



The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter

A Publication of the Shakespeare Oxford Society
"Dedicated to Researching and Honoring the True Bard"



Vol. 42: No. 4

"Horatio, thou art e'en as just a man / As e'er my conversation cop'd withal." Hamlet IIIi

Fall redux 2006

Ann Arbor Conference

By Lew Tate

The joint SOS/Shakespeare Fellowship conference was held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, February 9-12 at the Dahlman Campus Inn, part of the University of Michigan Campus. The conference coincided with a residence of the Royal Shakespeare Company at the University. More on that later. The conferees were treated to nice accommodations, informative and exhilarating presentations, great theater, new friendships, and reunions with old friends and colleagues.

Arrival at the conference center brought registration and concomitant hugs, handshakes, and glancing at name tags all around. Rather quickly the conference got down to business. Dr. Richard Joyrich, the organizer, facilitator, and convener, (extraordinarily able and efficient), called the proceedings to order. Following his amiable comments, he turned the meeting over to the first presenter, Matthew Cossolotto, president of the SOS. He appealed to Oxfordians to focus more on growth of the movement, *outreach*. "We need to think like an ad agency." He suggested that the groups might consider hiring one. He solicited and received responses from the audience. Many of the comments

tended toward ideas about merging the two organizations, a topic that dominated for awhile. Mr. Cossolotto brought things back to outreach and commissioned all to commit to expanded membership.



Research Triangle - l-r Dr. Paul Altrocchi, Hank Whittemore, Richard Whalen

were written by Oxford. In this paper he explained that the heart of the sonnets was a sequence of sonnets 27-126, chronologically running from the Essex rebellion to Queen Elizabeth's death. Mr. Whittemore pointed to other literature of the time that in conjunction with the one hundred sonnets yield a portrait of Edward de Vere. The works joining the sonnets are *Hekatompathia or the Passionate Century of Love* ostensibly by Thomas Watson, *One Hundred Sundrie Flowers*, ostensibly by George Gascoigne, all actually by and referencing de Vere. Mr. Whittemore drove some sonnets off the page with a passionate recitation reminding the audience of the passion driving the canon. He closed stating that he did not deal with some more controversial ideas in his book in the interest of unity.

Sean Phillips challenged the right-brained in the audience with "Decrypting Shakespeare: Transposition Ciphers and the Friedman Conditions." He explained cryptology, its importance to authorship, and how de Vere's work uses them. The audience was given some background in cryptology including some vocabulary and was introduced to William and Elizabeth Friedman who established the "Friedman Condition," for analyzing authorship ciphers and in 1957 "categorically falsified" them all. Ciphers, according to their condition, must make sense, be grammatical, be meaningful, and make meaningful references to contemporary people, among other conditions. Mr. Phillips centered on "transposition ciphers" or acrostics and anagrams to show the difficulty of proving them valid yet also to show their presence in spite of the Friedman Conditions. He shared publicly for the



Dr. Robin Fox

Hank Whittemore, Renaissance man in the arts, followed with "The Subject of the Sonnets is... the Sonnets." He explained that the sonnets are Shakespeare's monument, the subject and title of his book *The Monument* that posits that the sonnets

(cont'd on p. 5)

• I N S I D E •	
GREETINGS	2
Mr. Marlowe: You're No William Shakespeare	3
Trailing Elizabeth Trentham	9
Much Ado About Oxford	16
Ideational Change:	
Why Is It So Difficult?	24
RSC at Ann Arbor	30
Letters to the Editor	31

Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter

Published quarterly by the
Shakespeare Oxford Society
P.O. Box 808
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598
Tel: (914) 962-1717
Fax: (301) 946-1313
Email: oxfordnet@aol.com
ISSN 1525-6863
www.shakespeare-oxford.com

Editors:
Lew Tate

Editorial Board:
Dr. Frank Davis
Ramon Jimenez
Brian Bechtold
Dr. James Brooks
Joe Peel
James Sherwood
Dr. Richard Smiley

Layout and Printing
St. Martin de Porres Lay Dominicans
New Hope, Kentucky

All contents copyright © 2006
Shakespeare Oxford Society

The Newsletter welcomes research articles, book reviews, letters and news items. Contributions should be reasonably concise and, when appropriate, validated by peer review. Assignment of copyright is required for publication. The views of contributors do not necessarily reflect those of the Shakespeare Oxford Society as a literary and educational organization.

Board of Trustees Shakespeare Oxford Society

Lifetime Honorary Trustees
Dr. Gordon Cyr and Charles Boyle
2006

President: Matthew Cossolotto
First Vice President: John Hamill
Treasurer: Virginia Hyde

James Sherwood
Dr. Frank Davis
Michael Pisapia
Randall Sherman
Dr. Richard Smiley
Elliot Stone
Brian Bechtold
Dr. Richard Joyrich

Dear Fellow SOS Members!

First things first. Happy Golden Anniversary! I've mentioned this major milestone before, most recently in my year-end appeal letter and in the annual renewal letter. I hope by repeating this reminder several times members will take note and join with other members in supporting our outreach activities in the course of this year.

Raising Funds, Building Awareness, Growing Our Membership

I hope we will use the 50th anniversary as a mean to accomplish three important goals for the Society – raise funds, build awareness, and grow the membership base. With regard to membership, I'd like to see us at least double our membership in 2007. Does that sound like an unrealistic goal? I don't think so. If every current SOS member recruits a single new member in 2007, our membership would double. It's that easy. To encourage current members to actively recruit new members, the Board of Trustees has approved an exciting new Recruit-A-Member program. With a current member acting as a "sponsor" for a new member, the new member pays only half the Regular membership dues the first

President's Page (cont'd on p. 15)

GREETINGS

If you compute the summer solstice by the newsletter season designation, I am before you uncovered but for *mea culpa*, so put away your fall things and relish the new year and this newsletter. Enclosed you will find stirring and unique research in the articles. Though we are inundating the world with a preponderance of Oxfordian evidence, we are still the challengers. I hope that the researchers and writers will continue their monkish endeavors in the dusty archives wherein they will continually and gradually disseminate the light of truth.

Enclosed also is a report on the Shakespeare Fellowship/Shakespeare Oxford Society Conference in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Just writing that moniker is unwieldy, almost as unwieldy as these two organizations continuing as two organizations. I also report on a wonderful spirit at the conference. I hope you share in this spirit of common cause and the goal of unity.

In addition I wish to voice agreement with Matthew Cossolotto's (President of SOS) challenge to us all that the acts of finding the facts must be vigorously supplemented with organized strategies for getting the facts out.

Please enjoy the newsletter.

Lew Tate, ed.
tate3211@bellsouth.net

THIS IS YOUR NEWSLETTER

The Shakespeare Oxford Society welcomes articles, essays, commentary, book reviews, letters, and news items of relevance to Shakespeare, Edward de Vere and the Authorship Discussion. *It is the policy of the Shakespeare Oxford Society to require assignment of copyright on any article submitted to the Newsletter.* Please contact the editor with any questions.

Submit text in digital form to: editor@shakespeare-oxford.com
tate3211@bellsouth.net

Mail photographs and illustrations to:

Newsletter Editor • Shakespeare Oxford Society
PO Box 808 • Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Mr. Marlowe: You're No William Shakespeare

The Bible Tells the Tale, Ph.D.

By James Brooks

Some skeptics of the notion of William Shakspere of Stratford as the dramatist and poet William Shakespeare have in the past proposed Christopher Marlowe as the real bard, noting among other things some similarities in passages in the plays. This paper will examine this possibility through an analysis of the uses of the Bible as found in the plays, with particular attention focused on *The Massacre at Paris*.¹

The analysis that follows considers the use of the Bible by Shakespeare, Spenser, Bacon, and Marlowe. Their references and allusions to specific verses have been studied by previous scholars and documented in the following sources:

- Shakespeare – Naseeb Shaheen's *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays* (1999)
- Spenser – Naseeb Shaheen's *Biblical References in The Faerie Queene* (1976)
- Bacon – P. D. H. Cole's Ph. D. Thesis, Oxford University (1950)
- Marlowe – R. M. Cornelius's book *Christopher Marlowe's Use of the Bible* (1964)

This analysis focuses on the works of Marlowe and Shakespeare, specifically:

- Shakespeare – Plays, but not including *Edward III* or *Sir Thomas More*.
- Marlowe – Plays, comprising *Dido Queen of Carthage*, *1 Tamburlaine*, *2 Tamburlaine*, *The Jew of Malta*, *Edward II*, *Doctor Faustus*, and *The Massacre at Paris*.

A Top-Level Perspective

Which version of the Bible did the two playwrights use in developing their biblical references, allusions, and parallels? Comments from previous scholars bearing on this question are remarkably similar. Concerning Shakespeare, Naseeb Shaheen notes the following:

The vast majority of Shakespeare's references [Shaheen finds over 1,000 references in the plays] cannot be traced to any one version, since the many Tudor Bibles are often too similar to be differentiated....Shakespeare's references are often closer to the Geneva Bible than to any other version.... There are approximately thirty passages in the thirty-eight plays ... in which Shakespeare clearly refers to the Geneva Bible, besides several other passages in which he seems closer to that version than to others.....But the Geneva was not the only version to which Shakespeare referred. At times he is closest to the Bishops' Bible. There are also a number of passages in which he is *least* like the Geneva and closer to the other versions of his day....[A]lthough the Geneva Bible

may have been the version that Shakespeare knew best and which he seems to refer to most often, the influence of other versions is also clearly evident, and no version can be called "Shakespeare's Bible" (38-44).

R. M. Cornelius recognizes a number of difficulties in attempting to identify Marlowe's Bible; a chief one is the extensive similarities in wording of the various Bibles of the time. He states that Marlowe [like Shakespeare] "did not always quote the Bible verbatim, but quoted from memory, paraphrased passages, or changed the wording in other ways to suit his own whims and needs." (11) Cornelius nonetheless arrives at the following assessment:

In spite of these difficulties, however, there is enough evidence to indicate that Marlowe probably had both the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles in mind when referring to the Scriptures. In all of Marlowe's many references to the Bible, there are only ten instances in which his wording is distinctly different from that of the Geneva. ...[T]here are twelve other fairly definite biblical references in which the Geneva is the only version that is consistently close to Marlowe's wording (11).

[W]ith reasonable certainty...Marlowe was influenced by many versions of the Bible but especially by the Geneva (or Tomson-Geneva) and the Bishops' versions, whose unique phraseology he employed on a significant number of occasions (15).

Consequently, distinguishing the works of Marlowe and Shakespeare on the basis of their preferred version of the Bible is impossible.²

Books of the Bible as Sources for Shakespeare and Marlowe

The preferences of authors for particular books of the Bible as sources of influence for passages in their works emerge from indexes of biblical verse citations corresponding to the passages arranged by book. Here's an example of a verse citation for Shakespeare from Shaheen:

Genesis 3.5 – *The Winter's Tale* 1.2.303 (770)

In Shaheen's text we find the information supporting the reference:

Gen. 3.5: Your eyes shall be opened...knowing good and evil.

WT 1.2.303: With thine eyes at once see good and evil. (723)

And Cole offers this for Marlowe:

Psalm 97.1-2 – *The Massacre at Paris* 1.42

with the text:

Ps. 97.1-2: The Lord reigneth: let the earth rejoice: let the multitude of the isles be glad. Clouds and darkness are round about him.

MP 1.42: ...he that sits and rules above the clouds (214)

Thus, a citation in an index can consist of more than one verse. Note also that sometimes a specific scriptural source cannot be identified for the literary passage because the same phrase appears in multiple places in the Bible; in such cases, more than one verse citation will be provided in the index for the same passage. Despite this, however, an assessment of the indexes provides a rough idea of the differences and similarities in the preferences of the different authors for which biblical data are available.

It would not be surprising if some portions of the Bible were more suitable than others for potential literary merit. An analysis of the biblical verse citations for Shakespeare, Spenser, Bacon, and Marlowe reveals that several books can be considered overall “favorites” as sources for biblical references.³ When the total number of references for each book is tabulated and ranked according to the number of verses cited for each book (the lower the rank, the greater the number of citations of verses in the book), the books that emerge as favorites—based on appearing in the top ten rankings for at least three of the four authors—consist of the following: Psalms, Matthew, Genesis, John, Luke, Proverbs, Job, and Isaiah.

Turning now to Shakespeare and Marlowe, specifically, an aggregation of the data by Old Testament, Apocrypha, and New Testament begins to reveal some differences in sources of biblical influence, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of Verse Sources for Shakespeare and Marlowe

	Distribution of Verse Citations (%)	
	Bible	Shakespeare
Old Testament	63	51
Apocrypha	16	4
New Testament	22	45

Both Shakespeare and Marlowe draw upon the New Testament more often than would be indicated by the portion of the Bible to these books, with Marlowe using the New Testament significantly more than does Shakespeare. Also, Shakespeare takes advantage of material in the Apocrypha more so than does Marlowe (by a factor of four, according to these data).

The data on individual books reveal both similarities and contrasts for Shakespeare and Marlowe. Selecting books for which the use by both authors is relatively frequent, Table 2 displays similarities as measured both by the ranking and fraction of total verse citations for the entire Bible.

Table 2. Books with Similar Emphasis by Marlowe and Shakespeare

Book	Rank		Percent of Verse Citations	
	Marlowe	Shakespeare	Marlowe	Shakespeare
Psalms	1	1	9.9	11.2
Matthew	2	2	8.5	10.3
John	4	10	6.3	2.9
Romans	6	7	5.6	3.4
Isaiah	7	6	4.3	3.6
Luke	7	3	4.3	7.6
Acts	10	13	3.1	2.5
Genesis	11	4	2.9	5.6
Mark	12	7	2.2	3.4

The table is based on 648 verse entries for Marlowe; 2,265, for Shakespeare. The emphasis on the Psalms and the Gospels is prominent.

Key distinctions between the two authors are revealed in Table 3, which shows areas where the use of the particular books contrasts sharply. Items in this table have been selected to highlight cases in which one author makes relatively frequent use of a book and the other does not.

(cont'd on p. 21)

OXFORD'S LETTERS

*The Letters of Edward de Vere
Seventeenth Earl of Oxford*

Read by Sir Derek Jacobi

With quotes from letters by contemporaries
and music thought to be by de Vere

Narration by Joan Walker

Narrative and editing by Stephanie Hopkins Hughes

Recorded by Malcolm Blackmoor at EFS Motivation Sound
Studios in London

Produced by Susan Campbell and Malcolm Blackmoor

For the 2CD set, send order and check:

IN AMERICA

\$20 to;

Stephanie Hughes

59 Depew Ave.

Nyack, NY 10960

IN ENGLAND

£9.95 to:

Susan Campbell

36 Shad Thames

308 Butler's Wharf

London SE1 2YE

For more information see www.politicworm.com

Ann Arbor Conference (cont'd from p. 1)

first time a two part anagram which he feels meets the Friedman conditions. It is from "Sonnet 154" and reads, "vere wrote these alas if / a clown stole Vere too."

Dr. Peter Austin-Zacharias presented "The Boar Among the Flowers: A Closer Look at *The Adventures Passed by F.J.*" Dr. Austin-Zacharias opened with a poetic look at some events of 1573, a new star in the region of the constellation Cassiopeia which was associated with the queen and which quickly disappeared. Also appearing and quickly disappearing was the anonymous book *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. The book re-appeared after two years, this time with an author, George Cascoigne, and an embellished tale, "The Adventures Passed by F.J." The original was a brief satirical and amorous tale of the English court; the new version was set in Italy with Italian characters, still a tale involving the English court, thinly disguised. Dr. Austin-Zacharias related that Michael Brame and Galina Popova had proven that Edward de Vere was the editor and author of the book. He went on to show that de Vere was the subject of "Adventures..." He proceeded with an informative and extremely entertaining reading from the story, pointing out the parallels between the libidinous escapades of the Italian rogue, F.J., and the libidinous escapades of the young English courtier, Edward de Vere.

Dr. Paul Altrocchi reminded the audience that switching from the Stratford man to de Vere does not constitute open-mindedness, that Stratfordians do not have a monopoly on neophobia. He offered an interesting statistic that only three percent of humans seem willing to question their beliefs and adopt new ones without a latent period of twenty-five to forty years. Dr. Altrocchi quoted Karl Popper, a philosopher, "At any moment we are prisoners caught in the framework of our theories, our expectations, or past experiences," and later, "Many, if not most (humans) accept the ruling dogma of the day, do not wish to challenge it, and accept new revolutionary theory only if almost everybody else is ready to accept it." After several examples of intractability from science, medicine, philosophy, and literature, he turned to Shakespeare authorship and to many Oxfordians unwilling to accept ideology change. A small sample of Oxfordian latency in the authorship debate yields that John Lyly did not have the talent to write *Euphues* or other works attributed to him; that Henry Wriothesley, the third Earl of Southampton, was the son of Queen Elizabeth and Edward de Vere. This "Prince Tutor Theory" comprised much of Dr. Altrocchi's support. He strongly suggested that Oxford scholars read Hank Whittemore's *The Monument* with minds open to a new perspective on the Sonnets and not fall into this latency as Julia Cooley Altrocchi stated it, "Citadels of thought, unlike stone citadels, / cannot be overthrown in a day."

Dr. Robin Fox opened his talk by sharing two euphoric experiences of the weekend. An anthropologist, he gloried in verification of a theory he held that humankind shares DNA with Neanderthals; a Rutgers professor, he gloried in Rutgers continuing its undefeated

run in football by defeating Louisville the night before. He then presented on "Personal Reflections on the Authorship Question, and the Grammar School Issue." On the authorship question, Dr. Fox noted his observation that Oxfordians like to recount how they came to the belief. On the grammar school issue, he had an ax to grind. He told of his history with the Oxford thesis in a gently satirical vein regarding English attitudes (He is from Haworth, Yorkshire, U.K.). Mark Twain's "*Is Shakespeare Dead?*" was an early influence. Enoch Powell was a politician of some renown but one whose career ended in disgrace; he was, though, Oxfordian and influenced Dr. Fox. Sigmund Freud, who was known for being anti-Stratfordian and whom Dr. Fox studied, was an influence. The speaker underscored the difficulty in spreading the word with his support being a rustic American, a disgraced British politico, and the originator of psychoanalytic thought for which the U.K. was unprepared, as well as a writer named Looney.

Dr. Fox was from a relatively poor family, yet he attended the English school system and has risen to a great deal of prominence. He pointed out that the grammar schools that he had attended were not much different than the one Shaksper likely attended in Stratford. It is possible that he knew enough Latin to have read a great many of the Latin texts he referenced. Dr. Fox agreed that we don't know, and that only ten or so percent of the necessary knowledge would have come from there. Both issues coalesced in an account of a dinner party with guests including Ashley Montague, A.L. Rowse, and him. All were low born



Jeopardy Contestants – l-r Dr. Dick Desper, Ron Hess, Sean Phillips

yet academically advanced, and Rowse, of course, was the outspoken critic of Oxford studies. He apparently spoke in the manner of the PBS special, *Frontline, The Shakespeare Mystery*, of some years ago. At the end Dr. Fox had affirmed the Oxford thesis and defended his U.K. Grammar school system.

Tom Townsend addressed the group on "Shakespeare and the Essential Common Man Theory." Though evidence leads scholars to de Vere as the author of the canon, the Stratfordian "common man" theory continues to drive Stratfordian thinking to Shaksper, the "common man." A difference in research is the Oxford search for historical evidence and the orthodox search for emotional evidence. "Shakespeare is just like us." Supporting the Oxfordian view are facets of the author found in the works: education, social life, political life, to name a few. The emotional angle uses archetypes; they are universal, but cultures change. Some examples of archetypes include: the hero (usually inside the box), the outlaw (outside the box), the explorer (identity), the jester (reality inside / truth), the creator (conflict), everyman (belonging, conformist). The parentheses indicate the author's comments on the archetypes thus applying authorship thinking to them. De Vere more closely fits the outlaw, explorer, jester, and creator molds. Shaksper does fit the more tight hero and everyman molds. The study of these archetypes outside the narrow emotional search for the author could yield important research and conclusions.

Ron Hess struck a familiar chord to academic researchers in presenting a small, perhaps unfamiliar item made important by scrupulous investigation. He presented to the audience *Hierarchy of the Blessed Angels* by Thomas Heywood. This poetic book includes a section wherein he lists several writers, among them, Shake-speare. Stratfordians count this as evidence of a Shake-speare writing in London. On the surface it seems a catalogue of writers with nicknames: Shake-speare=Will; Ben Jonson=Ben; Christopher Marlowe=Kit. Mr. Hess pointed out that the list is more than that. It is writers who were imitators, frontmen, collaborators, or borrowers. "Mellifluous Shake-spear" is prominent. Also, there is a list of Roman writers, men who collaborated or plagiarized, as well, "*Publius Virgilius* likewise had th' addition/Of *Maro*, to expresse his full condition/." A Terence reference in the poem indicates that he wrote as "Titus Calphurnius, Siculus, as **bred**," thus affirming another reference to Shake-speare as Terence meaning he was a frontman for a nobleman. *Hierarchy of the Blessed Angels* by Thomas Heywood as analyzed and presented by Ron Hess contributes significantly to the Oxford thesis.

Barbara Burris presented "The Provenance of the Ashbourne Portrait of Shake-speare, or what the portrait's history can tell us about the Shake-speare authorship question." The Ashbourne portrait of Shake-speare by Ketel presently at Wentworth Palace has undergone changes. A most striking change is that the present portrait is three-fourths the length of the previous one. The portrait traveled among several estates and owners and has a following of Oxfordians who suspect that it is actually the Earl of Oxford. Ms Burris's references included art experts, historians, literary figures, Folger Shakespeare Library files and more. She presented a mystery worthy of the genre and showed the audience the importance of the portrait to the authorship debate.

Bill Farina gave the audience a presentation on "Puritan Politics and Geography Lessons: The authorship Debate As an Educational Device." Mr. Farina opened with the oft asked question, "Why does it matter...?" Among other answers are that it is valuable critical thinking and it is educational

Politics of Elizabethan England are a great cause for a hoax in the authorship of the plays. If the plays included governmental or court policies, actions, words, or personages for entertainment or propaganda, it would hardly do for their author to be highly placed in that system and a rogue at that. A central political message of the plays is to unite under your government. Elizabeth had to worry about Catholics, Protestants, foreign intervention and other state issues. Not only the author but some political ideas within the plays made anonymous or misdirected authorship a necessity. Mr. Farina pointed to Falstaff as a problematic character, and he cited act four of *Henry V* when Henry wanders among the troops speaking to them of religion among other topics, some topics discussed being perhaps more egalitarian than a monarch would be comfortable with. In *Twelfth Night* the author shows himself as no friend to the Puritans in his satirizing of the reputed Puritan, Christopher Hutton as Malvolio. Mr. Farina had told his audience of the growing Puritan movement. The character Oliver MarText from *As You Like It* made Martin MarPrelate an object of satire.

"Shakespeare writes of people, not places, but places are important." Edward deVere's travels continue to be important to authorship studies. Mr. Farina pointed out that the geography of Italy at the time of these travels continues to verify the accuracy of the works set there. The canals of the country, particularly of Venice and the play's accurate depiction of the city are important. He told of the seemingly inaccurate account of Bohemia being a coastal city in *The Winter's Tale* and this inaccuracy being used to prove that Shake-speare was not careful in his geographical references therefore is of no use in authorship discussions. He pointed out a map showing that Bohemia did in the ninth century reach to the Adriatic. DeVere knew that.

Matthew Cossolotto addressed the group on the establishment of a speakers bureau for disseminating Oxford information and enlarging the overall numbers of Oxfordians. He mentioned several successful experiences in speaking before various academic and civic groups. Members present also told of opportunities utilized in such activities. Mr. Cossolotto suggested a coordinated effort, and he suggested a presentation that would be brief and relatively simple to understand, more a primer on the Oxford movement.

Dr. Roger Stritmatter spoke on "A Moveable Feast: The Liturgical Symbolism and Design of *The Tempest*." His presentation was drawn from research and writing of Lynn Kositsky and him on dating *The Tempest*. Their work has essentially closed the book on orthodox dating of the play and is getting wider and wider attention. This paper focuses on court performances of plays during liturgical festivals. There are seven such festivals; this paper dealt with Shrovetide performances of *The Tempest*. Shrovetide is the Christmas equivalent of Carnival. It celebrates the end of the Winter Revels and the beginning of Lent. Plays were performed at court every Shrovetide from from 1567 to 1608 with four exceptions. Dr. Stritmatter pointed to the tension of the self-indulgent revels transitioning into the more austere Lent. Within the play we see the disciplined, loyal, though "airy" Ariel and the wild and rebellious Caliban. The orderly island is interrupted by the carousing of Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo as well as a planned rebellion of the courtiers. Organized feasting is seen in the stylized banquet scene after which the banquet just disappears and the ending of revelry in Prospero's "now our revels now have ended" speech. The expected climax of revenge is countered with forgiveness. The characters are prepared to move on to a new season. Dr. Stritmatter and Ms Kositsky point out that on Shrove Maundy, 1605, *The Spanish Maze* was presented at court, a play they maintain was *The Tempest*.

The title of Ron Halstead's paper was "Suffer a Sea-change: Sources of the Alchemical Images of *The Tempest* in a Life Crisis of Edward deVere." Mr. Halstead established a working explanation of alchemy that goes well beyond mixing metals. He established the connection with chemistry, philosophy, (imagination), music, and magic. DeVere had a connection with alchemy in that he had patronized works concerning an alchemical approach to medicine particularly as practiced by Paracelsus. Mr. Halstead set forth the idea that John Dee, an Elizabethan alchemist, astrologer, and proponent of alchemical medicine as the model for Prospero. On the island was a boiling. Prospero was not, however, perfecting metals, but

people through the "man as vessel" approach to healing. DeVere is his example, and his life crisis is seen through Ferdinand. Ferdinand suffered shipwreck, apparent drowning, loss of his father, and isolation from familiar surroundings. The same situations were true of deVere's life. With Cecil also being a part of Prospero and Miranda as Anne Cecil, it is easy to see Ferdinand as deVere. Prospero "heals" his crisis with a mixture of physical development, hauling logs, feeding him, (also chemical), moral development, and emotional development, among others. To be sure, Prospero had magic to call upon, but his dealings with Ferdinand went much further while showing a deVere connection to the play.

The intriguing paper entitled "*The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One: A Newly Authenticated Play by William Shakespeare*" was presented by Dr. Richard Egan. *Richard II, Part One* was formerly known as *Woodstock*, an anonymous manuscript. Dr. Egan cited computer-assisted analyses of the language, scenes, narrative structures, themes, history, several other play conventions, and 1,600 phrase and word parallels that prove the author of the play to be Shakespeare. The best proof of all was a reading comparing the diction to other Shakespeare plays. The reading became an amusing, entertaining reading of *Richard II, Part One*. Dr. Egan read from the play, employing the dialects and mannerisms of the characters. He eloquently made the case that "It's good enough to be Shakespeare."

The title of Dr. Tom Hunter's presentation was "Shylock: Jew and No Jew: Why Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* is not Anti-Semitic." Dr. Hunter points out the anti semitism in the play and that it is characters speaking, not the author. The play is satire on human failings, and anti Semitism is one of the failings. *The Merchant of Venice* is tied to scripture: Venice, itself serves as a Tower of Babel in its mixture of classes, races, and cultures. Human duplicity is spotlighted. Antonio is afflicted with a mysterious melancholy. Bassanio's love for Portia is money oriented. Portia has secrets (racial prejudice for one). Mercy is central to the play; it was presented as central to Jewish and Christian belief. Portia's mercy speech, while disguised as the lawyer, is mercy as given in the Torah, a balance of justice and mercy. Names from the play were shown to be tied to the Bible. The characters also represented three groups of humanity descended from Noah's sons.

The erudition of Dick Desper was evidenced through his presentation entitled "Stars or Suns: The Portrayal of the Earls of Oxford in Elizabethan Drama." Dr. Desper gave some personal background with the Oxford movement (Frontline), some background of characterizations of earls of Oxford in Shakespeare. The centerpiece to his thesis comes from a conversation among French nobles before the Battle of Agincourt in *Henry V*, Act 3, scene 7. Almost in passing Lord Rambures asks the Constable, "My Lord constable, the armour that I saw in your tent tonight, _____ are those stars, or suns upon it?" The answer, "Stars, my Lord."

Dr. Desper makes much of the fact that not much has been made of these words. It is a description from Oxford heraldry. He noted that in the Kenneth Branagh film, a shield in the battle scene was the shield of the 11th Earl of Oxford. He also surmises that the use of this image could come from historically out of sync moments. In the Battle of Barnet, (War of the Roses), Warwick mistook The

Earl of Oxford's star for those of Edward IV's sun and attacked, driving out Oxford and cementing the battle for Edward. The talk covered other earls of Oxford and their roles in history as well as literature. A closing thought was that deVere's name and those of some less admirable earls may have been detrimental to the propaganda possibilities of the plays.

Professor Thomas Regnier presented "Disclaiming Shakespeare's Legal Knowledge." Prof. Regnier noted that a large number of orthodox scholars write that Shakespeare's legal knowledge was common in his day. In *Hamlet* can be found complex and subtle examples of law, and Prof. Regnier pointed many of them out. One such example was homicide law which during Elizabethan times had changed from victim based to accuser based law. This meant that the killer was protected by more than a pardon from the king. *Hamlet* showed that the mental state of the accused was a consideration. Hamlet thought that a rat was behind the arras, something to be considered. Also a factor would be Hamlet's mental condition or madness. The play obviously considers these things. *Hamlet* also touches upon the law regarding suicide, poisoning, inheritance, revenge, property among others, thereby *reflecting* a writer deeply steeped in law, not casual encounters as might have been the Stratford man.

Richard Whalen took on orthodox dating of the plays with "Shakespeare Plays allegedly Written After 1604: Not Proven and Here's Why." Mr. Whalen began by mentioning that some famous Stratfordian scholars such as Jonathan Bate, Sylvan Barnet, Harold Bloom, and Samuel Schoenbaum recognize the dating as "a problem," "speculative," and "tentative." The paper counted down twelve plays said to be post 1604 and how they were written before that date. Some are arbitrarily dated two to three years before they were recorded; this method of dating is not only faulty but seems manipulative to fit with Shaksper's dates. Mr. Whalen asked why *Henry VIII* would have an intentional performance before James I with references to Elizabeth in it. He discounted the need for *Macbeth* to post date the Gunpowder Rebellion or "equivocation" references. The long held notion that *The Tempest* was based on reports from Strachy on a New World shipwreck has been put to rest by recent research by Dr. Roger Stritmatter and Lynn Kositsky. Mr. Whalen cited this research. The dating is still problematic, but dating plays after 1604 to exclude deVere is not solving the problem.

Earl Showerman made a remarkable connection between classical literature and mythology and *The Winter's Tale* in "All In the Family: Gods and Greeks in *The Winter's Tale*." Dr. Showerman found that the play "is layered in the mythology, dramas, and history of ancient Greece." He traced the names of characters to classical sources; perhaps Apollo is the best example. Apollo is mentioned twelve times in the play, and the Oracle of Delphos is featured in some detail. The scene in the play wherein Hermione, the queen, is resurrected from a statue to a living woman can be traced to Euripides' *Alcestis* who Hercules brings to life. Pygmalion and Demeter and Persephone are also characters bearing on Hermione. Dr. Showerman's treatment of resurrection is a piece of the puzzle which he assembled for the audience in making the case for the vital influence of Greek literature on Shakespeare.

The giving of papers was the mainstay of the conference, but other activities contributed to the learning, business and fun. The Shakespeare Fellowship and the Shakespeare Oxford Society had annual meetings. Matthew Cossolotto, president of The Shakespeare Oxford Society, and Ted Story, president of The Shakespeare Fellowship, gave a joint welcome and introduction.

The morning after *The Tempest* was presented by the RSC, Dr. Ren Draya of Blackburn University presided over a panel discussion of the play. Panelists were Dr. Roger Stritmatter, scholar and Assistant Professor at Coppin State University and James Newcomb, actor, most recently with Oregon Shakespeare Festival and whom many conferees enjoyed as Richard III at last year's conference. Their thoughts and interpretations of the performance were insightful and interesting. Most striking was their agreement on how this production and Patrick Stewart's interpretation made a most moving experience of the Act Five, scene seven moment wherein Ariel's wistful thought on being human was pivotal to Prospero's journey being complete. Patrick Stewart, himself, joined the discussion. He spoke and answered questions in a most thoughtful and intense fashion. He too emphasized the same breakthrough dialogue between Prospero and Ariel. He explained how they derived the moment and its long, quiet stare, a stare the director felt was too long. Mr. Stewart added slyly that the director wasn't around so much recently, so it has stayed in. In answer to a question, he explained that he does feel a relationship with the author; he experiences a unity with him. He was asked his thoughts

on Oxford. He answered that he was intrigued by the history, life, and range of experiences, but that the writing he had read under his name was second rate.

Alex McNeil presented and moderated his creation, *Oxfordian Jeopardy*. The game conformed to the *Jeopardy* format with Shakespeare-Oxford subjects. The contestants were Sean Phillips, Ron Hess, and Dick Desper. All of the technology was in fine form as was the moderator. After a spirited, hilarious, and impressively intelligent game, Dick Desper emerged as the 2006 *Oxfordian Jeopardy* Champion.



VIP – Lynn Kositsky.

The movie *Shakespeare Behind Bars* was shown twice to those interested. It is a film about the performances of Shakespeare by prisoners and the effect it had on all involved. It was quite a moving movie for many of those in attendance.

On the last day everyone was treated to an elegant banquet. Dr. Richard Joyrich was cited for his efforts and skills in the making of a successful conference. A talk was given by James Newcomb. He said he sees himself as an interpretive actor. He gave credit to scholars for material which has aided in interpreting characters. Mr. Newcomb used Devere's life in creating his version of portrayal of Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. He is also using de Vere to help inform his interpretation of the title character in *Coriolanus*. The award for The Oxford Researcher of the Year was presented to Lynn Kositsky. Nobody present was anything but delighted at this choice. She represents us all well, and the recognition was a fitting ending to the conference.

**Visit the Shakespeare Oxford Society
website at**

www.shakespeare-oxford.com

Publications

Membership

Calendar

Links to Shakespeare on the Net

Blue Boar Giftshop

Shakespeare Oxford Library

2006 Authorship Conference

Trailing Elizabeth Trentham

By Christopher Paul

Elizabeth Trentham¹ (1559?-1612), one of the queen's Maids of Honour whom Oxford married in 1591, has been the recent subject of fascinating speculation by both Mark Anderson (251-3) and John Hamill (1+) in conjunction with *Willobie His Avis*. Pauline K. Angell, an apparent Stratfordian (though one suspects a closet Oxfordian), in an intriguing PMLA article of 1937, first proposed the theory upon which Anderson and Hamill have separately expanded.² While I have nothing here to add or detract with regard to the theories elaborated by Anderson and Hamill, there are some items about this intriguing woman generally familiar to Oxfordians that merit reviewing, and others unfamiliar worth taking into consideration.

If we may judge by the available evidence, Countess Elizabeth was attractive, well educated, and assertive, not to mention wealthy, which naturally begs the question why she had not married sooner than she had. Although by the time the two were married, Oxford's earldom was beyond recovering the splendor it once had, the countess nevertheless managed to save it from utter bankruptcy. Her business insight and sense of justice are evident from more than a dozen extant letters penned in her precise holograph to Robert Cecil, Julius Caesar, Christopher Hatton (cousin of the Lord Chancellor of the same name), and Fulke Greville, among others. Her innate intelligence exudes in her last will and testament. John Chamberlain mentions her hospitality less than six months before her death, when she was found entertaining King James and his retinue at Havering-atte-Bower (McClure I.357). That she was not to be taken lightly may be surmised from a 1601 complaint by Arthur Mills (sometime servant to Oxford), who prayed for Cecil's protection from Lady Oxford, claiming that she was persecuting and threatening him with various charges, although he had been tried and acquitted on the false charge of having stolen her casket (Salisbury XI.586). We may gather that her appearance was not unpleasing from a letter to Roger Manners of 5 April 1582, by one J. Farnham, who, in paying compliments to several ladies, wrote that Elizabeth Trentham was "as fair ... as ever" (Rutland I.134). Thomas Churchyard, who had served Oxford as well as Oxford's uncle, the poetical earl of Surrey, offered a lyrical description of Trentham in a 1593 publication titled *A Pleasant conceite penned in verse*. In this pamphlet dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, Churchyard paid tribute to different "famous Townes"—counties really—by offering each its own stanza, but which were transparent encomia



A farewell to his booke.

Stand a defense to the Prince, to the Publick weale as a pillar,
And God graunt to that Earle of Oxford, mirror of highnes,
Happines in this world: God bleffe his Ladie the Countesse,
Elizabeth Trentham, that right trew Maiden of honor,
Immaculat Virgin: whose house and name I doe fauor,
With reuerence as I should, For I came my selfe of a *Trentham*,
Aunt to thee, Lady renoun'd: yet I am not knowne to thee Madame.
Loth I am yet to be knowne. For I should be knowne to the best fort:
Knowne to that Earle *Daucenex*: whom I pray God daily to comfort,
Vere, *Daucenex*, *Talbot*, three nobel principal howses,
Ar to be greatly renoun'd, for their nobilitie peerelesse.
And I do charge thee my booke, with things not rashly to meddel,
Which ar about our reach, that concerne vs but a littel:
Nor to detract any fame, from Peeres or States that are highest.

For



to the countesses who bore those names. For the countess of Oxford, he wrote:

Oxford came last, like sober Sibbill sage,
Whose modest face, like faire *Lucyna* shone:
Whose stayed lookes, decors her youthfull age,
That glisters like, the Alablaster [sic] stone.
Her blotlesse life, much laude and glorie gate,
And calld her vp, to be a great estate.
The Diamond, dooth lose his daintie light,
And waxeth dim, when *Oxford* comes in sight (sig. B2r).

One should never read such panegyrics too literally, but there is some reason to believe that Churchyard's words are not entirely formulaic; and if the compliments are anywhere near accurate, Trentham, who was in her early thirties by this time, had retained her youthful appearance, albeit her looks were "staid", in other words dignified, or sober.³ Considering that the countess had given birth to Oxford's heir, Henry de Vere, on 24 February 1593, associating her with *Lucina*, the Roman goddess of childbirth, would have been most appropriate. *Lucina*, from the Latin *lux*, later became an epithet of Juno, as "she who brings children into the light." This again was fitting, as Churchyard says Lady Oxford's skin glistens translucently, and that the light of a diamond falls short of her own illumination.

An earlier tribute had appeared in 1591 in *Brittons Bowre of Delights*, an anthology attributed to Nicholas Breton but which included some of Oxford's poems. Among other compliments Trentham is here again called "fair" and likened to a "beautie" of "[e]xcellence rare." In his edition of 1933, Hyder Rollins made the following observations:

The Earl of Oxford wrote not merely No. 40, as [Richard] Jones indicates, but also No. 54 and possibly No. 3 ... The first countess of Edward de Vere died in 1588. It would be pleasant if one could prove that the Earl of Oxford wrote this poem in praise of his future second wife. He was a poet of great reputation—so great that various misguided persons to-day believe him to have been Shakespeare. Whoever the author, he manages in lines 20-22 to pay a graceful and no doubt an acceptable compliment to the "heavenly Queene" Elizabeth. (xviii, 73)

While Rollins' assessment of Oxfordians is itself arguably

misguided, his suggestion that Oxford may have authored No. 3 in the collection is perceptive indeed. Oxfordians have in the past also suggested that de Vere authored this acrostic poem. Although it has been printed in previous Oxfordian publications, it repays another look.

T Time made a stay when highest powers wrought,
R egard of loue where virtue had her grace,
E xcellence rare of euerie beautie sought,
N otes of the heart where honour had her place,
T ried by the touch of most approved truth,
A A worthie Saint to serue a heauenly Queene,
M ore faire then she that was the fame of youth,
E xcept but one, the like was neuer scene.

There may be no 'proving' that Oxford wrote this poem, per Rolins' suggestion, yet considering that Oxford was an acknowledged poet and betrothed to Trentham around the time it was published, it seems not at all unlikely that he was the author. If so, it may be instructive to note some parallel passages in Shakespeare:

From "Time made a stay" to "we must stay the time" (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*: V, i); "I must stay his time" (*Cleopatra*: III, xiii); "But stay the very riping of the time" (*Merchant of Venice*: II, viii).

From "Time made a stay when highest powers wrought" to "To stay the providence of some high powers" (*Julius Caesar*: V, i).

From "virtue had her grace" to "Her virtues graced with external gifts" (*Henry VI, pt. I*: V, v); "Their virtues else—be they as pure as grace" (*Hamlet*: I, iv).

From "Excellence rare of every beauty sought" to "I sought the purchase of a glorious beauty" (*Pericles*: I, ii).

From "Tried by the touch" to "being touch'd and tried" (*King John*: III, i).

From "approved truth" to "approve the truth" (*Henry IV, pt. II*: I, ii); "Approve their truths" (*Troilus and Cressida*: III, i).

From "A worthy saint" to "Worthy saint" (*Henry VI, pt. I*: IV, vii).

From "to serve a heavenly Queen" to "I serve the fairy queen" (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*: II, i).

From "More fair" to "more fairer than fair" (*Love's Labours Lost*: IV, i); "far more fair than she" (*Romeo and Juliet*: II, ii); "A thousand times more fair" (*Merchant of Venice*: III, ii).

From "the like was never seen" to "I never saw the like" (*Coriolanus*: II, i).

In and of themselves these parallels of course prove nothing, but nevertheless offer food for thought if Oxford wrote both the foregoing poem to his fiancée and the works of Shakespeare.

Immaculate Virgin

Early in the year 1600 an interesting if somewhat curious reference to the countess, along with her husband Oxford, appeared in a publication titled *The First Booke*

*of the Preservation of King Henry the vij. when he was but Earle of Richmond, Grandfather to the Queenes maiesty; Compiled in english rythmicall Hexameters.*⁴ What makes this item curious (among other things) is that although the book was published anonymously, the author claims to be Elizabeth Trentham's first cousin, and yet is unknown to her. He is, additionally, intent on remaining unknown to everyone. His fifteen-page 'Dedicatory Epistle to the Reader' finishes after the manner of many others:

But now least I should be too tedious, wishing to you all as to my selfe, in our Lord and Sauour Christ Iesus; I most humbly take my leaue: resting yours, in all loue and duetie to commmand [sic], (sig. C1r)

Invariably such sign-offs, whether in a personal letter or a printed book, are followed by the author's name, but it is noticeably absent here, more so in view of the fact that a comma follows the final word "commmand [sic]". There is a similar occurrence at the end of the nineteen-page 'Epistle to Queen Elizabeth' signed off thus: "Your Graces Subiect, in faith, loue, duty to commaund:" (sig. F4v). One would normally expect the author's name to follow the colon at the end, but there is only a blank. The author's anonymity becomes all the more conspicuous when he refers to himself as a courtier but "with a name vnknown: which is a grieffe to my heart"; "Vnto the Court: to the Queene vouchsafe my name to be namelesse"; and, in his address to the countess of Oxford, he is "Loth ... to be knowne" (see figure 1).

Although the author writes that this is the first of five intended books on Henry VII, he was apparently never heard from again, which is unfortunate, as his treatment of the thirteenth earl of Oxford would no doubt have been of interest. Included here are the introductory and concluding lines surrounding those dealing with Countess Elizabeth and Earl Edward.

A farewell to his booke.

MY prety booke farewell: God send thee prosperus accesse



Vnto the Court: to the Queene vouchsafe my name to be
namelesse.
Thy soueraigne Patronesse (if please her grace to defend thee)
Can patronize thy defectes. Whom God preserue, as a bay
tree,
Long to be predominant, with Lords of her priuie Counsaile:
Namely the Lord Keeper, with learned lawes who doth excell:
That Metropolitan eake, whom I think my selfe to be bound
to;
Th' Archbishop, at *Lambeth*: that wise Lord Treasurer also:
And Senator *Cecill*; that appeares to the Realme a defender:
Sonne to the Lord *Burleigh* late deade, his wise wittie father,
That sapient *Nestor*: which did by pollicy compasse
Much quiet vnto the Realme. For like as *Cælfifer Atlas*,
On large broad shoulders sore pressed, propped vp heauen:
So with his experience, this noble Realme was vpholden.
For why? The state of a Prince consisteth chiefly by counsel
Of wittie graue Senators, whose wittie with vertue doth excel.
And I beseech God blesse that noble pillar of highnesse,
Glorius Earle, *Talbot*, stout Earle of *Shrewsbury*; doubtlesse
Vertues trew president: of al humane curtesy mirror:
Mirror of armipotence. Whose nobel name was a terror
Vnto the Frenche Regiment: to the Crowne still knowne to be
constant:
Worthy to be credited with a Prince, as a faithfull attendant:
And to be chiefly preferd; that he may with bounty the better
Stand a defense to the Prince, to the Publick weale as a pillar.
**And God graunt to that Earle of Oxford, mirror of high-
nesse,
Happines in this world: God blesse his Ladie the Count-
esse,
Elizabeth Trentam, that right trew Maiden of honor,
Immaculat Virgin: whose house and name I doe fauor,
With reuerence as I should. For I came my selfe of a
Trentam,
Aunt to thee, Lady renoun'd: yet I am not knowne to thee
Madame.
Loth I am yet to be knowne. For I should be knowne to the
best sort:
Knowne to that Earle *Deuereux*: whom I pray God daily to
comfort,
Vere, Deuereux, Talbot, three nobel principal howses,
Ar to be greatly renoun'd, for their nobilitie peerelesse.
And I do charge thee my book, with things not rashly to med-
del,
Which ar aboue our reach, that concerne vs but a littel:⁵
Nor to detract any fame, from Peeres or States that are highest.
For littel meddling, of most is thought to be wisest,
As the Poet poetiz'd, that *Naso* Poetical Author;⁶
Frugally liue to thy selfe: flee far from great men of honor.
For many men that atend some Lords, or daily do follow,
Do but as *Æsops* dogge, that a substance lost for a shaddow.
Yet many men be preferd, by the meanes of great men of
honor;
Such speciall persons which they most dearely do fauor.**

Farewel againe prety book be dutiful vnto thy betters:
Humbly with al reuerence, submit thy selfe to thy Rulers.
(sigs. C4v-D2r, bold emphasis added)

On first impression it seems strange for Trentham's anonymous cousin to refer to her in 1600—seven years after she had been married and given birth to Henry de Vere—as an immaculate virgin. However, tied in with the preceding “right trew Maiden of honor,” this trope would have been understood as a metaphorical compliment meaning that she was chaste in thought and devotion. It is a portrayal of the countess not dissimilar to that in the *Brittons Bowre* acrostic, in which she was “Tried by the touch of most approued truth, / A worthie Saint to serue a heauenly Queene.” In both pieces the references to ‘true’ and ‘truth’ may well have been intended as a double entendre on the name Vere. While Trentham's cousin was no doubt being consciously diplomatic, it is nonetheless pleasant to see Oxford referred to as a “mirror of highness” at this late date. Although John Farmer had paid high compliments to the earl in his 1599 book of madrigals, Oxford's reputation was generally so tarnished by then that flattery of this kind was no longer a matter of course—at least not under his own name.⁷

We are left to wonder about the identity of the countess of Oxford's mysterious cousin, who was loath “yet to be knowne” for that he “should be knowne to the best sort”; in other words, whether through false modesty or genuine humility he felt his station was such that he didn't deserve to be counted among the thoughts of such esteemed individuals.⁸ Despite apparently having been a courtier, and qualifying these sentiments by writing “[y]et many men be preferd, by the meanes of great men of honor;” he nevertheless omitted his name. In the ‘Epistle to the Reader,’ in which he defends his hexameters, admittedly “misliked of many,” the author acknowledges a number of “excellent and singular good Poets in this our age,” including Golding, Harrington, Daniel, Fraunce, and Spenser, the last of whom he writes “(without offence spoken) hath surpassed them all” (sig. A2v). While he goes on to discuss and praise the likes of Phaer, Stanihurst, Homer, Virgil and Lucan, he spills no ink upon the name Shakespeare. Whether or not he was aware Oxford was the man must remain an open question.

The pen is mightier than the sword

The Diary of Philip Julius, duke of Stettin-Pomerania, as kept during his visit to England in 1602 by his tutor and secretary, Frederic Gerschow, contains a thought-provoking allusion to the countess of Oxford. In his entry of 17 September 1602, Gerschow recorded their tour through Westminster Abbey and the palace of Whitehall, describing the shield gallery in the latter thus (here translated from the original German):

Afterwards we were led into a long gallery, in which were hanging many fine shields, painted with artistic emblematis, that the knights use in their processions, and our notice was directed to the two verses used by the great and celebrated noble warrior the Earl of Essex in several tournaments against the Lord of Borle or Burghedt (Burleigh), the Queen's Secretary.

With this Secretary he was for ever at strife, and this was one of the causes of his fall.

Seeing that he could accomplish nothing against the Lord of Borle, chiefly on account of his mother, a Countess of Oxford,⁹ who greatly befriended him, and on account of his being a favourite and friend of the Queen, he got a shield made with a pair of scales upon it, and in the one scale was a big cannon, in the other a writing-pen which nevertheless out-balanced the cannon, with this inscription: 'Et tamen vincor.' ['And yet I am subdued.'] Not having accomplished anything with the writing-pen he made another attempt and covered a shield with black velvet and embroidered with small black stones; in the middle were printed the following words in golden letters: 'Nulla par est figura dolori.' ['Nothing can represent his sorrow.'] To what a sad ending this bitter enmity came at last, the result—God have mercy upon us—has lately showed. (Von Bülow 22-25, emphasis added)

Without question Gerschow's syntax is difficult to follow, and different interpretations of the foregoing passage have been at least partially attempted. There was evidently a communication gap, and Gerschow, confused, referred to Robert Cecil as both Secretary of State and as Lord Burghley (Thomas Cecil was second Lord Burghley by 1602). On this point Gerschow seems to have gotten at least partially straightened out within the next couple of days, as he recorded on 20 September that they visited "Thiepoltz (Theobalds) in the county of Hertforth (Hertford) ... erected by William Sitzell (Cecil), Lord of Boule or Burget (Burleigh), whose son, the Lord Secretary, possesses it at present" (29). Obviously too, Essex would never have jousted, at least literally, with Robert Cecil. That is not to say, however, that the verses he presented in the tournaments weren't directed towards his troubles with Cecil, to whom the queen had gradually conferred Lord Burghley's power—power that the disappointed Essex had hoped to seize. I have not determined the role, if any, that Essex's mother, Lettice Knollys-Devereux-Dudley, played in the rivalry between her son and Robert Cecil, but admit to not having researched this point. What captures our attention more than anything is Gerschow's apparent claim that the countess of Oxford had befriended Essex and, in order to accommodate him in his rivalry with Cecil, was somehow influential in acquiring this emblem for him.

Without mentioning the countess of Oxford, Roy Strong discusses the emblem in *The cult of Elizabeth*. Although he names no source, there is no question that his commentary was gleaned from the Gerschow/Julius diary, only Strong silently amends "Burghley" to Robert Cecil:

When the bid for power between Essex and Sir Robert Cecil was at its height the Earl carried an *impresa* depicting a pair of scales, a pen outweighing a cannon, with the motto *Et tamen vincor*. Peacham illustrates this, as well as another device known to have been carried by Essex—a blank shield signifying his grief, probably over the death of Sir Philip Sidney, with the inscription *Par nulla figura dolori*. Earlier in the book Peacham includes an emblem of Philautia, and one speculates whether this was Essex's emblem for the 1595 tilt. Only in these isolated instances do the riddling Accession

Day *impresa* take on the dimension they once had and, like the speeches, become pointed and even stinging allusions to the grim realities of court politics. (68)

Paul E.J. Hammer has a different take than Strong, albeit a misleading one, writing that "according to a visiting German nobleman ... [w]hen balked by Burghley in his urging that England must expand its war effort, [Essex] displayed an *impresa* showing a pen and a cannonball hanging in equal balance beneath a set of scales, with the inscription *Et tamen vincor*" (203). Hammer's scenario about the disagreement between Burghley and Essex regarding the war effort did not derive from Gerschow or the duke of Stettin-Pomerania, which is certainly the impression he gives. Hammer also misreports Gerschow's (not the duke's) description of the *impresa*, writing "a cannonball" rather than "a big cannon," and that it hung "in equal balance" with the pen, whereas Gerschow wrote that the pen "nevertheless out-balanced the cannon." As can be seen, Henry Peacham's depiction of the emblem in *Minerva Britanna* in 1612 corroborates the accuracy of Gerschow's account (see figure 2).

Perhaps the most provocative discussion of the emblem comes in the form of a bookend to Bruce Danner's 2003 *Shakespeare Quarterly* essay "Speaking Daggers." Danner launches his thesis on how for many audiences "the central fact of the play" remains the question of why Hamlet chooses to "'speak daggers ... but use none' (3.2.387)—and thus to rely on language when he should most act" (29), and ends it, ironically enough, on how the "inextricable links between action and language crystallized in one of Essex's tournament *impresa*" (62). Danner mentions the entries in the duke of Stettin-Pomerania's diary and Peacham's *Minerva Britanna* and subsequently observes:

Such a device illustrates the symbolic constraints within which military ambition was forced to maneuver in the Tudor Court. Gifted in such image-making, Essex certainly delighted in insinuating the skewed logic that placed the skills of language and writing of the Cecil faction over his identity as a heroic figure. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether he could have realized the degree to which such designs reduced his martial identity to a courtly aesthetic, or how much more effectively he represented his military pretensions through such symbols than he ever did in outright execution. Like Hamlet's appeal to the metaphor of the mirror, Essex's scales suggest a longing for a fixed standard of truth, a means by which the material and the symbolic may be "weighed" against each another. Yet both the content and the form of the design concede that no such measurement exists. For all its paradoxical sarcasm, Essex's complaint [*Et tamen vincor*] acknowledges that both his martial identity and its representation in the ponderous cannon lie equally "subdued" to the quill pen ... In a world where all things convey their value through the lens of representation, even the sword must rely on the intermediary of the pen. Under similar conditions Hamlet progresses from speaking pictures to speaking daggers... (62)

Having preceded his discussion of the emblem by an unintentionally double-edged consideration of how "the aura of heroic action lay in a concealed form of representation" (61), it comes as

no surprise that Danner does not mention the countess of Oxford, but rather that Essex was simply “[g]ifted in such image-making.” Certainly Danner did not have the earl of Oxford in mind, let alone Shakespeare, when he wrote of “the skills of language and writing of the Cecil faction” holding sway over Essex’s “identity as a heroic figure.”

It seems clear enough from Peacham’s 1622 *The Compleat Gentleman* that his familiarity with the emblem resulted from his eyewitness account of it: “The best [emblems and impresas] that I haue seene, haue bene the deuises of Tiltings, whereof many are reserued in the priuate Gallery at White Hall, of Sr. Phillip Sidneie’s, the Earle of Cumberland, Sr. Henry Leigh, the late Earle of Essex, with many others” (199). Peacham may have changed the impresa’s existing motto to *Quæ pondere maior* [Which greater weight?—a fact that goes unacknowledged by every other commentator—to suit his poetical designs with the rest of the emblem. However, since Peacham seemed to be informed on the matter it is not clear why he didn’t indicate that the emblem had derived from Essex, as he had done with emblem 114 (*Par nulla figura dolori*), of which he specified: “The deuice of the late Honorable, Earle of Essex.” Instead, Peacham here put *Incerti Authoris* [uncertain author] in the margin. The only additional information Peacham gives in his other marginal annotation is that the impresa had been used during a tournament in the reign of Elizabeth and represented one of the “trophies of the spear-tilts” (*Hastiludiorum trophæis*). Is it possible Peacham’s disassociation of the emblem from Essex was intentional? Were it not for Gerschow’s description in the duke of Stettin-Pomerania’s diary it would never have been known that the device had belonged to Essex. Assuming that the countess of Oxford had some hand in the matter, compiled with other Oxfordian speculations about *Minerva Britanna*, it’s tempting to wonder whether Peacham’s references in this emblem to Pallas and Minerva have any special significance, or if they are unrelated to the emblem’s point of origin.

Considering Gerschow’s other confused testimony, it’s also natural to wonder whether he may have been mistaken about the identity of the countess of Oxford. It is, of course, possible that he was, but if so, is there another countess known to have befriended Essex during that period capable of assisting him, in some manner, with either the invention or procuring of this emblem? There is none to my knowledge other than Oxford’s daughter, the countess of Derby, with whom Essex was known to have had an affair. Yet it was “die eine Gräfin von Oxford” who was named, and while the concept of the pen being mightier than the sword was not unknown at the time, Elizabeth Trentham seems particularly likely to have been familiar with it considering to whom she was married, and the assertion in *Hamlet* that “many wearing rapiers are afraid of goose-quills” (II, ii).¹⁰

In any event, it is interesting, if puzzling, to read of Countess Elizabeth’s apparent friendship with Essex, who was no friend of her husband, evident in Oxford’s letter to Robert Cecil of 20 October 1595, in which he wrote that he had “receyved diuerse iniuries and wronges from him.” There has been speculation that Oxford may have been referring to Essex’s scandalous affair with his daughter Elizabeth, countess of Derby, since there is some documentary

evidence indicating the affair had begun by that time. But as Oxford complains of “divers” insults, signifying numerous layers, might one of these grievances have involved his wife’s relationship with Essex, whatever that may have been? One would like to know more about the countess’s role in the episode mentioned by Gerschow, but until more evidence surfaces, it must remain a tantalizing mystery.

The Shakespearean Elizabeth Trentham

A good deal has been written about the several places Oxford’s first wife, Anne Cecil, holds in the Shakespeare canon. Elizabeth Trentham, however, has been somewhat more difficult to ascertain. In his recent book *De Vere as Shakespeare: An Oxfordian Reading of the Canon*, William Farina considers that “in Shakespeare’s two great cross-dressing heroines, Rosalind and Viola (from *Twelfth Night*), we may be catching a glimpse of de Vere’s spirited, independent and literate second wife, Elizabeth Trentham ... What little we know about the Countess Elizabeth indicates that she, like Rosalind and Viola in the plays, was an astute and strong-willed individual” (71).

The countess’s extant letters attest to Farina’s use of the adjectives “astute” and “strong-willed,” but the following story may actually bolster Farina’s speculation regarding Countess Elizabeth’s Shakespearean characteristics. While it doesn’t involve “cross-dressing” it does entail make-believe and impersonation. The anecdote comes from the journal of Sir William Brereton recording his visit with Thomas Morton circa 1635. Morton (1564-1659) was a distinguished Cambridge scholar from 1584 to 1606, who had served as the dean of Gloucester (1607), dean of Winchester (1609), prebendary of York (1610), bishop of Chester (1616), bishop of Lichfield (1614), and then bishop of Durham (1632). Brereton notes in his journal for 20 June 1635: “This day att Bishoppe-Auckland with Dr. Moreton, Bishop of Durham, who maintaines great hospitalitie, in an orderly well governed house, and is a very worthy reverend bishoppe : whose importuntie I could nott resist : who when I offered to take leave, brought mee into my chamber...” From there Brereton offers a detailed description of the “castle” and his entertainment by various “facetious discourses” remembered by Morton, of which the following will be of interest to Oxfordians:

Apud Prandium [around lunchtime], this 20 Junii [June]: A discourse *per ipsem episcopum* [by the bishop himself] of a petition or supplication presented to the Queen Eliz[abeth]: by a girle of 12 or 14 yeares of age : whose father was injuriously committed to prison by the meanes and greatness of my L[ord] Hunsdon then L[ord] Chamb[erlain]: who beeing committed sends for a daughter, a child of pregnant witt and parts : and gives hir money to pay for hir fraught¹¹: directs hir to take presently a paire of oares to Greenwich: and to goe directly to the Queen and nott to impart unto any hir errand : onely shee was by hir father directed to answer all that questioned hir : ‘I have a supplication [to] hir M[ajestie].’ *Shee was brought uppe into the Presence where the Countess of Oxford personated the Queen : and deceived the child :* afterwards beeing brought before the Queen, my Lo[rd] Hunsd[on] present, who seeing hir, said : ‘This is a prettie

supplicatour': who beeing commaunded to deliver hir message, said: 'A supplication to your Ma[jes]tie, my L[ord] Hunsd[on] hath committed my father like a theyfe, to prison, for seekeing his owne': The Queene much displeased, said: 'My Lord *ex ore infantia* [out of the mouth of a babe] you are condemned. Lett this bee reformed'; hee was thereby sett at libertie (Hodgson 10-11, emphasis added).

Sir Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, was Lord Chamberlain of the Household from 1585 to his death in 1596. Although one might wonder which countess of Oxford is referred to since Anne Cecil died in 1588, the anecdote seems much more in character with Elizabeth Trentham, who was well placed to carry off the charade, having been, as we've noted, one of the queen's Maids of Honour prior to marrying Oxford. That the second countess remained close to Queen Elizabeth after her marriage to Earl Edward can be gathered from the fact that she stood in for the queen *in absentia* as godmother at the baptism of Lady Elizabeth Hatton's daughter, as reported by John Chamberlain in a letter to Dudley Carleton on 23 August 1599: "[A]bout ten dayes since [the delivery] yt was christened with great solemnitie, the Quene (by her deputie the Lady of Oxford) and the countesse dowager Darbie being godmothers, and the Lord Treasurer Godfather" (McClure, I, 84-5).

Here again, one would certainly like to know more about the circumstances behind the countess's little charade of impersonating the queen in the presence chamber, deceiving the witty girl, the queen taking her rightful place, Hunsdon complimenting the child, only by her to be duped, concluding with the father's liberation—all of which sounds worthy of a Shakespearean subplot. While the details must necessarily remain sketchy, they are nonetheless intriguing and reveal a mischievous side of Countess Elizabeth's nature that may offer fuel to the abovementioned theories propounded by Anderson and Hamill.

Further research will hopefully unveil more revelations about Elizabeth Trentham-de Vere. In the meantime, Oxfordians should be encouraged at the substantial strides that have been made in recent years with regard to hitherto unknown facts about Oxford and those individuals in his orbit. New discoveries in historical research much older than the Shakespearean period continue to be made even at this late date, and it is not unrealistic to think that evidence may yet be unearthed that will definitively resolve the Shakespeare authorship question one way or the other.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Mark. *Shakespeare by Another Name*. New York: Gotham Books, 2005.
- Angell, Pauline K. "Light on the Dark Lady: A Study of some Elizabethan libels." *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 52:3, Sept. 1937, 652-74.
- Anonymous. *The First Booke of the Preservation of King Henry the vij. when he was but Earle of Richmond, Grandfather to the Queenes maiesty; Compiled in english rythmicall Hexameters*. London: R. B[lore?], 1599 (STC 13076).
- Churchyard, Thomas. *A Pleasant conceite penned in verse*. London: Roger Warde, 1593 (STC 5248).
- Danner, Bruce. "Speaking Daggers." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 54: No. 1, 2003, 29-62.
- Farina, William. *De Vere as Shakespeare: An Oxfordian Reading of the Canon*. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland & Co., 2005.
- Hamill, John. "The Dark Lady and Her Bastard: An Alternative Scenario." *The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter*, Vol. 41: No. 3, Summer 2005, 1+.
- Hammer, Paul E.J. *The polarisation of Elizabethan politics: the political career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Hodgson, J. C. "The journal of Sir William Brereton, 1635." *Surtees Society Publications, CXXIV, North country diaries (2nd series)*, Durham: Andrews & Co., 1915.
- McClure, Norman Egbert, ed. *The Letters of John Chamberlain*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979. Reprint of the 1939 ed. published by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.
- Peacham, Henry. *The Compleat Gentleman*. London: Francis Constable, 1622 (STC 19502).
- _____. *Minerva Britanna* (1612). English Emblem Books No. 5. Menston: Scolar Press, 1973.
- Rollins, Hyder Edward, ed. *Brittons Bowre of Delights*. Cambridge Harvard UP, 1933.
- Rutland, Duke of. *Manuscripts*. HMC, 12th Report, Appendix, Pt. IV, 1888.
- Salisbury, Marquis of. *Calendar of Manuscripts at Hatfield House*. HMC, 24 vols. London: 1883-1976.
- Strong, Roy. *The cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan portraiture and pageantry*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.
- Von Bülow, Gottfried, ed., assisted by Wilfred Powell. "Diary of the Journey of Philip Julius, Duke of Stettin-Pomerania, through England in the Year 1602." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, NS, VI, 1892, 1-67.
- Ward, B.M. *The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, 1550-1604*. London: Murray, 1928.

(Endnotes)

- 1 The name was pronounced Trentam.
- 2 Not only does Angell's article have a decidedly Oxfordian flavor to it, she corresponded with B.M. Ward and receives an acknowledgment from Burke Boyce "for books of reference" in his 1949 novel *Cloak of Folly*—a historical romance in which Oxford is cast as an unnamed Shakespeare. In addition to Angell's article (listed under Works Cited), see T.W. Baldwin's responses to her article with her subsequent replies in *PMLA* 55:2, June 1940, 598-602.
- 3 While the exact date of Trentham's birth is not recorded, Angell persuasively establishes her approximate age by comparing records pertaining to her family in the Rochester Parish Register, the visitation of Staffordshire, her father's will, and other factors (656, fn. 19).
- 4 Although the title page of this work lists 1599 as the year of publication, it was entered in the Stationers' Register on 12 January 1600 (New Style). Because the Elizabethan New Year did not change over until 25 March, this means the book was published sometime in the first quarter of 1600 (New Style).
- 5 In the margin is the Latin "Quæ supra nos nihil ad nos," the meaning of which is translated within the lines themselves.
- 6 In the margin is the Latin "Ouid. Viue tibi, & longènomina magna fuge," which again is translated within the lines themselves.
- 7 It seems not unlikely that Oxford may have still been receiving compliments under a "silent name." B.M. Ward posited that John Marston was paying tribute to Oxford in the 9th Satire of *The Scourge of Villanie* (1599):

Far fly thy fame
 Most, most, of me belov'd, whose silent name
 One letter bounds. Thy true judicial style
 I ever honour, and if my love beguile
 Not much my hopes, then thy unvalued worth
 Shall mount fair place, when Apes are turned forth.

Ward writes that Marston "is here speaking of a concealed poet" whose "'silent name one letter bounds' may well be a reference to the name Edward de Vere, which begins and ends with the letter E" (329). As most Oxfordians have agreed, Ward's solution has a logical symmetry. I would suggest, however, that an additional possibility (one that transcends any irregularities in Elizabethan orthography, wherein Vere was sometimes spelled Veer, Veer, Ver, etc.), is that the "One letter" binding the silent name is "O", for Oxford. This solution entails a symmetry that transcends time.

- 8 Should anyone wish to follow up this research, there are late sixteenth century pedigrees of the Trentham family held by the Staffordshire Record Office (D5121/3/1, f.115r) and the Northamptonshire Record Office (C 963 and C 1396). Though the chances are remote, these could conceivably offer some clues to the author's identity. Unless,

however, the author's mother was Elizabeth Trentham's *paternal* aunt, the search would almost certainly be futile.

- 9 The original German is "die eine Gräfin von Oxford," which could also be translated as "the one countess of Oxford."
- 10 Separately, Shakespeare reveals his familiarity with the concept and art of *impres* in *Pericles* (II.ii), when he has Thaisa describe the devices on the six knights' shields, and in *Richard II* when Bolingbroke, referring to himself as "a Prince, by fortune of my birth," addresses Bushy and Green:
- [Y]ou haue fed vpon my Seignories,
 Dis-park'd my Parkes, and fell'd my Forrest Woods;
 From mine owne Windowes torne my Household Coat,
 Raz'd out my Impresse, leauing me no signe,
 Saue mens opinions, and my liuing blood,
 To shew the World I am a Gentleman. (First Folio, III.i)
- Beneath its context within the play, an additional layer in the foregoing passage—from an Oxfordian perspective—could conceivably be Oxford reflecting on Leicester's near usurpation of his estates in 1562.
- 11 Fraught, i.e. freight: the hire of a boat for the transportation of cargo.

President's Page (cont'd from p. 2)

year. This way the current member can offer a friend, colleague or family member a real benefit in the form of a 50% first-year discount. I want to encourage all current members to go forth and multiply – recruit at least one new member in 2007 – and help us double our membership this year.

By celebrating our 50th anniversary milestone this year, I hope we will make our own history in 2007 by re-energizing the authorship debate generally and building greater interest in the Oxford case in particular. Our 50th anniversary presents us with a wonderful outreach platform for communicating more energetically with the media and with potential donors. The more members we have, the more credibility we'll have with important audiences in the media and the foundation community.

A Word of Thanks –My Second Year As President

I want to say a word of thanks to the membership for reelecting me to another three-year term as a member of the Board of Trustees and to my fellow Board members for reelecting me to a second one-year term as President. I pledge that I will do my utmost to provide energetic leadership that serves the best interests of the society and builds awareness about our mission to key audiences.

I also want to say a quick word of thanks to all members for your generous support and active involvement in our society. Ours is an important mission. As we now make clear on our website, this society is "dedicated to researching and honoring the true bard."

That is a noble mission indeed. By renewing your membership, by recruiting new members, and by donating directly to our 50th Anniversary Outreach Effort, you are helping us to spread the message about the Shakespeare authorship question and the Oxfordian case. We couldn't do it without your support.

If you have any questions or if you'd like to share your ideas with me and other members of the Board of Trustees, please contact our new office by writing, calling or emailing us at:

Shakespeare Oxford Society
 P.O. Box 808
 Yorktown Heights, NY 10598
 Tel: 914-962-1717
 Email: SOSOffice@optonline.net

Members can also join in our new Yahoo! discussion group. Just send an email to sos4ever@yahoo.com and you'll reach other SOS members on the list.

Once again, happy 50th anniversary and many thanks for your generous support.

Sincerely,

Matthew Cossolotto
 President

Much Ado About Oxford

Richard Desper, Ph.D.

In part one Dr. Desper related the play to de Vere's life; he analyzed the dating, and related it to John Lyly's Endimion.

The First Publication of *Much Ado*

In dealing with the dating of *Much Ado* Greenblatt notes that it was first published in quarto form in 1600 with a title page that states that the play

hath been sundrie times publicly acted by the right honourable, the Lord Chamberlaine his servants." Its entry in the Stationers' Register, listed as of August 4, 1600, is also marked "to be staied," i.e. not to be published without further permission. "it is generally thought that the Lord Chamberlain's Men were attempting to ensure that they would be paid for any printing . . . and that the release of *Much Ado* about Nothing later that same year indicates that the company had resolved whatever dispute had led them to stay publication". Greenblatt further notes that "Q's [the quarto's] speech prefixes are inconsistent . . . they preserve the names of actors . . . for two of the comic parts: Will Kemp for Dogberry and Richard Cowley for Verges. Since Kemp left the Lord Chamberlain's Men in 1599 . . . the play must have been first performed before the date of his departure. And since Francis Meres does not include *Much Ado* about Nothing in a list of Shakespeare's plays he compiled in September 1598 (unless that is what he meant by the play he calls *Love's Labour's wonne*) . . . the play was first performed after that date. Therefore the likeliest date of the first performance is the winter of 1598-99" (*Norton Shakespeare* 1387-88).

With regards to the entry in the Stationers' Register, reference must be made to the extensive research into authorial rights

and the Stationers' Register published by Robert Detobel in two successive issues of *The Oxfordian*. Detobel finds that such a stay is an assertion by the author of his rights. A printer, by making an entry in the Stationers' Register, could block printing of the same work by another printer by the simple entry, but only for six months, while the author could stay publication indefinitely. As Detobel put it, "a stationer to whom a work was entered could not postpone printing (by another stationer) for an indefinite period . . . he could do so only on condition that the author had explicitly made the printing conditional on his authorization". (Vol. 4 39). Why would an author wish to stay publication? Detobel suggests that he considers the work to be still unfinished and has further changes in mind, and knowing that copies of his "work in progress" may be out of his hands, wishes to prevent any printer from printing the work prematurely. Thus the above stay means that the author himself is holding up publication until he is satisfied with the work. As for the date of first performance, the presence of the names of the two actors in lieu of the names of their characters does indeed indicate that the play was written and performed before the 1599 departure of Kemp from the Lord Chamberlain's Men, how much earlier is uncertain.

With regards to the process of writing, staging, and publishing plays, one must consider one essential and defining difference between Oxford's situation and that of other Elizabethan playwrights. Edward de Vere was not a professional playwright in any sense. He did not live off the proceeds of his writing activities. He was an amateur playwright in the true Latin root sense of the word – it was an activity he engaged in because he loved to do it. He did not write plays to meet a schedule – instead, he wrote a play because it pleased him to do so. He was free to write plays for the entertainment of his queen, stage them, put them aside, give them years later to a professional acting company for public performances, allow them to be printed anonymously, and then

later publish them under a pseudonym, if that is what he chose to do. There is no valid logical reason to assume that a particular play was written shortly before the first record of its appearance on the public stage, or its first printing. Such an assumption is a supposition rather than rigorous logic, and should be dealt with as such.

In this regard, there is precedent for assigning a much earlier date for a play than its first date of publication. *The First Part of the Contention betwixte the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, published anonymously in 1594, has very much in common with *2 Henry VI*, which was published as the work of Shakespeare, but not until 1623, the date of the First Folio. Examining the possible relationship between the two, Manley has proposed an interesting interpretation and supports it with compelling arguments. He sees *2 Henry VI* as having been acted by Lord Strange's Men (dissolved early 1593) while *First Part of the Contention* was acted by Pembroke's Men in perhaps a 1594-5 time frame. In Manley's words,¹⁷ "*The First Part of the Contention* represents an adaptation by Pembroke's Men of this *2 Henry VI* written for Strange's Men" (256). The new acting company evidently assumed the right to alter the script, doing so in a way impacting the interpretation of the character of Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester. However, since it was published earlier, *First Part of the Contention* has conventionally been considered to be the source for *2 Henry VI*. Manley argues for the opposite, and his work shows precedent for taking the Shakespeare work as the earlier work despite a late publication date.

Connecting *Love's Labour's Won* With *Much Ado*

With regard to the dating of *Much Ado*, one must consider Francis Meres, whose *Palladis Tamia* offers a list of plays, some already published anonymously, others as yet unknown as of the 1598 date of his book,

that he attributes to "William Shakespeare," who previously published only as a poet, author of *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*. Meres's list contains a *Love's Labour's Lost* and a *Love's Labour's Won*. The former, with which we are all familiar, first appeared in quarto form in the same year (1598) as *Palladis Tamia*, while no vestige of the latter has appeared either by reference or in publication. We suggest here, in agreement with Ogburn Jr. (614), that *Love's Labour's Won* has, indeed, come down to us, but with a different title, that of *Much Ado about Nothing*. How does one make such an identification? The common factor between *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Much Ado about Nothing* is that Anne Vavasor figures in both plays as the living inspiration of the female lead character: Rosaline in the former and Beatrice in the latter. As noted by Ogburn Jr., the plot of *LLL* leaves the romance between Berowne and Rosaline up in the air, so to speak. There is no happy romantic ending for these lovers; such an end is forestayed by the ladies with "a twelve-month term" in which Berowne has the burden of repenting his past falseness to his own oaths and making amends to Rosaline. It is most significant that the final song of *LLL* contains an echoing refrain: "The cuckoo then on every tree / Mocks married men". Indeed, Oxford's oath of marriage (to the former Anne Cecil) forms the insurmountable difficulty between himself and Anne Vavasor, the impediment which results in the demise of the relationship.

In *Much Ado about Nothing*, proposed here as the final name of a play once called *Love's Labour's Won*, a happy romantic denouement is achieved between Beatrice, originally known to us as Rosaline in *LLL*, and Benedick, originally known as Berowne in *LLL*. The story is no longer up in the air – hero and heroine accomplish a happy resolution of the issues between them. And how is this accomplished? In real life, Oxford cannot divide himself and satisfy the conflicting demands of his relationships between his wife and his mistress. On the stage, however, he divides himself into two separate fictional characters – a Count Claudio to be Hero's husband and a Lord Benedick to marry Beatrice.¹⁸

The Need To Conceal Oxfordian Authorship

We have suggested that including intensely personal details of one's life into a published work can cause difficulties. A very good example of this arises in the publication of O'Neill's *Long Day's Journey into Night*. The evidence shows that O'Neill first safeguarded a manuscript of the play with Bennett Cerf at Random House, with the stipulation that the sealed envelope should not be opened until twenty-five years after his death, restrictions¹⁹ evidently applied at the request of his son, Eugene Jr, who feared personal embarrassment. The play contains strong parallels with the lives of O'Neill and

Love's Labour's Won suggested an obvious comparison with Love's Labour's Lost, one which might too readily invite a comparison between the Rosaline and Beatrice characters and thus unravel the attempt to conceal the identities of the real life counterparts of the characters.

his parents: his father was a long-time stage actor; his mother was addicted to drugs; like the younger son Eugene O'Neill had run off to join the Merchant Marine and also had suffered from tuberculosis; and alcoholism was rife in the family. Not the type of thing that Eugene Jr. wanted blazoned on the stage for the amusement of his Yale associates. Such matters may well merit consideration when an author puts intensely personal details into his works (Shaeffer 560,609,614,634-5,663).

In Oxford's case such matters seem to have come to a head by 1598. He had created the pen name of "William Shakespeare" five years earlier for attribution of two long poems but had allowed (or perhaps "suffered") the publication of a few plays anonymously by this time. However, anonymous publication of *LLL* and *Much Ado* was quite another matter: the correspondence between numerous details in the Earl's life

and elements of the two plays might well allow penetration of the veil of anonymity. It may well have been decided that something more definitive needed to be done.

The "Shakespeare" name had first appeared in print in 1593-94 as a poet, author of *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* (Ogburn Jr. 328-9). After that, a number of "Shakespeare" plays also appeared in print, but up to 1598, the date of Meres' *Palladis Tamia*, always were published anonymously, with no name offered for the playwright. In *Palladis Tamia* Meres named "Shakespeare" as author of a number of plays previously appearing anonymously, as well as of a few plays which were at the time hitherto unknown. As was previously mentioned, Detobel has shown that only an author, not a stationer, could step forward and put an indefinite stay on the publication of a written work. However, the author had to step forward by name, something Oxford was not wont to do, and as a result pirated versions²⁰ of the anonymous plays could sometimes be printed.

Among the comedies of "Shakespeare" Meres named *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Love's Labour's Won*. *LLL* appeared as the work of "W. Shakespere" in 1598, the same year as that of *Palladis Tamia*, while *LLW*, by being named there as a work of "Shakespeare", was afforded some level of protection from pirates, in that this "Shakespeare" person evidently might step forward to stay a pirated edition. Upon reflection, however, the playwright may well have decided that the title *Love's Labour's Won* suggested an obvious comparison with *Love's Labour's Lost*, one which might too readily invite a comparison between the Rosaline and Beatrice characters and thus unravel the attempt to conceal the identities of the real life counterparts of the characters. Consequently, *Love's Labour's Won* disappeared from literary history, its place to be taken by *Much Ado*. *Love's Labour's Won* is the only play among the list²¹ published in *Palladis Tamia* to disappear from history, and even though *Much Ado* was not printed until 1600, two years after the printing of this list, there is definite evidence that it was staged before 1600, since its first quarto referenced a player (Will Kemp) no longer with the Lord

Chamberlain's Men in 1600. These facts taken in combination form strong evidence that *LLW* did not simply disappear from history but was merely renamed.

Remarks on the New Historicism

Most of what is said here is at odds with orthodoxy with regards to (1) the identity of the playwright/poet "William Shakespeare" and (2) how to relate the playwright's biography to his literary works. As for the first part, the starting point of this investigation takes Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, as the identity of the playwright, and is therefore in contention with the views of orthodox scholars on the subject. However, the literature supporting the Oxfordian view is also quite extensive, and that material shall not be repeated here.²² In terms of the second part, how to relate the playwright's life with his work, this remains a lively field to this day, but efforts in this direction by orthodox scholars have given us little in the way of results. According to Jonathan Bate, quoted in *The Boston Globe*:

"... the problem for all Shakespeare biographers ... is how to relate the life to the work ... What we know about the life does not help us to understand the greatness of the work ... we will never get inside Shakespeare the man ... plays are plays, in which feelings and opinions belong to the characters and not the author."

To deal with these difficulties a movement called the "New Historicism" has appeared, postulating that "literary works were the product less of individual geniuses than of the broader cultural forces of their age", thus finessing the need to relate the author's life to his works. The foremost exponent of this approach is Stephen Greenblatt, author of *Will in the World*, which offers a biography of the supposed playwright from Stratford-upon-Avon and with it a full exposition of the New Historicism as his solution to the problem. For the Oxfordian, however, there is no need for a New Historicism, since the man himself may be found in his works. While the cultural forces of the age certainly abound in the Shakespeare plays, Oxfordians contend

that the author has also put his personal feelings into his works, and his success at doing so is a mark of his genius. We have striven to do this in terms of his *Much Ado about Nothing*.

We have already discussed *Long Day's Journey into Night* to exemplify how a playwright, such as Eugene O'Neill, can create great art by putting his own self into his works. For a second such example, consider what has been said of another great 20th century playwright, Arthur Miller:

"Writers give themselves away even when they don't intend to. Arthur Miller remained unaware for some time that he had based Maggie, the leading character in his play *After the Fall*, on his famous wife, Marilyn Monroe. After Monroe died, Miller's producer told him that everyone would see Maggie as "a portrait, purely and simply, of Marilyn," and only then did he realize that he had been "blinding [him]self to the obvious".²³

Oxford also put himself not merely as generalized cultural forces of his time, but in terms of his personal situation, his most personal feelings and the feelings of those closest and dearest to him. We can't say whether he recognized this as it was happening, or only after a work was completed. This recognition *did* take place, however, and was the driving force behind the creation of an *alter ego* to be assigned the authorship role.

Summary

The story of Ariodante and Genevora in its various forms has long been recognized by Shakespeare editors (Neilson and Hill 17; Greenblatt in *The Norton Shakespeare* 1381; Barton in *The Riverside Shakespeare, 2nd Edition* 361) as a source for *Much Ado*. From the 1583 title, *Ariodante and Genevora*, we are given to know the basics of what to expect: a clandestine assignation, mistaken identity, and a falsely reproached lady rejected by her intended. Then the playwright fleshed it out with a second plot – a witty pair intent on denying their love until brought to confront it – a plot which has come to overshadow the first plot in the esteem of playgoers and critics over the years.

Scholars have acknowledged (Neilson and Hill, p. 180; Greenblatt in *The Norton Shakespeare*, p. 1381; Barton in *The Riverside Shakespeare, 2nd Edition*, p. 363) that there is no source in the earlier literature for the Beatrice and Benedick plot (Neilson and Hill 180; Greenblatt in *The Norton Shakespeare* 1381; Barton in *The Riverside Shakespeare, 2nd edition* 363). However, events in the life of the 17th Earl of Oxford, namely his love affair with Anne Vavasor, offer a very credible source for this second plot. The fact that the Earl of Oxford used persons close to himself in real life for drawing the personalities and traits of characters in *Much Ado*, as well as a number of other plays, carries with it the explanation for the need to conceal his name as author. As Ogburn has put it:

"If there is anything on which Elizabeth, Burghley, and the other Cecils ... and doubtless others who appeared in the plays and poems were agreed upon it was that the author must never, never be known for who he was, lest his characters be seen for who they were, if heaven and earth had to be moved to prevent it" (Ogburn, Jr. 657).

The pride of two of the greatest families of England – Cecil and de Vere – was at stake, and it just wouldn't do for the story to come out, as it necessarily would in good time, were Oxford's name attached to such as *Much Ado about Nothing*.

In the dramatic arts, we have heard much about "method acting", a technique in which the actor, to the best of his ability, attempts incorporate within himself the feelings and motivations of his character in order to better deliver to the audience not only the character's lines, but also the character's inner status. It is contended here that the 17th Earl of Oxford, with personal experience on stage and as author of court dramas, understood full well this aspect of drama, and achieved his best as a playwright when he essentially reversed this process, putting his own motivations and feelings, and those of people close to him, based on his life experiences, in to the plays he wrote.

For *Much Ado about Nothing*, he drew from his own rather complicated love life,

putting elements of his countess, Anne Cecil de Vere, into the character "Hero", the falsely accused wife rejected by her husband. Anne Vavasor, his mistress in the early 1580's, appears as Beatrice, a match for any man in wit, but disinclined to give her heart to a man, since she rues the day when Signior Benedick had "lent it [his heart] me awhile; and I gave him use for it . . . he won it of me with false dice". The evidence (in terms of allusions in the final work to publications in the 1579-82 time range) strongly suggests 1583, rather than a date in the late 1590's, as the year in which the earliest *Much Ado about Nothing* was written. This is not to imply that our present text of *Much Ado*, as has come down to us in print, coincides with the play as performed in the 1579-82 time frame. Incidental changes in text may well have been made between those performances and the first publication of the play in 1600. However, by establishing that both the Beatrice and Benedick plot line and the Claudio and Hero plot line were present in the earlier time period, it would seem that the essential elements of the play were established by the early 1580's.

Works Cited

- Bate, Jonathan, "The masked man: Little is known about the life of William Shakespeare, and the works themselves are an unreliable key to the man. That hasn't stopped scholars from trying to get inside his head", in *The Boston Globe*, Oct. 10, 2004.
- Bradbrook, Muriel C., *The Rise of the Common Player*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1962.
- Chambers, Sir Edmund K., *Elizabethan Stage*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1923.
- Chiljian, Katherine, *Letters and Poems of Edward, Earl of Oxford*, Katherine Chiljian, San Francisco, 1998.
- Clark, Eva Turner, *Hidden Allusions in Shakespeare's Plays*, 3rd Edn, Kennikat Press, New York, 1974. First published Payson, New York, 1931.
- Desper, Richard, and Vezzoli, Gary C., "A Statistical Approach to the Shakespeare Authorship Question", *The Elizabethan Review*, Vol. 1 No. 2, fall 1993, pp. 36-42.
- Detobel, Robert, "Authorial Rights in Shakespeare's Time", *The Oxfordian* Vol. 4, 2001, pp. 5-24; "Authorial Rights, Part II: Early Shakespeare Critics and the Authorship Question", *The Oxfordian* Vol. 5, 2002, pp. 30-46.
- Dowden, Edward, *Comedies, Tragedies and Histories and Poems of Shakespeare*, 3 vols. London, Oxford University Press, 1911.
- Evans, G. Blakemore, and Tobin, J.J.M., Eds., *The Riverside Shakespeare – Second Edition*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1997.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, *Will in the World: How Shakespeare became Shakespeare*, Norton, New York, 2004.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, editor, *The Norton Shakespeare, Based on the Oxford Edition*, Norton & Co., New York, 1997.
- Humphreys, A. R., (ed.) *Much Ado about Nothing*, The Arden Shakespeare, 1981.
- Holland, H.H., *Shakespeare, Oxford and Elizabethan Times*, Denis Archer, London, 1933.
- Jolly, Eddi, "Shakespeare and Burghley's Library" *Bibliotheca Illustris: Sive Catalogus Variorum Librorum* *The Oxfordian*, V. III, pp. 3-18, 2000.
- Johnson, Philip, "John Lyly's *Endimion* and William Shakespeare's *Much Ado about Nothing*, in *Great Oxford*, R. Malim, K. Gilvary, E. Imlay, and E. Jolly, eds., Parapress Ltd, Tunbridge Wells, 2004, pp. 151-158.
- Kittredge, George Lyman (editor), *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, Ginn, Boston, 1936.
- Llewellyn, Sally Hazelton, "Such Shaping Fantasies? Psychology and the Authorship Debate", *The Oxfordian*, Vol. 4, 2001, 143-53.
- Looney, J. Thomas, "*Shakespeare*" *Identified in Edward De Vere, Seventh Earl of Oxford*, Minos Publishing Co., Kennikat Press, Port Washington, New York, 1975. Originally published London, 1920.
- Manley, Lawrence, "From Strange's Men to Pembroke's Men", *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 54 No. 3 Fall 2003, 253-287.
- Miller, Arthur, *Timebends: A Life*, Grove Press, New York, 1987.
- Miller, Ruth Loyd (ed.), "*Shakespeare*" *Identified in Edward De Vere Seventeenth Earl of Oxford and The Poems of Edward De Vere*, Vols. I and II, Minos Publishing Co., Kennikat Press, Port Washington, New York, 1975.
- Neilson, William A., and Hill, Charles J., Eds., *The Complete Plays of William Shakespeare*, Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1942.
- Ogburn, Charlton (Jr.), *The Mysterious William Shakespeare – the Myth and the Reality*, EPM Publications, McLean, VA, 1984.
- Ogburn, Dorothy and Charlton (Sr.), *This Star of England*, Coward-McCann, New York, 1952.
- Price, Diana, *Shakespeare's Unorthodox Biography: New Evidence of an Authorship Problem*, Greenwood Press, Westport CT, 2001.
- Sheaffer, Louis, *O'Neill – Son and Artist*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1973.
- Simonton, Dean Keith, *Origins of Genius*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999.
- Talvacchia, Bette, The Rare Italian Master and the Posture of Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*, *The Elizabethan Review*, Vol. 1 No. 1, Spring 1993, pp. 40-56.

(Endnotes)

- 1 For discussion of these sources, see Holland, pp. 37-43; Ogburn and Ogburn (Sr.), pp. 480-506; Nielson and Hill, p. 179; Ogburn (Jr.), p. 661 Greenblatt, pp. 1381-8.
- 2 Ogburn and Ogburn (Sr.) echo many of these examples in their later book, Ch. 37, pp. 480-506.
- 3 There now seems to be a literary precedent for the title used for this paper, *Much Ado about Oxford*. Brame and Popova, in their recent book, *Shakespeare's Fingerprints*, begin with a chapter, "A Naughty Note on Nothing," and in this chapter they identify Oxford with the verbal cues *nothing* and *naught*. From repeated use in the Shakespeare canon, they identify *nothing* and *naught* through the digit zero (0) with "the big O," the letter "O," which they identify as symbolization for Oxford himself. Thus they see "Much Ado about Nothing" as the original playwright's way of saying "Much Ado about Oxford". While the coincidence is inadvertent, the present writer does not wish to take credit for originating the latter phrase.
- 4 Ogburn (Jr.), p. 614; he also sees Anne Vavasor as the model for Rosaline of *Love's Labour's Lost* (pp. 613-15) and Oxford as the model of Rosaline's lover Berowne (pp. 475, 613-14, 623-25, 726).
- 5 Indeed, Anne herself broached the matter to the world outside the family herself. Before her child was born, while Oxford was away on travel, she discussed her fears as to whether her husband would suspect infidelity with Dr. Masters, the Queen's physician, which led to sharing these fears with the Queen and the Earl of Leicester, a personal enemy of her husband. See Ogburn (Jr.), pp. 561-2, 571-2.
- 6 Desper and Vezzoli have explored the identification of Leontes and Hermione with Oxford and his first Countess in a *Elizabethan Review* paper showing that and many other connections between *The Winter's Tale* and the life of its playwright, Edward de Vere.

- 7 See Simonton, *Origins of Genius ...* for his thorough investigation of the association of artistic genius, in many instances, with a degree of psychopathology, problematic relationships, broken marriages, disabling personality traits, and alcoholism.
- 8 Llewellyn's *Oxfordian* article would seem to indicate that a problematic personality, rather than being a bar for Oxford as a creative writer, is a common trait of gifted writers.
- 9 The painted statue, one of the few such in the Abbey, was noted by Desper and Vezzoli, and Bette Talvacchia has confirmed it as a typical work of the 16th century artist Julio Romano, although earlier critics had criticized "Shakespeare" for confusing the painter Romano with a sculptor. He was both.
- 10 The child was born in March 1581, and the Queen's displeasure was so great that the Earl of Oxford was lodged in the Tower of London until June 8th of that year, and then banished from court until June 2, 1583.
- 11 The present author apologizes; he could not resist the temptation for use of "pregnant".
- 12 A secret love affair was one thing, but as a married man the Earl could not give his mistress his name. Even if he had wanted to do so, a divorce from Anne Cecil would have the crown as final arbiter, according to the Act of Supremacy, of such matters, and Elizabeth's Lord Treasurer, Anne's father William Cecil, Lord Burghley, would be adamant against it, and would call in every debt the Queen owed him, as one who had helped her survive princesshood to become Queen.
- 13 Ogburn and Ogburn (Sr.) (p. 485) find further sexual innuendoes in III.iv suggesting a pregnant Beatrice, such as references to "barns" ("bairns"?) and to "A maid, and stuff'd!"
- 14 Reminiscent of a quite similar bawdy allusion in *Romeo and Juliet*, I.iii.40-49.
- 15 Anne Vavasor's well-known dark hair fits with the depiction in the "Dark Lady" sonnet in *LLL* (IV.iii.258-265) of Rosaline's hair. However, Ms. Vavasor is *not* identified here as the "Dark Lady" of the Shakespeare Sonnets collection.
- 16 Ward cites Bodleian, Rawlinson Poetical MS., 85,111; see also Clark, *Hidden Allusions*, pp. 472-73.
- 17 For the Strange/Pembroke transition Manley references Cairncross in his Arden editions of the Henry VI plays.
- 18 Anne Vavasor eventually finds stability with a devoted long-term lover, Sir Henry Lee.
- 19 However, in 1955, two years after the playwright's death, his widow Carlotta insisted on publishing the play and had to go elsewhere (Yale University Press) when Bennett Cerf refused to comply; stage, television, and film performances ensued.
- 20 This has led to a number of anomalies. Often an anonymous and possibly pirated version would agree in many details with what is now accepted as the legitimate "Shakespeare" text, but differ in other details. Examples of this (Neilson and Hill, 146,566,781; Evans and Tobin, 138, 703, 805) are a) *The Troublesome Raigne of John, King of England*; b) *The First Part of the Contention betwixte the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster*; and c) *The Taming of A [sic] Shrew*.
- 21 The list of plays cited in *Palladis Tamia* in 1596 is available in Price, p. 135.
- 22 See, for instance, the past works of J. Thomas Looney and Charlton Ogburn (Jr.).
- 23 See Arthur Miller, p. 527. We are indebted to Diana Price's book for this reference.

Join the Shakespeare Oxford Society

Become part of the Oxfordian Movement by joining the Shakespeare Oxford Society, founded in 1957.

Members receive both the quarterly Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter and the annual journal, *The Oxfordian*.

Contributory members also receive special bonus gifts. Please contact our office for additional information.

You can sign up through our website at www.shakespeare-oxford.com, or by sending a copy of the completed form below (check, Visa, MasterCard, American Express accepted) to:

The Shakespeare Oxford Society

P.O. Box 808, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598 • Tel: (914) 962-1717

The SOS is a non-profit, tax-exempt organization.

Donations and memberships are tax deductible (IRS no. 13-6105314).

2007 Membership Dues (Check one)

- Regular (\$50/ \$60 overseas)
 Family (\$75/ \$85 overseas)
 Student (Regular) (\$30/\$40 overseas)

School: _____

Contributory Memberships

- Sponsor (\$100) Contributor (\$250)
 Patron (\$500) Benefactor (\$1000)

Special Student Rate:

- Student (*Newsletter only*) (\$15/ \$25 overseas)
 Student (Regular) (\$30/\$40 overseas)

School: _____

Member Directory: Yes, include my listing

No, do not include my listing

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP: _____

Check enclosed or: Credit Card: American Express MasterCard Visa

Name exactly as it appears on card: _____

Card No.: _____ Exp. date: _____

Signature: _____

Shakespeare/Marlowe (cont'd from p. 4)

Table 3. Books with Contrasting Emphasis by Marlowe and Shakespeare

Book	Rank		Percent of Verse Citations	
	Marlowe	Shakespeare	Marlowe	Shakespeare
Revelation	3	14	6.8	2.4
Hebrew	9	23	3.6	1.2
1 John	18	47	1.4	0.3
1 Timothy	27	47	1.9	0.6
Proverbs	22	9	1.2	3.3
Ecclesiasticus	49	15	0.2	2.3
1 Samuel	36	17	0.6	1.9
2 Samuel	49	21	0.2	1.3

Marlowe draws upon Revelation, Hebrews, 1 John, and 1 Timothy more frequently than does Shakespeare by a factor of at least three or so, and Revelation is notable in that it ranks very high in the overall list for Marlowe. On the other hand, Shakespeare's greater emphasis on Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus (also known as Sirach), and 1 and 2 Samuel is evident. The underlying data for Ecclesiasticus is especially striking: 1 verse entry for Marlowe and 52 for Shakespeare; this accounts for most of the difference noted for the Apocrypha as seen in Table 1.

Evidence from the Psalms

Shakespeare and Marlowe differ markedly in their use of the Psalms. To start, we examine which of the Psalms they draw upon and count the number of Psalms used by each and the number used by both. Statistical methods are then employed to determine the probability that the observed overlap could be the result of chance (the random hypothesis). For this analysis, a use of a Psalm is considered valid when the previous scholar identified the verse in the Psalms as no more than one of two possible sources for the reference, and the phrase or thematic idea was not a commonplace in the time of Shakespeare. The analysis also recognizes that in some cases the phrase from the play is clearly of biblical origin, but that the wording matches more closely a contemporary or classical source, such as the histories of Holinshed, North, or Plutarch. Such instances are not considered valid references to the Bible.

The data show that Shakespeare uses 58 Psalms, Marlowe 28, with 13 in common (the overlap). The probability of 13 or more matches by chance is 0.23. Statisticians often use 0.05 as a threshold for statistical significance. Because 0.23 is greater than 0.05, we conclude that the extent of the Shakespeare/Marlowe overlap is consistent with the random hypothesis and inconsistent with the idea that the two sets of works actually represent the work of a single author.⁴

This analysis can be refined by taking into account the concept that some Psalms might be highly likely to be used by any author, say, due to their content and greater literary potential. When the data from all four authors—Shakespeare, Bacon, Spenser, and Marlowe—are assessed, we find that six of the Psalms are used by all of them at least once. The probability of this resulting from chance can be calculated and is very small, thus supporting the idea that a certain number of Psalms are favored as candidates for reference in a literary context. If we then consider these Psalms to be non-probative, i.e., not useful in discriminating authorship, an analysis can be conducted on the remaining 144 Psalms to give a clearer picture. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Full Comparison Matrix – 144 Psalm Analysis

	Probability of Observed Overlap (Random Hypothesis)			
	Shakespeare	Marlowe	Bacon	Spenser
Shakespeare	0.002			
Marlowe	0.75	N/A		
Bacon	0.24	0.91	0.015	
Spenser	0.76	0.75	0.22	N/A

The results for Shakespeare versus Shakespeare and Bacon versus Marlowe were determined by dividing their respective canons into two separate groups and evaluating each against its counterpart. This method is possible for Shakespeare and Bacon because of the large amount of text available. Insufficient data are available for Spenser and Marlowe for a similar comparison to be made. A low value in the table for Shakespeare/Shakespeare (0.002 in this case) means that the data for the two Shakespeare groups show a high degree of overlap, inconsistent with the smaller extent of overlap that would be expected on the basis of the random hypothesis. All other combinations in the table are consistent with the random hypothesis (any value greater than 0.05 would be sufficient to support the random hypothesis as opposed to that positing, for example, that Marlowe's works and Shakespeare's are attributable to the same person).

It might be argued that a comparison of Marlowe's works, written in a relatively short time span in the late-1580s and early-1590s, to Shakespeare's is not rigorous because of the longer period during which Shakespeare's works were produced. Shakespeare's use of the Psalms may have evolved over time to an extent that all the plays do not represent a homogeneous set. To mitigate this possibility, a comparison was made between seven of Shakespeare plays that are dated to roughly the same time as Marlowe's seven plays (Shakespeare Group A) and the rest of the Shakespearean canon (Shakespeare Group B), and Marlowe's plays were also evaluated against the same set of Shakespeare's plays. Shakespeare Group A comprises all three parts of *Henry VI*, *Richard III*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *The Taming of the Shrew*. (These constitute the earliest of Shakespeare's plays as identified in *Riverside*, 2nd Edition.)

Of the 22 Psalms drawn upon by Marlowe, slightly less than one-third match with the Psalms corresponding to Shakespeare Group B, and of the 18 Psalms in Shakespeare Group A, half match with those in Group B. As shown in Table 5, the Marlowe/Shakespeare Group B result is just what is expected on the basis of the random hypothesis (probability of observed overlap of 0.54), while the Shakespeare A/B result is 0.054, just on the threshold of statistical significance for the random hypotheses. As before, 144 Psalms constitutes the population of probative Psalms. Consequently, we find no statistically significant Marlowe/Shakespeare match in terms of the Psalms drawn upon in their plays.

Table 5. Use of the Psalms, An Alternative Marlowe/Shakespeare Comparison

Plays	Number of Distinct Psalms			Probability of Observed Overlap (Random Hypothesis)
	Used by Author	Used by Shakespeare (Group B)	Used by Both	
Marlowe	22	44	7	0.535
Shakespeare (Group A)	18	44	9	0.054

Marlowe and Shakespeare differ in other significant ways in which they make use of the Psalms. In the more than 107,000 or so lines of text in the Shakespeare plays and approximately 14,700 lines of Marlovian text, we find the frequency of references and allusions to the Psalms to be 2 and 1 per 1,000 lines of text for Marlowe and Shakespeare, respectively. Depending on the frequency with which an author draws upon the same Psalms (i.e., duplication), the number of unique Psalms cited as sources for references will be less than the total number of references. Marlowe draws more than once on particular Psalms in his plays less often than does Shakespeare, so that in terms of references to distinct Psalms, Marlowe’s occurrences per 1000 lines are about 4 times those of Shakespeare. Finally, when Marlowe uses the same Psalm as Shakespeare, he uses the same verse as Shakespeare in 4 of 13 instances (150 Psalms considered), which is less than half the frequency as when a subset of 9 randomly selected Shakespeare plays are compared to the other 29 plays (9 of 15 instances).

When all the evidence from the Psalms is considered, it seems clear that the plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare are distinctly different in terms of their use of the Psalms.

Assessment of *The Massacre at Paris*

Even a cursory examination of Shaheen’s appendix listing the Scriptural passages he discusses in his text as possible sources for the biblical references he detects in Shakespeare’s plays reveals that Shakespeare often drew upon the same verses on numerous occasions. Consequently, if *The Massacre at Paris* is actually one of Shakespeare’s plays we might expect some of the verses cited for this play by Cornelius to match those cited by Shaheen for Shakespeare. Once the extent of the match has been determined, however, the significance will have to be assessed. How many matches would indicate a reasonably good chance that the play is actually Shakespeare’s? That’s the essence of the analytical challenge.

Because Cornelius employs less strict criteria in identifying biblical references than does Shaheen, it is appropriate to examine each of the passages in the play and the verses he cites as sources and determine whether to retain them in the list of references for the analysis. After following this procedure, most of the references Cornelius labels as “clear” or “probable” are retained, and many in the “possible” category are dropped. Passages involving commonplaces are also eliminated from consideration as not being conscious references to Scripture per se. For the Shaheen data, the

text corresponding to each of the passages in the plays identified in the index of references is also carefully examined. This procedure eliminates verses that are secondary rather than primary sources for the reference and instances where the verse is discussed in an ancillary context. The purpose of these procedures is—as much as possible—to place Shakespeare and Marlowe on an equal footing and avoid an apples-oranges problem with the data.⁵

Of the 33 references in *Paris*, 9 have a biblical verse (or verses) cited as a source that matches a source cited for a reference in one of Shakespeare’s plays. (Such a match is termed a “hit” in the discussion below.) To assess the significance of this degree of match, we take *Richard III* and *The Comedy of Errors*, assume them to be representative of Shakespeare’s work in roughly the same timeframe as *Paris*, and ask how many “hits” occur relative to the other Shakespeare plays. *Richard III* has 66 references, of which half are hits; and *Errors* has 33, with 18 hits. We also examine two other Marlowe plays, *1 Tamburlaine* and *Edward II*, to test whether *Paris* more closely matches them or the two Shakespeare plays. About one-third of the references in the two Marlowe plays qualify as hits with respect to the Shakespeare canon. Thus, *Paris* is closer to Marlowe than to Shakespeare, based on these results, which are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. References with Sources in Common with References in Other Shakespeare Plays

Author/Play	References	Hits	Hit Percentage
Marlowe			
<i>The Massacre at Paris</i>	33	9	27
<i>1 Tamburlaine</i>	101	33	33
<i>Edward II</i>	49	18	37
Shakespeare			
<i>Richard III</i>	65	33	50
<i>The Comedy of Errors</i>	33	18	55

The results displayed in Table 6 definitely appear to show that the plays attributed to Shakespeare and Marlowe belong to two separate classes. But can this assessment be quantified? If the data for *Richard III* and *Errors* are used to represent Shakespeare, we find that the probability of a Shakespearean reference producing a hit can be estimated as 0.52. Under the hypothesis that the Marlowe plays are of the same class as the two Shakespeare plays, the expected number of hits for the Marlowe plays can be calculated and compared with the observed number of hits. The probability of obtaining the observed number of hits can also be calculated.⁶ If this probability is very low, then the hypothesis can be considered unlikely.

Table 7 displays the results of the calculations. The observed number of hits for each of the Marlowe plays differs by at least three standard deviations from what is calculated on the basis of the data *Richard III* and *Errors*, resulting in the very low probabilities shown in the table.

Table 7. References with Sources in Common with References in Other Shakespeare Plays

Author/Play	Hits	Hits Expected Based on Shakespeare	Probability of Observed Marlow Hits Based on Shakespeare
Marlowe			
<i>The Massacre at Paris</i>	9	17.2 ± 2.1	< 10 ⁻⁴
<i>1 Tamburlaine</i>	33	52.5 ± 3.6	< 10 ⁻⁶
<i>Edward II</i>	18	25.5 ± 2.5	< 2 × 10 ⁻³

None of the Marlowe plays fits with the Shakespeare plays. *Paris*, on the other hand fits well with the other two Marlowe plays. If we calculate the expected number of hits for the references in Paris based upon what is observed in *1 Tamburlaine* and *Edward II*, we find 11 ± 2.7 , which is entirely consistent with the observed value of 9 hits (9 is within one standard deviation of 11).

Conclusion

The foregoing analysis, particularly in regard to the commonality of use of identical verses in the plays by Marlowe and Shakespeare, offers evidence against the hypothesis that *The Massacre at Paris* belongs in the Shakespeare canon. The result pointing to the play as Marlowe's is less strong, and the possibility that it is misclassified as a Marlowe play may deserve further study.

In addition, the analysis based on the Psalms argues strongly against the idea that the Marlovian canon as a whole might be the work of Shakespeare. Less compelling, but still significant, are the observations concerning the differences in use of certain books of the Bible as sources for or influences on passages in their works, especially Ecclesiasticus, Revelation, Proverbs, and Hebrews.

Finally, this analysis demonstrates that the influence of the Bible on authors' works has the potential to shed light on questions of authorship attribution, provided sufficient data exist or can be developed to support the analysis.

Endnotes

1. The attribution of *The Massacre at Paris* to Marlowe stems in large part to the discovery of a manuscript leaf by John Payne Collier. That Collier's notoriety as a reputed forger does not permit the conclusion that it is not Marlowe's.
2. The most definitive statement I have found in regard to the versions of the Bible used by Shakespeare, Spenser, Bacon, and Marlowe is Cole's in regard to Bacon, in which he firmly states Bacon used the Latin Vulgate more than any other version (23) and that he certainly did not use the Bishops' (75). This seems to rule out Bacon as "Shakespeare."
3. Shaheen (1999) is the source for Shakespeare; Shaheen (1976), for Spenser; Cole, for Bacon; and Cornelius, for Marlowe. All but Cornelius provide indexes of verses cited; I developed one for Marlowe, based on Cole's text.
4. Because Shaheen and Cornelius differ somewhat in the criteria used to determine which passages are worth including as biblical references, care must be taken to develop the lists of Psalms drawn upon so that they represent as best as possible (in a process that has some associated inherent subjectivity) similar lists. Though Shaheen's

criteria are stricter, Cornelius helpfully labels each of his references according to his judgment as to whether they are clear, probable, or possible. Selecting those in the first two categories is a reasonably good approximation to Shaheen's methodology, but in every case I have examined Cornelius's comments (if any) and the passage from the play and the verses in the Bible identified by Cornelius to determine if the references should be included in the analysis.

5. Even when the Cornelius data are not culled to eliminate the dubious or remote references, no material difference is observed in the results of the analysis. Also, if the analysis is restricted to Cornelius's "clear" or "probable" references, the effect on the results is minor.
6. The expected number of hits is found by multiplying the number of references by 0.52. The standard deviation can be estimated by $(npq)^{1/2}$, where n is the number of references, p is 0.52, and q is 1 minus p . The difference between the observed and expected number of hits and the standard deviation can then be used with the properties of the normal distribution to estimate the probability of obtaining the observed number of hits.

Works Cited

- Cole, P. D. H., *Bacon's Knowledge and Use of the Bible*, D. Phil. Thesis, Oxford University, 1950.
- Cornelius, R. M., *Christopher Marlowe's Use of the Bible*. New York: Peter Lang, 1964.
- Shaheen, Naseeb. *Biblical References in The Faerie Queene*. Memphis: Memphis State University Press, 1976.
- , *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999.

Our Mission:

Founded in 1957,
the Shakespeare Oxford Society
is a non-profit, educational organization
dedicated to exploring
the Shakespeare authorship question
and researching the evidence that
Edward de Vere,
the 17th Earl of Oxford (1550 – 1604)
is the true author of the poems and plays of
"William Shakespeare."

Ideational Change: Why Is It So Difficult?

by Paul H. Altrocchi, MD

In the ocean depths off Madagascar, obsolete fish keep their laggard appointments. In the depths of the human mind, obsolete assumptions go their daily rounds. And there is little difference between the two, except that the fish do no harm.

- Robert Ardrey, 1908 -1980
The Territorial Imperative

Many Oxfordians believe that since they have switched from the Stratford man to Edward de Vere as author of the Shakespeare Canon, by definition this makes them open-minded. Would that this were true, but it isn't. Stratfordians do not have a monopoly on neophobia – fear of the new. Many Oxfordians, like most humans, resist novel ideas which conflict with their own with raptorian tenacity, gripping their own erroneous concepts with the same taloned intensity which they habitually claim is an identifying characteristic of their Stratfordian adversaries.

The Latency Concept

A fascinating characteristic of our biological species is that we readily alter certain aspects of our daily lives and accept new technology such as horseless carriages, TV, and the internet in the twinkling of an eye, but 97% of us will resist changing a fundamental belief for our entire lives even when there is solid evidence, sometimes massive evidence, that we are wrong.

A myth may be defined as an unfounded belief held uncritically. Despite abundant mythology in all fields of human endeavor, only 3% of humans seem willing or able to question their own beliefs and adopt new theories promptly without a latent period of 25 to 40 years. The same latent period characterizes most fields of human endeavor, including the arts and most branches of science.

Why does it take so long for us to alter our opinions to a new and clearly superior mental model, i.e. a new paradigm or ideational framework? The latent period time-clock begins when new knowledge refuting old concepts becomes readily available, not when it is discovered. A wrong idea, e.g., the earth is flat, or bloodletting is the cure for disease, may persist for centuries but the latency clock does not start ticking until new ideas are easily accessible.

Physicians are not immune to ideational blockade. For four decades, I watched MDs switch immediately to new antibiotics and new gadgetry like MRI scanning. Yet the same MDs would maintain outmoded concepts for their entire careers, putting the very lives of their patients in jeopardy. As a physician, I have witnessed both crippling and death on a number of occasions caused by outworn MD ideas and steadfast refusal to change.

So we are not dealing with trivial issues here. Think how many lives have been lost by the multiple myths which led our government, including "the best and brightest," into the Vietnam and Iraq wars.

Guild dogma

Philosopher of social change Karl Popper, in his 1959 book *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, pointed out the rigidity of much human ideation: "At any moment we are prisoners caught in the framework of our theories, our expectations, our past experiences."

Our culture generally does not teach the value of innovative thinking.

Once an idea becomes part of guild theory, whether in literature or medicine, it becomes part of that discipline's teachable dogma, and students are pressured to swallow it whole. As Stephen Toulmin said:

"An established conceptual scheme carries considerable intellectual authority; a dominant individual carries magisterial authority."

Young instructors and graduate students wisely resist questioning the fundamental tenets of their mentors, thus not putting their careers in jeopardy. New guild inductees become loyal adherents of established doctrines and pass them on, usually unchanged except for a tendency towards increasing rigidity.

From an Oxfordian perspective, Stratfordians represent a hotbed of ideational status-quo. As Elenor Breed wrote in 1952:

There'll never be Status
As good as Quo.
All the old-timers
Will tell you so (1).

Andrew Greeley, Professor of Higher Education at the University of Illinois, described his professorial colleagues as follows:

"The typical academic suffers from an excess of what can only be called religious zeal . . . he is serenely confident of his own judgment and thus assumes that those who dare to disagree with him are not only wrong but are either stupid or in bad faith, or quite conceivably, both"(2).

When a new doctrine or idea comes along, it is designed to replace the now outworn, erroneous viewpoint or paradigm, but usually meets immediate resistance. As Karl Popper said:

"Many, if not most (humans) accept the ruling dogma of the day, do not wish to challenge it, and accept new revolutionary theory only if almost everybody else is ready to accept it."

As Winston Churchill said, "I don't like to have my myths tampered with."

The power of conventional wisdom

One of the most potent forces in human experience is the power of conventional wisdom – that which we are taught as members of our culture or our professional discipline as core knowledge. It was the

late John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard Professor of Economics, who introduced the term "conventional wisdom" in 1958 in his book, "The Affluent Society." (3) He pointed out that a basic guild belief "is more preciously guarded than any other treasure," and that the defense of conventional wisdom is almost a religious rite, permeated with mystique. (4)

A mental model we have learned, particularly when we are young, behaves as if it had become an intrinsic part of our intracellular DNA, like an invading DNA virus. Thus do we fight any new idea with astonishing vigor, as if it were a threat to our very survival as an organism.

For those in the potent clutches of conventional wisdom, which means most of us, truth and change are not welcomed with open arms. As Machiavelli said 500 years ago in his classic book, *The Prince* :

"There is nothing more difficult to pull off, more risky to succeed in, nor more dangerous to manage than the introduction of a new order of things."

New ideas are almost never received warmly, a process well understood by the Christian writer, Tertullian, in the Third Century

"*Cum odio sui coepit veritas. Simil atque apparuit, inimica est.*"

The first reaction to truth is hatred.

The moment it appears, it is treated as an enemy (5).

Those who suggest a change in guild thinking, i.e., a change in the conventional wisdom, are often subjected to derogatory attacks, frequently personal, as Oxfordians have repeatedly discovered in the past 80 years – not only from their adversaries but, as an intrinsic manifestation of their humanness, also from their own guild compatriots.

There are some exceptions to the latency concept which raise questions about its being an "intrinsic" human characteristic as opposed to a learned behavior. In particle physics and astronomy in the past fifty years, for example, changing concepts and basic research which unlocks secrets of the universe occur so frequently that successful

professionals *must* have a flexible mindset ready and willing to alter course promptly. Is this intellectual adaptability learned, or do those disciplines primarily attract the 3% of humans with pliant minds open to new ideas?

Examples of Latency in scientific fields

Historically, how has man adapted to new ideas? Let's take a look at ideational change in science in past centuries. The phenomenon of latency since Western science began in the mid-1600s can be illustrated as follows:

1. Galileo was forced by the Vatican's Inquisition to recant his theory, based upon insightful telescopic observations, that the earth revolved around the sun and not vice-versa. It took more than 25 years after his death in 1642 for Galileo's ideas to be adopted.

2. Isaac Newton's elegant theory of gravity, proven mathematically in his 1687 treatise on natural philosophy, was not accepted for 30 years.

3. Verbal abuse, hostility, derision and mockery met Simpson's suggestion of chloroform for anesthesia, Lister's recommendations regarding antiseptics, Elliotson's introduction of the stethoscope into medical diagnosis, and Pasteur's recommendation of vaccination with cowpox to stimulate immunity to smallpox.

4. Einstein was awarded the 1921 Nobel Prize in Physics, not for his theory of relativity, which the Swedish Academy didn't believe, but for his work on the photoelectric effect. The Nobel committee made Einstein promise not to mention relativity in his acceptance speech (6).

Examples of Oxfordian latency in the authorship debate

Logic, rationale, and evidence are usually not sufficient to overcome guild dogma. Oxfordians are neither more nor less impervious to ideational change than other humans. Here are some Oxfordian ideas, deemed correct by this author, which have been resisted far too long by many Oxfordians:

1. That John Lyly did not have the talent to write *Euphues, The Anatomy of Wit* or

Euphues and his England, still attributed to him even though he was listed on the title page as "compiler." Both works are clearly de Verean (7).

2. That Thomas Kyd did not write *The Spanish Tragedy* and that the true author was Edward de Vere, as recently analyzed by Chuck Berney (8).

3. That Henry Wriothesley, Third Earl of Southampton, was the son of Queen Elizabeth and Edward de Vere, i.e. the Prince Tudor theory (9).

4. That the "Portrait of an Unknown Woman," hanging in Hampton Court palace, is a portrait of a pregnant Queen Elizabeth, a portrait which was commissioned by Edward de Vere and contains vital authorship clues (10).

5. That 12 year-old Edward de Vere wrote *Tragical Historie of Romeus & Juliet*, not Arthur Brooke (11).

6. That a teen-aged Edward de Vere was the translator of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, not Arthur Golding whose name was on the title page (12).

How can some of our best and brightest refuse to believe these ideas, backed by powerful logic and increasingly compelling evidence? Because they are human, and it is easier to stick with conventional wisdom than risk backing a new idea.

Change of Model

Thomas Kuhn (13), Karl Popper (14), Fritjof Capra (15), Imre Lakatos (16), Alan Musgrave (14), Jerome Ravetz (17), Lewis Thomas (18) and others (19) have pointed out that the average latent period is 25 to 40 years for a paradigm shift to occur, i.e. for a new idea to take hold even after solid evidence against the old model and in favor of the new model has become readily available. The reason for this uniform latency was explained by 1906 physics Nobel Prize winner Max Planck in his *Scientific Biography* :

"A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it."

It is a remarkable concept, validated by history, that 97% of humans not only refuse to change their basic ideas after they are proven wrong, but they resist new ideas with incredible vigor until death separates them from their earth-bound myths. As Thomas Kuhn said:

“Scientists often are not able to make the transition to a new theory and offer lifelong resistance to it. The transfer of allegiance from paradigm to paradigm is a conversion experience that cannot be forced. Sometimes a whole generation is required to affect the change” (20).

Planck summarized the latent period more succinctly:

“Science advances funeral by funeral.”

Open minds view the world of ideas openly

What about the 3% of humans who have different brains which are open to new ideas? An outstanding example is Linus Pauling who is the only person to have won two unshared Nobel prizes, in Chemistry and Peace. He was asked at his 80th birthday party why he had been so successful in research all his life (21). He said he had concluded that it was because he handled new ideas differently from most other scientists. When a new concept appeared, he gave it equal weight with his own theories, then chose the better one. With this Strategy of Ideational Equivalency, no wonder Pauling was so successful compared to most people who utilize all of their energies doing battle to the grave against new clashing theories.

Ideational resistance is a strange phenomenon when it is so obvious that all human knowledge throughout history is the result of repeated overthrow of outworn ideas. Harold Laski, 20th Century English political scientist, commented on the resistance of “experts” to change :

“Expertise breeds an inability to accept new views from the

very depths of its preoccupation with its own conclusions.”

When models are wrong and the practices dependent on those models aren't working, proponents still cling rigidly and steadfastly to their old ideas without any attempt at reevaluation. It was the great Russian novelist, Leo Tolstoy, who reminded us that ideational change is not easy:

“I know that most men, including those at ease with the problems of greatest complexity, can seldom accept even the simplest and most obvious truth if it be such as would oblige them to admit the falsity of conclusions which they have delighted in explaining to colleagues, which they have

Even humans who are aware of the universality of myths fail to recognize their own.

We do not subject our core knowledge and viewpoints to regular scrutiny and reassessment; therefore, we remain inflexibly blind to their intrinsic wrongness.

proudly taught to others, and which they have woven thread by thread into the fabric of their lives.”

Mythology Begets Mythology

Even humans who are aware of the universality of myths fail to recognize their own. We do not subject our core knowledge and viewpoints to regular scrutiny and reassessment; therefore, we remain inflexibly blind to their intrinsic wrongness. Thus myths get piled upon myths in a devastating downward spiral of delusion, quite unbeknownst to the individual who remains completely oblivious to the warning cries of the 3% of mountain top thinkers whose admonitions are lost in the “business-as-usual” quagmire of wrong-think.

“Truth,” as we have seen, is often backed by “prevailing opinion,” enhanced by the unyielding authority of textbooks and rigidified professors totally convinced of their conventional wisdom which they defend, as Galbraith pointed out, with a tenacity akin to religious fervor. In all fields, resistance to change is mighty until the entire guild undergoes a paradigm shift and a new model prevails in a new generation. The poet and writer Julia Cooley Altrocchi, an enthusiastic Oxfordian, summarized this process:

“Citadels of thought, unlike stone citadels, cannot be overthrown in a day.”

Errors are perpetuated by traditional thinking, often with tragic consequences until such time as critical or imaginative reappraisal takes place, usually by new and younger guild members. The process usually cannot be rushed. As George Bernard Shaw said: “You cannot convert a man whose livelihood depends upon his not being converted.”

New guild initiates are persuaded not by logic, but by the power of authority. English Ph.D. candidates are told during their Shakespeare training that the authorship controversy is absurd and therefore not an area of legitimate inquiry and research. Most Stratfordians, therefore, never spend a nanosecond studying authorship debate literature. But, after they acquire their Ph.D., they believe – almost by Divine Right – that they are now authorship experts. Thus they can immediately treat with contempt and disparagement anyone who advocates an alternative authorship viewpoint.

The result of so many years of authoritarian, inflexible training inevitably leads to faulty assumptions, lack of logical analysis, slanted experience, prejudiced research, and biased teaching for another generation. As Michel Montaigne, 16th century French writer, warned:

“Nothing is so firmly believed as that which is least known.”

Oxfordians must remind themselves that this is normal, predictable human behavior of which Oxfordians are also frequently

guilty. How many of us give Stratfordian ideas equal weight with our own and then choose the better concept, as opposed to instantaneous blockade? How many Oxfordians do exactly the same with new Oxfordian ideas which conflict with their own, never even giving them a chance inside their own concrete mindset?

When a concept is unusually brilliant and accompanied by strong literary and historical evidence, like Hank Whittemore's eloquent book, *The Monument* (22), how many Oxfordians take time to study this magnificent research? How many Oxfordians reject Whittemore's work because it conflicts with some dearly-held belief of their own which they have never subjected to reevaluation, e.g. an opinion that "the Prince Tudor theory is nonsense"?

Has any psychologist amongst us analyzed what might be the actual motivation behind the almost instantaneous rejection, often emotion-laden, by certain Oxfordians when major new research findings are published by fellow Oxfordians? Whence derives the surprising vehemence of attacks against Whittemore's masterful analysis of *The Sonnets*?

How many other near-smoking guns or actual smoking guns, postulated and evidenced in detail by Oxfordians in the past five years, have had to face stinging hippocampal attack, disavowal and confrontation by other Oxfordians without sufficient time allowed by them for appropriate study and unbiased analysis. How often do these individuals put into effect the Linus Pauling Doctrine of Ideational Equivalency? This has not been an intellectually refreshing or spiritually uplifting experience for the majority of Oxfordians, and it is difficult not to become concerned about the motivation involved.

We might recall the words of Cambridge Professor T.C. Lethbridge:

"It is not the observers who are at fault; it is the attitude of mind of the people who think they know better. Above all, there is the mental refusal to accept anything which contradicts what they have been taught."

Can only death separate humans from an erroneous paradigm? Yes, usually. Except

in physics and astronomy, the latent period is breached only in rare circumstances. While the routine mind is inherently threatened by change, an original person's open mind gives equal weight to new concepts. Why isn't that approach taught in our high schools and universities? Why is conventional wisdom deified? Why aren't students taught that virtually all conventional wisdom is a temporary cultural phenomenon, and that all basic human ideas should be subjected to periodic reappraisal?

Why don't we train our students to recognize and eliminate cerebral blockade, thus allowing intuition and unencumbered new ideas the marvelous opportunity to disentangle puzzling mysteries? Why can't we train humans to recognize their hostility to any new idea which conflicts with their own and to diagnose, in themselves, a tendency to resent and envy the innovations and discoveries of others, even to the point of doing battle with the rare opportunity to embrace a potential paradigm-changing smoking gun?

Universities: Safe Harbors for Conventional Wisdom?

Universities, their protests to the contrary notwithstanding, are veritable bastions of conventional wisdom. They tend to protect, not challenge, ways of thinking. Discussion? Research and openness to new ideas? Yes, but only to a point. Professors tend to encourage ideational challenge in other fields but *not* in their own. Think openly, they say, but let's not push your luck too far by intruding in my own sacrosanct domain of Obvious Truth, of which I am the self-appointed custodian.

In this way, professors often unintentionally serve as unyielding "guardians" of comfortable old theories which are long outdated and often just plain wrong. As educational and political philosopher John Gardner said:

"The success of fools in the university world is one of God's great mysteries."

John Kenneth Galbraith pointed out that "high academic rank . . . itself is a reward for expounding the conventional wisdom at a properly sophisticated level." (23)

Professors vigorously deny that they themselves are closed to new ideas. Should we ask their spouses for an independent opinion on that point? But how many of us actually do have insight into our own human frailties?

Why is anyone who goes against conventional wisdom and proposes new ideas automatically considered a "troublemaker" and "rebel"? Why is it considered "loyal" to stick with old ideas just because they are old? Why is it "mutinous" to shift rapidly to a new and much better concept? Why shouldn't the words "rebel" and "troublemaker" be applied to those who unthinkingly stick with tired, old, erroneous ideas – their guild's core knowledge of conventional wisdom, much of which is pure mythology?

Why aren't new ideas given the highest priority? How sad that so many of us, both Oxfordians and Stratfordians, are not familiar with Physics Nobel Laureate Richard Feynman's term, "humility of the intellect." Before we laugh at Stratfordians for lacking this quality, how many Oxfordians have intellectual humility as a prominent characteristic? To paraphrase social scientists Neil Agnew and Sandra Pike, there may be an insufficient number of such people to fill a phone booth. (2)

Why is it that intellectually-gifted people often perpetuate their myths with increasing conviction, impervious to logic and research? Lisa Fittko, resistance fighter in Nazi-occupied Europe who saw firsthand the extreme costs of oldthink, described ideational resistance in very bright people:

"Such people — known for their eminent intellects — are found shambling throughout history with blinders on. Sometimes it seems that the higher the mind, the bigger the blinders" (24).

Skrabanek and McCormick, insightful authors of *Follies & Fallacies in Medicine*, explained this intriguing paradox by citing Francis Bacon's explanation from the 1600s:

"The more intelligent the authorities, the more idiotic will be some of their claims. When such a man sets out in the

wrong direction, his superior skill and swiftness will lead him proportionately further astray" (25).

Is the time ripe for Oxfordian ideational change?

The Greeks have a word, *kairos*, meaning a time ripe for change. Hugh Prather amplified this concept:

"There is a time to let things happen, And a time to MAKE things happen."

Is the time NOW to make it happen that Edward de Vere is finally, after 400 years, recognized as Shakespeare? If so, are we Oxfordians ready to meet that exciting challenge? How much time are we wasting on bickering and dissension rather than uniting in our common cause?

Skrabaneck and McCormick reminded all of us how knowledge advances:

"The progress of science and the growth of knowledge depend upon clearing away rubbish and challenging accepted dogma a belief" (26).

In the authorship debate, this does *not* mean throwing out only the obvious rubbish in the other fellow's dogma, e.g. as manifested by "those inflexible, unthinking Strats." We must also clear away the fossilization and falseness in our own Oxfordian ideation, of which we have plenty despite our own conventional wisdom which proclaims that we are a superb example of a refreshingly enlightened guild.

Types of smoking guns

In the authorship debate, the most powerful smoking gun would be discovery of the original Shakespeare play manuscripts in Edward de Vere's handwriting. Such a finding, universally clear and easy to understand, should precipitate a paradigm shift almost immediately, even surmounting Stratfordian attempts to prove them a forgery.

As forensic science attests, however, a smoking gun may be quite complicated, requiring prolonged detailed investigation before understanding is achieved sufficient

to convince others. Such is the nature of Hank Whittemore's brilliant analysis of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* (22). Even the most diligent Oxfordian may need several weeks of study to comprehend fully the majestic power of Whittemore's thesis and its line-by-line, word-by-word elegant proof. How many Oxfordians have actually spent this time? And of those who have, how many have unemotionally applied the Doctrine of Ideational Equivalency before doing so, giving equal weight both to Whittemore's theory and their own? How can we expect Stratfordians to change their ideas if we Oxfordians, for various reasons, refuse to do so?

How might we hasten the Paradigm Shift?

If the primary goal of Oxfordians is to convince the world that Edward de Vere is Shakespeare, how can this best be accomplished? Despite copious Oxfordian research in the past 30 years and energetic efforts to inform the public of Oxfordian data and logic, are we any closer to a paradigm shift now than in 1940 or 1980? Probably not.

Where and how will the long-awaited de Verean paradigm shift occur? It is now clear to this writer that it must begin within the Stratfordian guild itself, not amongst the general public. Oxfordians have concentrated too long on "spreading the word" to the uninitiated and have generally steered clear of Stratfordians. It is now deemed essential to plant the seed of change within Stratfordian soil, give it time to germinate, and then fertilize the concept during its inevitable growth towards Truth.

Ideational change does not derive from the older generation "seeing the light," declaring their error, and correcting their mistaken beliefs. As repeatedly pointed out by philosophers of science like Thomas Kuhn, change comes only after a suitable latent period during which powerful members of the older generation die. It is the younger generation which realizes more and more that the old ideas are just not working. Suddenly the former model is seen for what it is: an unfounded concept which is wrong – a myth held uncritically far too long.

Once the new bandwagon starts, it is often remarkable how swiftly the myth is rejected and the paradigm shift occurs – within a year or two, or perhaps even faster in our new internet age, as new information circles the globe in a twinkling.

Carpe diem

So how can Oxfordians best seize the moment – *carpe diem*, as first recommended by Horace in the First Century BC:

Carpe diem quam minimum credula postero.

Seize the day; put minimal trust in tomorrow (27).

Or, as Edward de Vere blithely interprets *carpe diem* in *Twelfth Night*:

In delay there lies no plenty,

Then come kiss me, sweet-and-twenty (28).

Sir George Greenwood said in 1908 that if we knew who wrote *The Sonnets* we should know the true Shakespeare (29). Hank Whittemore has provided a powerful and convincing case that only Edward de Vere could have written *The Sonnets*. How many Oxfordians truly understand what an incredible opportunity we finally have – that Whittemore's *The Monument* is most likely the only true smoking gun we have had in the 85 years, since the 1920 publication of Thomas Looney's *Shakespeare Identified*?

Stratfordian professors have universally admitted for more than a century that they do not understand *The Sonnets*. Isn't now the time for Oxfordians to make things happen – to seize this rare moment, pull together and develop a paradigm shift strategy?

Based upon the premise that the shift must come from within the Stratfordian guild, here is one idea: raise \$30,000, buy 400 copies of *The Monument*, and send them free to young instructors and assistant professors of English who are compelled to teach *The Sonnets* despite not knowing their meaning. Whittemore's book would allow them to understand every line and every word, finally comprehending the mystery of Shakespeare's beautiful, deeply personal poetry for the first time.

How many copies of *The Monument* will be promptly deep-sixed and how many

will be kept and studied by such young professors? Since no good educator relishes teaching what he does not understand, the number who actually study *The Monument* might be higher than would normally be predicted. Even if only a few young English instructors “see the light” after studying Whittemore’s *magnum opus*, which this writer thinks will become one of the most important books of the 21st Century, the ideas could grow with incremental power. Thus could a paradigm shift be initiated – from within Stratfordianism itself, where it *must* begin.

Now is a superb time for Oxfordians to unite in the common cause of triggering a de Verean paradigm shift – which should be the central goal of all of us, unblemished by any other motivation. In that effort, we should be encouraged by recalling the words of medical philosopher Sir William Osler about shifts in basic ideas:

“The philosophies of one age become the absurdities of the next, and the foolishness of yesterday becomes the wisdom of tomorrow.”

American philosopher William James’ message was similar:

“A new idea is first condemned as ridiculous, and then dismissed as trivial until finally it becomes what everybody knows.”

For Oxfordians who have doubts about the validity of Whittemore’s Sonnet analysis, perhaps they should climb to the moun-

tain top and reevaluate their own beliefs in the light of Linus Pauling’s Doctrine of Ideational Equivalency. All Oxfordians, as well as Stratfordians, might also remind themselves periodically of Hamlet’s prescient words to Horatio:

*There are more things in Heaven and Earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy* (30).

References

1. Altrocchi, Julia Cooley. Personal communication to the author, 1972.
2. Agnew, Neil McK. and Pyke, Sandra W. *The Science Game*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1969, 14.
3. Galbraith, John Kenneth. *The Affluent Society*, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, third edition, 1976, 8.
4. Galbraith, J.K. *ibid.*, 7-9.
5. Tertullianus, Quintus (Tertullian). In Norbert Guterman, *The Anchor Book of Latin Quotations*, Doubleday, NY, 1966, 340.
6. The New Yorker, Feb. 28, 2005, 82.
7. Ogburn, Dorothy and Ogburn, Charlton. *This Star of England*, Coward-McCann, Inc., New York, 1952, 178-179.
8. Berney, C.V. “Who Wrote The Spanish Tragedy?” *Shakespeare Matters*, vol. 4, no. 2, Winter, 2005.
9. Altrocchi, Paul H. A Royal Shame. “The origins and history of the Prince Tudor Theory”. *Shakespeare Matters* 4, no. 4, Summer, 2005.
10. Altrocchi, Paul H. “The Queen Elizabeth Pregnancy Portrait: Who Designed It and Who Did the Cover-ups?” *Shakespeare Matters*, 1, #2, Winter, 2002.
11. Altrocchi, Paul H. “Shakespeare, not Arthur Brooke, Wrote *Tragicall Historye of Romeus & Julie*.” *Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter*, in press, 2007.
12. Altrocchi, Paul H. “De Vere, Not Arthur Golding, Translated Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” *Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter* 45, no. 2, Summer, 2005.
13. Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Univ. of Chicago Press, Illinois, 1962.
14. Popper, Karl. *Conjectures & Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, Routledge Classics, London, 1963.
15. Capra, Fritjof. *The Turning Point*, Bantam Books, New York, 1982.
16. Lakatos, Imre and Musgrave, Alan, eds. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, Cambridge Univ. Press, England, 1970.
17. Ravetz, Jerome R. *Scientific Knowledge and Its Social Problems*, Oxford Univ. Press, NY, 1970.
18. Thomas, Lewis. *The Youngest Science: Notes of a Medicine-Watcher*, Bantam Books, NY, 1984.
19. Broad, William and Wade, Nicholas. *Be-trayers of Truth*. Simon and Schuster, NY, 1982.
20. Kuhn, Thomas, *ibid.*, 151.
21. Personal communication, 1981.
22. Whittemore, Hank. *The Monument*, Meadow Geese Press, Marshfield Hills, Mass., 2005.
23. Galbraith, J.K. *ibid.*, 10.
24. Marino, Andy. *A Quiet American*, St. Martin’s Press, 1999.
25. Skrabanek, Petr, and McCormick, James. *Follies & Fallacies in Medicine*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo, NY 1990, 38.
26. Skrabanek, P. and McCormick, J., *ibid.*, 9.
27. Quintus Horatius Flaccus (Horace). “Odes I, ii, 8”.
28. Shakespeare, William. *Twelfth Night* II, iii, 49.
29. Whittemore, Hank, *ibid.*, xvii.
30. Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet* I, 5, 168.

RSC AT ANN ARBOR

By Lew Tate

I will mention *The Tempest* first. The Shakespeare Oxford Society/ Shakespeare Fellowship Conference in Ann Arbor coincided with a residency of The Royal Shakespeare Company. The participants were privileged to see *Julius Caesar*, *The Tempest* and *Antony and Cleopatra*.

Imagine a huge radio projected onto a screen as a curtain; you see it as you come into the theater. After looking at it for awhile, imagine the lights coming down and hearing storm sounds and seeing rain on the screen and voices (that was all expected). The voices are coming from the radio announcing a large storm in the North Atlantic. They meld into the voices of the mariners, nobles, and courtiers aboard the ship seen through a porthole that was the round speaker of the radio. The ship crashes, the wit and banter of the survivors taking place, of course, on the island, an arctic island. No palm trees in this land-seascape, but barren rocks which change to wreckage, and the exterior of Prospero's cell, (rocks and wood askew). The interior is as stark as a northern woodsman may have it. Imagine seeing and hearing the storm, then seeing a primitive, fur-clad person, back to the audience, arms up, apparently directing the storm. As this director lowers his arms and hangs his animal skin robes on a hook, imagine Ariel appearing from behind the robes. Ariel, in a black cloak with a white face accented by dark sunken eyes, almost constantly bathed in bare white light. He walks slowly; he is menacing. Prospero is in control of him, but minds his air. Perhaps he is borrowed from an Anne Rice novel. Imagine the banquet scene with harpies, shapes, and what have you, as some sort of Eskimo girl spirits orchestrating, as they do many scenes, serving up a large narwhal from which all tear hunks to eat raw. Ariel does not disappear above; he rises from within the beast, screams, and he and the animal are pulled away. Caliban, usually the outrageous one, visually fits in. He is the angry, resentful, vengeful monster-slave of Prospero. Their mutual antagonism drives a great deal of the play's tension. At one point Prospero spits in Caliban's food. Caliban is

humorous in the drunk scenes and played often tied with ropes.

It is not hard to imagine Prospero and Miranda. Their affection shows throughout as Prospero instructs her, and us, on their circumstances, and prepares her for the courtship from Ferdinand and a life with him. It is easy to imagine the hilarious antics of Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo, although it may be surprising that their overthrow plan comes across as quite threatening.

Prospero grows and changes. It is not foregone that he will forgive or forsake his magic. The tension with Caliban has a surface rage and a primordial darkness. This coupled with the complicated relationship of master yet fearfully so to Ariel yields a troubled and uncertain Prospero. Ariel reports to Prospero that ship's company is in suspended animation; "prisoners" he calls them.

Ariel ...brim-full of sorrow and dismay: but chiefly

But him sir that you term'd sir The good old Lord Gonzalo

His tears run down his beard like winter's drops

From caves of reeds; your charm so strongly

Works 'em. That if you now beheld them, your

Affections would become tender.

Prospero Dost thou think so, Spirit?

Ariel Mine would, sir, were I human.
(5i, 16-23)

At this point Prospero stares across at Ariel for an uncomfortably long time during which he seems to physically change. He answers, "and mine shall", thus the epiphany that had been building has transpired.

The play is Prospero's. This production was Patrick Stewart's as Prospero. All of the ranges, changes, and transitions mentioned above were seamless and spine tingling. The Royal Shakespeare Company formed around him for a unique production of *The Tempest*.

Julius Caesar was considered a disappointment by many in the conference.

A few claimed to have left early. It was performed on a bare stage (pretty standard for Shakespeare) with lighting adding some interest. Quick entrances from the dark periphery and percussion punctuation made for dramatic scene changes. The costumes were representational. In the first scene the citizens were rowdy, beating drums, playing pipes, dressed in togaesque lacy garments from which they could escape into other costumes, often red or white togas over red under garments and familiar leather war costumes Caesar was properly naïve to his danger and died bloodily but not too convincingly. Brutus was conflicted, Marc Antony not enough, but the dueling eulogies scene was effective. Cassius was slimy. The war just didn't work. *Julius Caesar* was worth seeing, a fair representation of Shakespeare's play albeit with difficulties mentioned above.

Most in attendance with whom I spoke had never seen *Antony and Cleopatra* performed. It is rare. There is a reason it is said to be one of those plays more intended as literature to be read rather than viewed as a performance piece. Patrick Stewart as Antony and Harriet Walker as Cleopatra capture well the decadence of their Egyptian lifestyle. Patrick Stewart is again effective although he and Ms Walker seem to be in different acting styles, hers more classical to his more natural. Mr. Stewart had to be casually decadent, conniving, bellicose, drunk, in despair, and dying as Antony. All were accomplished making Antony a great character. Ms Walker's range was less. She was not evil enough or sexy enough, yet the wildness and duplicity came through. Enobarbus, played by Ken Bone, was an effective friend to Antony. The stage was often bare, but a lush room was represented, and a ship; and entrances, and exits were amplified with percussion and pipes.

It was a treat to be entertained by Patrick Stewart and The Royal Shakespeare Company.

Letters to the Editor

Dear Editor

As a member of the De Vere Society (UK), I greatly look forward to receiving the Shakespeare Oxford newsletter in order to read about the great work that our American cousins are doing researching the Shakespeare Authorship Question!

It may interest your members to know that the first part of my short history of the Trentham family has just been published in the DVS newsletter - this includes a comprehensive Trentham family tree incorporating the De Veres and the Sneyds as an A2 insert. For those of your members who are not also members of the DVS - it may be also be of interest to know that I have now published this article and family tree on my website: www.jeremycrick.info.

Oxfordians have often complained that so little is known about Elizabeth Trentham or her family that I hope that my attempt to shed some light on the background of Edward de Vere's second wife might be of some help to Oxfordian researchers. One of the reasons, perhaps, why researching the Trentham family has been neglected is the relative obscurity of the Trentham's family home at Rocester, nestling between the Dove and Churnett rivers, miles from anywhere in the Staffordshire Moorlands. Well, for me, this proved an opportunity as I do a great deal of freelance design work at an Ad Agency not five miles away at Uttoxeter. But my real starting point for this research began when I was reading a copy of Elizabeth Trentham's will and I noticed the following, ³I give unto my uncle Sneyd my two gilt candlesticks² - could this be, I wondered, a reference to the Sneyd family in whose archive I had spent the last three or four years working on a different local history project? It was indeed and, talking about the opportunities that proximity provides, I was absolutely delighted to realise that I lived not two hundred yards from where Elizabeth Trentham's maternal grandfather, Sir William Sneyd, lies buried in a most impressive carved alabaster tomb.

Any questions or feedback arising from my Trentham family research would be most welcome.

best regards

Jeremy Crick Wolstanton

Dear Sir:

Chris Paul's comprehensive article in the Fall 2006 issue did an excellent job of debunking earlier Oxfordian misunderstandings of the "Bolebec" crest with the lion rampant (i.e., standing on its left paw with its right paw ascendant), especially where shaking a broken spear or pen. I appreciated Chris' brief citation in his endnote #2 about my Vol. I book's page 77 analysis of a quote from Rear Admiral H.H. Holland (an underappreciated early Oxfordian and long-time President of the original Shakespeare-Fellowship). Here I wish to report that although Oxfordians did not "invent" the lion and broken-spear crest, I've concluded that it may be very difficult to discover any evidence that it was ever applied at all to Bolebec titleholders or family, let alone specifically to the 17th Oxford. At the Library of Congress (LOC) I discovered the crest illustrated in "Fairbairn's Crests of the Families of Great Britain and Ireland Compiled from the Best Authorities... Modified by L. Butters," 1968 ed., as identified in my Vol. II Frontispiece and Bibliography. The LOC also has several older editions, one of them 1860 (Edinburgh and London), and there's no doubt Fairbairn used much-older precursors. Thus, the crest in question almost certainly goes back a century and a half at least. Listed on Fairbairn's Plate #60, Crest #4, pg. 621, described as "Lion brandishing broken lance over ermine," the basic crest long-used by Oxfordians is genuine, but is linked to the "Butt, Drayner, and Halton" families or titles, NOT TO BOLEBEC! We may find that one or more of those families were heirs to the Bolebec title, but that still won't get us back to the 17th Oxford. In any case, Oxfordian variations of the crest in which the broken spear tip looks like the point of a fountain-pen (e.g., Ruth Miller's republication of J. T. Looney, Vol. I, 471) are certainly perpetuations of an Oxfordian "joke" or "irony" that overlooks the fairly modern history of the fountain-pen. So, precisely what source Adm. Holland referred to in the relevant part of his 1923 "Shakespeare Through Oxford Glasses," pp. 119-23, remains somewhat of a mystery. His focus was that since he'd adopted the then-

new Oxfordian (what he called "Oxonian") outlook, he'd been surprised by unexpected obscure facts that each tended to substantiate that outlook, such as: "Why do 'factotum,' 'shallow water' and 'worm,' words used in Robert Greene's [1592 'Groatsworth of Wit'] tirade, agree with the Earl of Oxford's names and office, and why should the Bolebec crest turn out to be a lion shaking a spear, although it must be admitted that this is not an uncommon crest?"

Since Adm. Holland, the Astronomer Royal in charge of Greenwich, was in close contact with and a great friend of Looney, and his 1923 book was actually only the 3rd Oxfordian book ever written (missing being the 2nd book by only two months), I agree with Chris' guess that either the crest with broken spear was Holland's "discovery" or else he'd been introduced to it by Looney or another one of the earliest Oxfordians.

As we search for more Oxford-relevant evidence in Heraldry, besides the works cited by Robert Brazil and Chris Paul, I also recommend "Boutell's Heraldry" 1973 revised edition, noting that Boutell died in 1877, and the 1871 "Arms and Armour in antiquity and the middle ages" had translations by Boutell from Paul Lacombe's French. In addition, Oxfordians may profit from the useful and readable "A Dictionary of Chivalry" by Grant Uden (NY, 1968, Crowell Co.) which, for example, has very interesting definitions distinguishing between "Lord Great Chamberlain" (pg. 184, originating under the Normans, this was originally the "Chief Financial Officer... in charge of the King's chamber... now mainly ceremonial, he is in charge of the Palace of Westminster, supervises the arrangements for the state Opening of Parliament, etc.") vs. the "Lord Chamberlain" (pg. 183, "chief officer of the royal household, a peer, a privy councillor... responsible for the administration... of great state ceremonies... of the King's chaplains... of wardrobes, beds, tents, revels, music, comedians, etc.; of all physicians, apothecaries, surgeons, barbers, messengers, trumpeters, drummers, tradesmen, and artisans, retained in his Majesty's service..."). Notably, the many known interests of LGC Oxford closely matched the musical, medical, comedy, revels, etc.

responsibilities of his mentor LC Sussex (term 1573-83) who in 1576-80 was so ill that his duties had to be temporarily taken over by Deputy LC Charles Howard, Lord Effingham, Oxford's 2nd cousin and best friend, who may have had Oxford assist in those duties then and at later times. I've long argued that we need to be thinking of "Shake-speare" as originating back during Sussex's term, not merely during the later term 1585-96 of Effingham's father-in-law, LC Henry Carey Lord Hunsdon.

Though the lion and spear crest never really deserved to be used for our Newsletter masthead, the Bolebec lion itself, accompanied by a boarshead mask, may be very significant in identifying Oxford as the late patron or person whom the main fictional characters resembled-honored in woodcuts associated with the 1609 "Guy of Warwick" 1st ed. (dedicated to Oxford's son-in-law Philip Herbert, "Guy" was depicted as heir by marriage to titles of "Earl of Warwick, OXFORD, and Buckingham") and the c.1553/54 "Palladine of England" 2nd ed. (translated in 1588 by Oxford's ex-servant Anthony Munday as identified in my Vol. II, Appen. F, "Palladine" = "of the Spear-shaker").

Chris' notes on other Heraldry matters remain valid, such as that the broken spear crest would have most likely been used by a cadet, rather than a primary claimant. Thus, I'm curious about the possibility that the cadet lineage inheriting under Robert the 19th Earl of Oxford might have circa-1626 modified the Bolebec lion rampant insignia to include a broken lance, and perhaps this was listed in a source known to Looney and Holland? If so, 1626 would have been within living memory of the 17th Oxford's artistic and pseudonymous avocations. Indeed, assisting the eventual 19th Earl in presenting his claim was Sir Simond

D'Ewes, the antiquarian and heraldry expert whose grandfather was the Dutch-Walloons immigrant Garrat Dewes (a.k.a., Dewce, D'Ewes, DeVere, possibly a distant Dutch minor-noble related to the DeVeres). G. Dewes printed and sold Bibles, ballads, and broadsides 1560-91, was occasionally disciplined by the authorities, and while serving as a Warden of the Stationers Company in September 1581 he authorized registration of the Oxford- and Munday-related "Cesar & Pompeyus" (which may have influenced Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar").

W. Ron Hess

(BeornsHall@earthlink.net)

Dear Editor,

There are two separate items I would like to address here:

First, after reading in the last issue of the newsletter (Fall 2006) the Letters to the Editor from John Hamill (anti-PT) and Alan Tarica (pro-PT) regarding Richard Whalen's article "The 'Prince Tudor' Hypothesis: A Brief Survey of the Pros and Cons" that had appeared in the prior issue (Spring 2006), it occurred to me that I should have written my own Letter to the Editor with regard to the same. Better late than never. Like Hamill, I also thought Whalen did a commendable job in laying out "the history, problems and issues around this theory." I would, however, like to emphasize a point that Whalen did not. When alluding to my article on the PT theory in *The Oxfordian* of 2002, Whalen mentions six documents to which I call attention that "refer directly several times to the wife of the 2nd earl of Southampton as the mother of Henry, the 3rd earl!" [and conversely, he is referred to as her son], and writes that "Paul and others find it hard to believe that this bequest in particular and the letters could all be part of a coverup" (17). However, I recognized

in my article that the terms "mother" and "son" could be exchanged between members of a non-biological relationship (58). What is more important than these "mother/son" references is Henry Howard's account (to the earl of Essex) of the second countess of Southampton telling him that the third earl of Southampton—according to "*the law of God*"—owed her duty, love and reverence because he "*sprang*" from her, and that the love which bound them to each other derived from "*nature*." In other words, the countess was claiming nothing less than that she *literally gave birth* to the third earl of Southampton. As I stressed in my article that Howard's letter "is perhaps the most compelling evidence for Henry Wriothesley's blood relationship to the Countess of Southampton" (64), I was disappointed that Whalen overlooked this item in his recapitulation.

Second, after reading on page 6 of the last issue of the newsletter the Editor's Note that "[t]here has been conflicting research in naming the 1st Earl of Oxford, Edgar Atheling or Aubrey Devere, Stephanie Hopkins Hughes and Christopher Paul in this edition and Thomas Hunter in the Winter 2006 edition", it occurred to me, too late, that when naming Aubrey de Vere "the first earl of Oxford" in my article "R.I.P.: Bulbeck bites the dust", I should perhaps have clarified that he was the first earl of Oxford of the de Vere creation, whereas, for instance, Robert Harley was the first earl of Oxford of the Harley creation. I would not have gone so far as to say the research is "conflicting", since such distinctions are rarely made. It is true, however, that Edgar Atheling was technically the very first earl of Oxford.

With kind regards,
Christopher Paul