Draya and Prof. William Rubinstein. Dr. Wright also gained Sir Derek Jacobi’s pledge to help further efforts in obtaining the Abbey’s official recognition of De Vere’s contribution to English letters.

The achievement of this memorial would be a fitting tribute for a writer who – if his cousin, Percival Golding, was correct – already may lie within the Abbey, yet unacknowledged. Abbey authorities are not expected to reach a decision until next year.

Oxford Play in London

Edward’s Presents, a play written by Oxfordian Sally Llewellyn, will run from January 6 to 24, 2004, at the Union Theatre, 204 Union Street, in London. Edward’s Presents tells the background story of Shakespeare’s Sonnets and A Midsummer Night’s Dream with the assumption they were written by Edward de Vere, and the two works are embedded in the play. Set in the early 1590s, the play opens with Lord Burghley arranging the marriage between De Vere’s daughter, Elizabeth, and Henry Wriothesley. But Elizabeth loves William Stanley, which is the first of several love triangles to follow. “I’ve invented one or two things for dramatic purposes, to show the theme of loss linked to a deadly struggle between madness and creativity. As a psychotherapist I’m particularly interested in the motivation behind Oxford / Shakespeare’s creativity,” says Llewellyn, who will provide notes to the audience on what is invention and conjecture in the play. Located in Southwark, Shakespeare’s theater area, the Union is a small theater, and is a two-minute walk from the underground tube station. Nearby is the Globe Theatre, Tate Modern, Jerwood Space and the Old Vic Theatre. Tickets can be booked now. Phone: 011-44-20 7261 9876; sasha@uniontheatre.freeserve.co.uk.

Stratfordians Speak in D.C.

For those who would like to see prominent orthodox Shakespeare scholars in action, the Smithsonian in Washington D.C. is sponsoring two evening events. On October 27, Stanley Wells, chairman of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, will discuss his book, Shakespeare: For All Time, and speak about how Shakespeare wrote his plays. On October 29th, British filmmaker and author Michael Wood (see Book Review) will discuss his new book, In Search of Shakespeare, and give participants a virtual walking tour of London, illustrated with “Victorian photographs of 16th century buildings that have remained standing for 400 years.” Book signing available after each program. General admission: $15-20. For more information, contact Smithsonian Associates (202) 357-3030.
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And again in Act II:

Stefano: If I can recover him and keep him tame and get to Naples with him. (II.2.68-69)

For the last time in the epilogue, lines 310 to 314:

Prospero: And in the morn
I'll bring you to your ship, and so to Naples,
Where I have hope to see the nuptial
Of these our dear-belov'd solemnized;
And thence retire me to my Milan.

How can we disagree with the playwright who repeatedly tells us that the wrecked ship was bound from Tunis to Naples, a commercially important shipping route for more than two thousand years?

The Island's Location:
Other Key Clues

The island in The Tempest is described as hard rock with a rocky shore. This nicely describes Vulcano which had eruptions in 43 AD, 1444, 1550, 1626, 1727 to 1739, 1771 to 1786, 1812 to 1831, 1873 to 1879, and 1886 to 1890.

The Grand Fossa of Vulcano with its spouting fumarole and steaming sulfurous vapors.

Thus many parts of the island are hard lava, with lava columns extending into the sea, without time for new plant growth. Pliny the Elder (24-79 AD) described Vulcano's eruption of 43 AD that littered the sea with dead fish. His own fascination with the science of volcanoes lured him into the danger zone of central Naples and he succumbed from the gases and ashes of the catastrophic eruption of Mount Vesuvius in 79 AD, as did the inhabitants of Herculaneum and Pompeii.

In Act I, scene 2, line 340, De Vere describes the island as having “fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile.” Vulcano, eight by four miles in dimension, has fertile valleys with vineyards, citrus groves, and vegetable crops as well as cattle and sheep. There are barren areas covered with volcanic ash, and hot mud ponds and mineral springs where one may soak to get rid of writer’s cramp. The smell of sulfur permeates the air, usually faint, repugnant at first but becoming curiously appealing. Bright yellow sulfur aggregations dot the island, including beaches. Thus, whereas most beaches are tan or beige, The Tempest talks of “yellow sands” (I. 2. 377).

Vulcano is separated from Lipari Island by a navigationally hazardous half-mile wide strait with two jagged rock pinnacles, the Faraglione, jutting treacherously into the narrowing – is this the location of The Tempest’s shipwreck? Vulcano is twelve miles from the hydrofoil port of Capo Milazzo on Sicily’s north coast and also easily reachable by ferry from Naples. Vulcano’s 500 inhabitants work in agriculture, livestock, or fishing. Rain is sparse, fresh water sources limited. The climate, albeit windy, is mild and serene even in winter. In The Tempest, Adrian says, “The air breathes upon us here most sweetly” (II.2.49). All of these geographic, geological, and sociological features are eminently compatible with Vulcano as The Tempest’s shipwreck island.

Stinking Pitch

Are there other powerful textual clues in The Tempest? Let’s look at Act I, scene 2, lines 3 to 5:

The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch,
But that the sea, mounting to th’ welkin’s cheek,
Dashes the fire out.

This well describes many years of volcanic eruptions in Vulcano’s history as well as daily volcanic activity for hundreds of years on nearby Stromboli, an Aeolian island also famous for Roberto Rossellini’s film of the same name. If Edward de Vere did visit Vulcano in early 1576, after his trip to Sicily where he issued a general jousting challenge in honor of his Queen, the most recent volcanic eruption was only 26 years before, in 1550. The true definition of pitch is an asphalt from transformed petroleum, but surely De Vere is using the word to describe molten lava: “The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch.” Since Stromboli’s volcano is usually covered in clouds, it is the sky which seems to pour forth torrents of lava. Stinking? Most assuredly, as those experiencing close proximity to volcanoes well know. Sulfur-impregnated clouds of steam are not only noxious but so stifling that it is often impossible to breathe.

Welkin is from the Middle English word with Germanic roots, welen, meaning cloud. Welkin describes the vault of heaven, the sky, the air. “Welkin’s cheek” is an original way for De Vere to say the cheek of the air, the enveloping cloud of fog above the hot descending lava. The veil of fog and the sea meet where the fiery orange-black lava is extinguished, dashing the fire out as the lava sinks beneath the sea.

Stromboli is among the most active volcanoes in the world. On a nightly basis one can see minor eruptions and fiery lava. Let’s see how well a recent description in a tourist book matches that of De Vere:

At night the streams seem to be fantastic torrents of fire whilst the darkness becomes dispersed by luminous bands of enflamed slag, the vivid flashes of which reflect sinisterly on the sea. At times the incandescent streams seem motionless and suspended in the air owing to a curtain of fog which usually envelops the slope.

Another diagnostic clue which makes the Aeolian island of Vulcano much more likely than Bermuda or Mersea is in Act I, scene 2, lines 325 and 326. The slave Caliban annoyedly responds to Duke Prospero of Milan, his master: “A southwest blow on
ye. And blister you all o’er.” Needless to say, there is no wind in England so hot and dry that it blisters one all over! This is a classic description of the sirocco, defined as “a hot, oppressive, dust-laden wind from the Libyan deserts, experienced on the northern Mediterranean coast, chiefly in Italy, Malta, and Sicily.”

The Stratfordian Dogma

Stratfordians have constructed a seriously flawed theory that places The Tempest in Bermuda and which they say provides solid prima facie evidence that the Stratford Man is the great playwright and even proves Edward de Vere could not be Shakespeare. Their logic-impoverished theory is an excellent example of the fallacy of starting with a desired conclusion and then manufacturing evidence as proof.

Despite thousands of shipwreck narratives throughout recorded history, including the Bible, Stratfordians state that Shakespeare unequivocally based his shipwreck play upon William Strachey’s description of the Sea Venture’s 1609 destruction on Bermuda’s coral reefs. Even Oxfordians know that by 1609 Edward de Vere had been dead for five years. A more detailed description of the shipwreck and its aftermath is given by Stratfordian Professors Wells and Taylor:

An expedition of nine ships taking 500 colonists from Plymouth to Virginia set sail in May, 1609. On 29 July the flagship, the Sea Adventure, was wrecked by a storm on the coast of the Bermudas. She was presumed lost, but on 23 May, 1610 those aboard her arrived safely in Jamestown, Virginia, having found shelter on the island of Bermuda where they were able to build the pinnaces in which they completed their journey.

Accounts of the voyage soon reached England; the last-written that Shakespeare seems to have known is a letter by William Strachey, who was on the Sea-Adventure, dated 15 July, 1610; though it was not published until 1625, it circulated in manuscript. So it seems clear that Shakespeare wrote The Tempest during the later part of 1610 or in 1611.

So even though Strachey’s letter was not published until nine years after the grain merchant Shaksper’s death, “it seems clear” that “he seems to have known” the letter which must have “circulated in manuscript” from London to the widely known literary center of Stratford-on-Avon which had no public library and contained no known books other than the Bible.

Further Stratfordian evidence is derived from the King’s Men playing The Tempest before King James I at Whitehall on November 1, 1611 and which, therefore, must have been a new play. By similar pseudo-logic, when King James ordered fourteen Shakespeare plays be presented at Court over Christmas, 1612, perhaps in honor of the death of Elizabeth Trentham, widow of Edward de Vere, all fourteen must have been newly written Shakespeare plays never before presented. Additional Stratfordian “proof” is that the playwright actually tells the world that The Tempest is set in Bermuda (I. 2. 229), in the words of Ariel, an airy spirit attendant upon Prospero, the legal Duke of Milan: “Thou called’st me up at midnight to fetch dew/From the still-vexed Bermoothes…”

Bermoothes was the way Spaniards describe a boatload of colonists from Tunisia to Naples, encountering a storm and being shipwrecked on the Aeolian Island of Vulcano. The

A closer view of Vulcano’s crater rim with its bright orange and yellow liquid and solid sulfur and strangely enticing steamy vapors.

Stratfordian pseudo-logic, when King James ordered fourteen Shakespeare plays be presented at Court over Christmas, 1612, perhaps in honor of the death of Elizabeth Trentham, widow of Edward de Vere, all fourteen must have been newly written Shakespeare plays never before presented. Additional Stratfordian “proof” is that the playwright actually tells the world that The Tempest is set in Bermuda (I. 2. 229), in the words of Ariel, an airy spirit attendant upon Prospero, the legal Duke of Milan: “Thou called’st me up at midnight to fetch dew/From the still-vexed Bermoothes…”

Bermoothes was the way Spaniards pronounce “Bermudas.” Stratfordians tell us, and what Shakespeare meant to write was “still-vexed Bermudas.” So important is this interpretation that English professors have actually changed the word to “Bermudas.” Is this based upon superior knowledge, supreme confidence or academic sleight of hand? And what does the passage imply? “Clearly” that The Tempest’s shipwreck island is Bermuda, based upon irrefutable internal evidence, but like many Shakespeare allusions, Stratfordians can’t explain the meaning of the lines.

It was eminent Oxfordian researcher Richard Roe who first pointed out the true and original meaning of those two lines: 1. Dew means alcohol produced by distillation, i.e., “home-brew.” 2. Still is the apparatus used for heat-induced vaporization and then condensation in the rapid amateur alcohol distillation process. Vexed is used in the sense of plagued or afflicted. “Still-vexed” means that there are many liquor stills in the area. 4. Bermoothes was a dingy western suburb of London out Drury Lane past Convent Garden with cheaply built houses, narrow lanes, brothels, crowded taverns, and dark basements full of sailors, dockworkers, itinerants and busy stills. The sentence in question, without any mysterious import about Bermuda, merely has the airy spirit Ariel reminiscing or imagining being asked one midnight to go fetch some alcohol from one of many liquor stills in the Bermoothes. The lovely coral island of Bermuda fulfills virtually none of the volcanic descriptive qualities of The Tempest’s shipwreck island except meager fresh water. The only fiery volcanic activity in Bermuda is provided by the many couples that honeymoon there.

The Tempest describes a boatload of Italians sailing from Tunisia to Naples, encountering a storm and being shipwrecked on the Aeolian Island of Vulcano. The

4. Ibid., p. 1168.
12. Wells and Taylor.
13. Ibid.
15. Wells and Taylor, p. 1171.
17. Personal communication with Richard Roe.
19. Ibid., p. 203.
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Book Review

Attributing Authorship: An Introduction
by Harold Love, Cambridge University Press 2002 (271 pages)

By Ramon Jiménez

The identity of the creator of the Shakespeare canon is only one of the many authorship mysteries that Harold Love discusses in this entertaining and thought-provoking history of scholars’ attempts to find out who wrote what. The author is a professor of English at Monash University in Victoria, Australia. His stated purpose is to “mediate” between “computer-based work on attribution studies” of the last four decades and the traditional approaches to such studies, which extend as far back as pre-Christian Athens, where Aristotle pondered the authenticity of Homeric texts. Attributions also occupied the compilers of the Jewish and Christian Bibles. “It was recognized early that the Pentateuch could not be more than a report of the work of Moses, though it was customary to present this fact with some delicacy.”

An author’s identity may be unknown or concealed in several different ways – anonymity, deliberate or accidental; pseudonymity, including the use of another person’s name; forgery; or fakery, which might include several methods. Love illustrates each method with a variety of examples. Pseudonyms, for instance, have been rife in every place and period, and in every genre from classical texts to modern romances. Some were involuntary. The name of Jesus’ apostle John was attached to the Liber pentateuchorum under the initials “M.N.,” the last letters of his name, and we are all familiar with the transparent “W. S.” Another “W. S.” was William Sharp, who, in the nineteenth-century, published biographies and novels under his own name, and “Celtic fiction” under the name “Fiona Macleod.” He resolutely concealed Fiona’s identity throughout his life, using such devices as a bogus entry in Who’s Who.

The subject of detecting the writer has not only a lengthy history, but a broad range as well – from the concept of authorship itself (or, as Michel Foucault puts it, “the author-function”) to some of the ultra-modern methods of detection, such as “dated examples of word-processor fonts” possessed by the FBI. Of the two types of evidence used, external and internal, the external – primarily bibliographic and biographic – has traditionally been given greater credence. But since the 1960s “the balance of confidence has shifted back in favour of the internal.” Two reasons for this are that new external evidence is rare, and techniques for detecting and evaluating internal evidence have improved exponentially.

One type of internal evidence, stylistics, as it is called by the practitioners, includes everything from broad comparisons of vocabulary and imagery to the counting of the frequency of a single letter. Toward this latter end of the spectrum, stylistics passes into stylometry, one definition of which is “the exact quantitative measurement, tabulation, and interpretation of designated aspects of verbal performance.”

Love quotes some startling assessments of “non-traditional attribution studies” – those “employing the computer, statistics, and stylistics.” One expert suggested in the late 1990s that the field was “a quagmire full of half truths and flawed techniques,” and asserted that after thirty years and 700 published studies, “there is more wrong with attribution studies than there is right.” Stylometry’s status as a legitimate science is still debated, and the irrepressible Eric Sams once equated stylometry with phrenology, adding that “nobody has ever proved that minds can be measured by bumps, or style by numbers.”

Even though he presumably finished his book in 2001, Love does not report the sudden resolution of the most recent authorship cause celebre – Donald Foster’s attribution of A Funeral Elegy to Shakespeare. He does, however, provide an amusing explanation for American critics’ higher opinion of the poem and greater willingness than English critics to ascribe it to Shakespeare – “much Elizabethan poetry sounds better with an American accent simply because it is closer to that of Elizabethan times than modern English.”

As expected in a book about attributing authorship, Love devotes a full chapter to what he coyly calls “Shakespeare and Co.” Even without the issue of the pseudonym and the identity of its user, the Shakespeare canon has long been a gold mine for attributionists. Questions about Shakespeare’s authorship of poems and plays and parts of plays, both in and out of the four Folios, probably began as soon as his name appeared in print, and surely by 1595, when the initials “W. S.” appeared on the quarto of Locrine.

For his discussion of the basic authorship question, Love appears to rely on John Michell’s relatively unbiased Who Wrote Shakespeare (1996), but his approach is far from objective. He has no doubts that the man he calls “Will the player” was the Kings Men’s “house dramatist” – functioning as “a play-doctor for work by others” and “a reviser of older scripts when they were brought back into the company’s repertoire.” He also briskly clears up several of the minor authorship questions that have plagued editors and critics all these years. For those who have mulled over the authorship of Henry VIII, The Two Noble Kinsmen and Cardenio, it is helpful to read Love’s pronouncement that they are “known to be collaborations with John Fletcher.” It is also revealing to learn that Timon of Athens, Measure for Measure, and Macbeth “probably contain contributions by Thomas Middleton and are to be included in the new Oxford University Press edition of Middleton’s Works.” (This publication has apparently not yet been issued.)

Love approaches the anti-Stratfordian argument in the usual manner of the

(cont’d on p. 22)
orthodox critics by disparaging its proponents and their alleged motives. But instead of the hoary “snobbery” argument, he sees sociological forces at work: “The Baconian cause, with its reliance on ciphers and elaborate mathematical arguments, represented an attempt to appropriate Shakespeare for the emerging, number-based culture of scientists, engineers, evolutionary biologists and political arithmeticians. Subsequent attempts to claim authorship for such colourful characters as Marlowe and the literary aristocrats of the Elizabethan court represent an anti-scientific move to reappropriate the plays for the older literary culture.”

How and where he would fit Whitman, Twain, James, or Freud into either of these groups is unclear. Continuing along this line, Love dismisses the Baconian argument by describing one of its more eccentric proponents. Turning to Marlowe, he calls him an “aggressive drunk” who “pulled a knife on Ingram Frizier,” and rejects the idea of the fake murder on the grounds that it is based on the “arbitrary assertion” that Marlowe was Walsingham’s lover.

As for the “literary aristocrats,” Love vigorously demolishes one straw man after another, such as the “implied assumption” that literary genius was a genetic quality “more likely to emerge in noble families.” He then naively claims that the case for Oxford is “hampered from the start by the fact that he died in 1604, whereas new plays attributed to Will the player continued to appear for a number of years after that date.” He does not seem aware of the same problem in the three or four previously unknown plays that appeared in the First Folio in 1623, seven years after Will’s death.

Another reason for rejecting Oxford and every other alternative author is that “the writing of a play for the Elizabethan public stage was a highly technical activity,” and “the candidates are invariably amateurs.” According to Love, actors know that the stage-savvy Shakespeare had to have been one of their own. This rules out everyone but Will the player. There is no mention that Oxford was a published poet, a patron of a playing company (as was his father), a lessor of a public theater, and was cited in print three times as a leading playwright, once as “the best for comedy.” These facts are outweighed by the scant evidence that Shakespeare of Stratford was an actor and a part-owner of two theaters. To explain the intimate and accurate knowledge of the law and legal concepts revealed in the plays, Love offers his own variant of the quaint “Mermaid Tavern” theory, suggesting that if Shakespeare needed legal knowledge “it was easier to extract this from Inns-of-Court drinkers in the Devil Tavern than to search volumes of precedents.”

Love’s excursion into the authorship question leads him to the issue of circumstantial evidence. He cites B. R. Ward’s connection of Shakespeare’s Sonnets to Edward de Vere through the onlie begetter → Mr. W. H. → William Hall → George Eld → Hackney → King’s Place → Earl of Oxford series of links as typical of a circumstantial chain that breaks wherever one of its links cannot be proved. True enough that there are weak links in this chain, but there is not even a thread of similar connections, much less a chain, between the publication in 1609 of Shakespeare’s Sonnets and the retired grainhoarder in Stratford-upon-Avon. Love then undercuts his own reasoning by citing a nineteenth-century judge’s observation that circumstantial evidence is not a chain-like series of links only as strong where it is weakest, but a rope of many strands that would still bear the weight of the argument if one or two of them were broken.

Some Oxfordians might think that Love hit the nail on the head with his conclusion that “the only sensible reason … why members of the aristocracy might have wanted their plays to be performed on the public stage is as a programme of political propaganda masterminded from the court.”

Strangely, Love does not cite, or even mention, one of the most revealing of the recent attempts to distinguish authentic Shakespearean texts from bogus ones – Jonathan Hope’s The authorship of Shakespeare’s plays, A socio-linguistic study (1994). Using “socio-historical” linguistic evidence to identify certain gradual changes in English usage, Hope found distinctive patterns among five selected dramatists – Marlowe, Dekker, Fletcher, Massinger, and Shakespeare. Each author’s use of half-a-dozen changing word-forms – thou/you, that/which, etc. – seemed to reflect his birth date, with one startling exception. Instead of the expected similarity of usage between Marlowe and Shakespeare of Stratford, both born in 1564, Hope found that the author of the Shakespeare canon had the socio-linguistic habits of a man significantly older than Marlowe. He suggested that this anomaly might be explained by the Stratford man’s “southwestern upbringing” in, as John Rollet once put it, “darkest Warwickshire,” far removed from the linguistically advanced London scene.

The Shakespeare authorship question involves an unusual set of circumstances – a literary genius who concealed his writings under a pseudonym throughout his life for as yet undetermined reasons; the continued concealment of his authorship after his death by those who knew about it, including his descendants; the deliberate substitution of an alternative author; and the intentional falsification of physical and literary evidence to perpetuate the fable into the ensuing centuries. It appears that a hoax of this scope and audacity is beyond the detective capacity of scholars who scrutinize documents and count words. This introduction to attribution studies is a useful survey of the subject that inadvertently reveals the astonishing failure of its practitioners to solve, or even to seriously address, the greatest mystery in world literature.
In Search of Shakespeare

By Derran Charlton

Michael Wood, a fellow of the Royal Historical Society, has written a lavishly illustrated book: In Search of Shakespeare, an elegant Stratfordian interpretation of Shakespeare's enigmatic life. Oxfordians will criticize Wood's book as being written from a Stratfordian angle, which it is, but nonetheless it and the supportive four-part BBC documentary are visual delights that incorporate many probing aspects, including Shakspere's family and ancestors, the vast size of his father's wool-dealing operations, the Somerville Plot, the execution of Edward Arden, theater as propaganda, Christopher Marlowe's murder, the death of Hamnet Shakspere, the Wilton "academy," the Oldcastle scandal, the Boys companies and the War of the Poets, the Essex Rebellion and the deposition play, the death of Elizabeth and the accession of James, and the King's Men.

Sumptuously illustrated, the emblems at the chapter headings and on the contents page are taken from Geoffrey Whitney's Choice of Emblems (1586) and other Elizabethan books. The maps of Shakespeare's London, of the Shoreditch theater district, Bishopsgate and the theater inns, Southwark ("a licensed stew" as one Puritan preacher called it), "Shakespeare's" 1602 to ca. 1606 neighborhood, including Silver Street, are choice, as are the Victorian photographs of the local Elizabethan topography taken ca. 1880.

In dealing with Shakspere's biography, Wood's book incorporates the usual suppositions, for example: "But in trying to get a sense of Shakespeare's early education we shouldn't exaggerate the importance of books. The household in Henley Street might have possessed the odd book; a Bible, for example, an old prayer book or primer." He fails to mention that there is not a single reference to any book (not even a Bible), unpublished manuscripts, nor a musical instrument, in Shakspere's will.

Wood also attempts to marry biography with Shakespeare's sonnets. He suggests that a sizeable number of the sonnets dealing with the "fair youth" and the "dark lady" had been written, at the latest, by a mature Shakespeare in 1598-9, and proposes that the beautiful boy was William Herbert, born in 1580, who became the earl of Pembroke in 1601, and had first come to court in 1597, around the time of his seventeenth birthday. The dark lady is proposed as Elizabeth Lanier—the late A.L. Rowe's candidate—and the other candidates are ignored. Shakespeare's "true sorrow" is usually explained as a response to his separation from the boy, but Wood, quoting Sonnet 33, claims that this cannot be the whole story as his love is "absolute, intense, overwhelming," in the way a father feels for a dead child. He relates Shakspere's feelings on the death of his son Hamnet. Oxfordians might disagree. Wood fully covers the Catholic influence on Shakespeare, detailing the Catholic Reformation and the enforcement of the anti-Catholic laws, the Catholic will of Shakspere's grandfather, and Shakspere's purchase on the morning of 10 March 1613 of the gatehouse at Blackfriars—a Catholic safe house.

The richest part of Wood's book is, I suggest, the pertinent references to the charismatic Jesuit priest Robert Southwell, who was distantly related to Shakspere through the Ardens (as was Edward de Vere through the same Arden and Trussel families). Essentially, William Shakspere and Edward de Vere were distantly related. Wood carefully explains how the poet Southwell drafted "An Humble Supplication to Her Majesty," addressed to the queen herself, insisting that it was possible to be both patriotic and Catholic—an extraordinary response to the government's anti-Catholic measures of Autumn, 1591. His poems, some startling in their fantastic and original imagery, first printed in 1595, went through thirteen editions in a generation, and were counted among the most successful of the age, alongside Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis. Together they represent the twin poles of Elizabethan devotional poetry, the one to God, the other to love.

Southwell's ideas were recorded in a remarkable and influential letter composed, perhaps, just before his capture in July, 1592, and circulated as a preface to a
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manuscript collection of his poems. The letter was addressed to his “loving and good cousin” who, he said, had encouraged him to publish his poetry. His cousin, he asserted, was a far superior poet, but Southwell took him to task over the role of poets in such an age, insisting on their obligation to write spiritual work. In a dedicatory poem to the reader, Southwell spelt out precisely what he had in mind: “Still the finest wits are (di)stilling Venus’ rose . . . playing with pagan toys. . . .”

Was this mere convention? Venus, after all, is at the heart of all love poetry. Or had Southwell read *Venus and Adonis* (published 1593) during his time at Southampton’s mother’s Holborn house? Several poets in the early 1590s were affected by Southwell’s plea, most famously the protestant Edmund Spenser, and Thomas Lodge. In the final lines of the letter, Southwell smiles about his own “ditties” compared with the much finer verse of his loving cousin. Although in the early editions the addressee is called “my loving and good cousin,” in the one brought out in 1616 (coincidentally or not, just after Shakspere’s death) his initials are given. They are “W.S.”

In the documentary (soon to debut in America on PBS), Stratfordian “insights” are given on location by Edmund Fairfax-Lucy re the legend of the Charlecote deer poaching; Sir Bernard de Houghton relates the Shakeshafte mystery; Lord Montague is interviewed about his ancestor, the Earl of Southampton; Stanley Wells refers to Wilton House; and the present Duke of Rutland discusses Burbage and Shakspere’s links to the Rutland Impressa. The documentary features performances by the Royal Shakespeare Company, and visits to the New Globe, the College of Arms, the Blackfriars, British Library, the Stationers’ Hall, the Public Records Office, the Bodleian Library, the National Portrait Gallery, and naturally, Stratford-upon-Avon.

The book is interesting in places, but infuriating in its lack of references and its tendency to assert, as true, things that are unknown. Most frustratingly, neither De Vere nor the Authorship Question is mentioned! In summary, Michael Wood has written an intriguing but largely irrelevant book and documentary.