



The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter

A Publication of the Shakespeare Oxford Society

"Dedicated to Researching and Honoring the True Bard"



Vol. 44: No. 1

"The rarer action is / in virtue than in vengeance" *The Tempest* 5.1.26

Winter 2008

Reverend Ward's Diary: The Early Tradition

By R. Thomas Hunter, Ph.D.

Part of educating the public and ourselves about the authorship issue is to understand Stratfordian research, history, criticism, and biography. Recently, I was fortunate enough to come upon a copy of Rev. John Ward's diary; Its importance is that it has been recognized as the earliest third-party testimony as to Stratford Shakspeare's life. This edition was published in 1839 in London by Henry Colburn and edited by Charles Severn just a half century after Garrick's Shakespeare Jubilee. The edition is instructive as to the state of bardolatry in the early 19th century. The scarcity of reliable, documented evidence has introduced much reasonable doubt about Stratford Shakspeare as the true author. A close reading of Rev. Ward's diary, relied on by so many Stratfordians, does nothing to clarify the situation.

Of the 315 page volume, the Rev. Ward's entries regarding Shakespeare take up barely

(cont'd on p. 20)

Complaints about *A Lover's Complaint*

by Katherine Chiljan

Very few Shakespeare fans have read or even know about Shakespeare's poem, *A Lover's Complaint*. Although published together with *SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS* in 1609, both making their print debut, *A Lover's Complaint* is usually left out of most modern editions of the *Sonnets*, and in scholarship, it is among Shakespeare's most neglected works. Currently one scholar is trying to expel it from the Shakespeare canon, which is odd, considering the trend of adding works to it. Why is this the case? Does *A Lover's Complaint* have some biographical elements, as do the *Sonnets*? Are these two works connected? There are distinct parallels between the young man of *A Lover's Complaint* and the older poet of the *Sonnets*. If they were the same person, then the great author was a nobleman-courtier who did not spend his youth in rural Stratford-upon-Avon.

A Lover's Complaint opens with the poet describing, in the first person "I," a scene he is witnessing in the countryside. A woman is ripping up letters and tossing rings into a river. An old man appears and asks to know her story. The poet is close enough to hear it. Her "complaint" is regret for allowing herself to be seduced by a

known womanizer who pleaded true love, and later "betrayed" her. The poem gives few details about the woman, but her ex-lover is fully described in eight stanzas. He is twice called a "youth," and this is confirmed with line 92, "small show of man was yet upon his chin." He is handsome and very popular.

O one by nature's outwards so commended
That maidens' eyes stuck over all his face (80-81)

Women obtain his picture and fantasize being his lover or wife, and they send him gifts of sonnets, pieces of their hair, and jewels, like offerings to a god. He has had numerous conquests including married women, some of whom had his children ("his plants in others' orchards grew," 171). He attracts followers, young and old, "in personal duty." He is also "accomplished." He is an expert horseman, intelligent, and has a pleasing voice and persuasive speech. In this passage, the woman could easily have been describing Shakespeare's particular gifts:

(cont'd on p. 5)

A Louers complaint.

BY

WILLIAM SHAKE-SPEARE.

FROM off a hill whose concaue wombe reworded,
A plaintfull story from a fistring vale
My spirits t'attend this doble voyce accorded,
And downe I laid to lift the sad tun'd tale,
Ere long espied a fickle maid full pale
Tearing of papers breaking rings a twaine,
Storming her world with sorrowes, wind and raine.

The print debut of *A Lover's Complaint* occurred in Thomas Thorpe's 1609 edition of the *Sonnets*, and it was specifically attributed to Shakespeare.

• I N S I D E •

President's Page	2
GREETINGS	2
Hypothetical Tudor Princes	3
Sue Sybersma	4
<i>Hamlet</i> in 1603:	
A Quick-and-Dirty Quarto	9
Who Was the Author of Five Plays that Shakespeare Rewrote as His Own?	13
New Eric Sams Website,	20
Book Review	25
Shakespearean Character Pairs	
Anagram Puzzle	27
Report on Oxfordian Activity in Seattle, Washington	28
Shakespearean Character Pairs	
Anagram Puzzle Solutions	28

Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter

Published quarterly by the
Shakespeare Oxford Society
P.O. Box 808
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598
Tel: (914) 962-1717
Fax: (914) 254-9713
Email: sosoffice@optonline.net
ISSN 1525-6863
www.shakespeare-oxford.com

Editor:
Lew Tate

Editorial Board:

John Hamill
Frank Davis
Dr. Jim Brooks
Ramon Jimenez
James Sherwood
Dr. Richard Smiley
Katherine Chiljan
Brian Bechtold

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

All contents copyright © 2008
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 Trustee
Charles Boyle

2008

President: Matthew Cossolotto

First Vice President: John Hamill

Brian Bechtold
Virginia Hyde
Michael Pisapia
Randall Sherman
Dr. Richard Smiley
Dr. Richard Joyrich
James Sherwood
Andrew Freye.

President's Page

By Matthew Cossolotto

Dear Society Members and Friends:

As many of you are well aware, last year marked the 50th anniversary of our Society. I hope you are also aware that we are publishing a 50th anniversary anthology of articles in a volume entitled "*Report My Cause Aright*." The anthology is going to press as I write this in early March 2008 and should be in the mail in the very near future. Many thanks to Stephanie Hughes for heroically seeing this demanding project through to completion.

All Society members in good standing in 2008 will receive a copy of this landmark publication free of charge. If you have not already done so, I encourage you to be sure to renew your membership in the Shakespeare Oxford Society without delay. We operate on a calendar year membership basis so you should renew your membership at the beginning of each year. Don't delay. Renew today!

We hope members will buy a few extra copies of the anthology and give them away as gifts to friends, relatives, libraries, and schools. We need your support to ensure that this anthology not only helps us spread the word about Oxford and the authorship issue, but also turns into a fundraising vehicle for the Society.

Our Founding Purposes

As part of the Foreword to the anthology, I wrote about the Society's history and the vision our founders had about the mission and objectives of the organization. It was particularly interesting to me to read the following excerpt from one of our first presidents, Richard Horne. In our June 30, 1966, newsletter, Richard Horne wrote the following:

"For the benefit of our recent joiners and for those of our regulars who may not be too familiar with the history and purposes of the Society, it may be well to outline what it is and what it hopes to accomplish. [The Shakespeare Oxford Society] is an Educational Foundation, tax-free, and dues and contributions are tax-deductible. The objects or purposes to be promoted and carried on are to conduct and encourage research into the history of the Elizabethan period of English literature, to disseminate the results of such research in the form of books, pamphlets, periodicals, papers and other publications in furtherance of or connected with the increasing knowledge of the English literature of said period and to aid or assist individuals, institutions or

(cont'd on p. 12)

GREETINGS

Welcome to the winter newsletter. This is a good one. We hear from the conference in Carmel again with a paper by Katherine Chiljan about the poem "A Lover's Complaint." You can never read enough about *Hamlet*. Carlton Sterling offers us "Hamlet in 1603." P.T. is back. "Hypothetical Tudor Princes" is here by Dr. Sterling. Thomas Hunter has for us "Rev. Ward's Diary." Ramon Jimenez asks us a question, "Who Was the Author of Five Plays That Shakespeare Wrote On His On?" He answers it, of course. Richard Whalen sent a report on Oxford studies in Seattle. Mr. Whalen's book, *Macbeth: Fully Annotated From an Oxford Perspective*, is reviewed in this edition. Also, for fun, Richard Joyrich has a puzzle for all of you scholars.

The winter newsletter is a bit late; we have held off some hoping to include substantive

information concerning the issues surrounding *The Oxfordian*. We have no resolutions as of this writing, but Matthew Cossolotto comments in his letter. On the subject of *The Oxfordian*, in the flurry of exchanges regarding the editorship of the book, particularly on *Phaeton* the question of how the newsletter will be affected came up a couple of times. Nothing on the subject has been suggested, certainly not mandated.

Erratum: A thorough report of the Carmel Conference was in the last edition by Richard Joyrich. A contributor to that report was Richard Smiley. I failed to include him and apologize.

Please enjoy this newsletter, and keep researching, writing, reporting, and teaching.

Lew Tate
tate3211@bellsouth.net

Hypothetical Tudor Princes

By Carleton W. Sterling

Elizabethan politics revolved around the Tudor Princess renowned as the Virgin Queen, an unfortunate status for the survival of her dynasty. I think this reigning monarch enjoyed the attentions of male admirers in the tradition of chaste "courtly love." Romantic tales of Elizabeth and her favorites included stories of the spinster monarch giving birth to a love child unknown to history.

Some Oxfordians now believe that Edward de Vere not only fathered the Shakespeare scripts but impregnated Her Royal Highness. Hank Whittemore and others infer that the "fair youth" of the *Sonnets* is not only the Earl of Southampton but also the secret son of the Earl of Oxford and Queen Elizabeth.¹

I'm unsure whether this Oxfordian foundling replaces or supplements the hypothetical Tudor princes credited to the longtime companionship of Elizabeth and her "sweet Robin," a.k.a. the Earl of Leicester. Nineteenth Century Baconians claimed to have deciphered a code embedded by Sir Francis in the First Folio of Shakespeare's works revealing the illustrious Bacon as Elizabeth's first-born son and "sweet Robin II," a.k.a. the Earl of Essex, as her second son from her undocumented private marriage to Leicester.² In birth order, Southampton would sit as the third hypothetical Tudor Prince.

Whatever the truth of the matter, Shakespeare surely could imagine Good Queen Bess blest with royal offspring she yet forsook. His reworking of the Hamlet legend portrays the preemption of rightful succession that doomed the dynasty and lost the realm to the opportunistic Prince from the North. As I argued in "Shakespeare's Monarchs," the exchange of words between the fictional Queen Gertrude and the Player Queen plays on the dynastic contest between Elizabeth of England and Mary of Scotland.³ The mutually fatal duel between Hamlet and Polonius' son Laertes could represent the struggle to the death between the headstrong Earl of Essex and William Cecil's calculating son, Robert.

The inference of a Tudor prince in the pages of literature is not reflected in the pages of history, so the Tudor Prince hypothesis needs a cover-up. I doubt the Elizabethan court would fail to realize if the monarch were carrying a child to term. Kings and queens of that era did not enjoy much privacy, and a queen's pregnancy would surely catch the attention of the ladies who dressed and undressed her. Were the royal attendants afraid to speak the truth or were they all too ready to tell lurid tales? It would be hard to hush up the birth of a royal child. Under hereditary monarchy, the sovereign's progeny is vital to the state and its dependent population. Even a bastard or the bastard's descendants might come to claim a crown. The Tudor dynasty's founder, Henry VII, claimed royal blood by way of an illegitimate grandchild of King Edward III, a tenuous claim but good enough once the childless Richard III was unhorsed and killed.

Elizabeth Tudor came into the world prematurely going by the time elapsed since her mother's public marriage to King Henry VIII, but only the mischance of gender denied her the status of immediate heir to her father's throne.

The execution of Anne Boleyn for failing to deliver a male heir may well have soured her only child on male domination, royal marriage and childbearing. Once enthroned as the last surviving child of her tyrannical father, Elizabeth was understandably wary of hazarding her sovereignty by tying herself to some other royal house. She played off competing royal families in protracted negotiations for a marriage alliance, but her failure to settle on a mate was suicidal for her dynasty

and dangerous for her people. Promoting the ideal of a Virgin Queen fit the P.R. needs of a childless queen, but this was not an apt strategy for a Queen Mother. If Elizabeth had borne a child, it would alter her calculations of self-interest. Elizabeth's shirking her dynastic duty to procreate is understandable but risking pregnancy and delivery without reaping the benefits is folly.

An acknowledged Tudor Prince would not only please his countrymen, but he would also strengthen Elizabeth's personal security. Her mortal enemies plotted to restore Catholic rule of England by killing her and freeing Mary Stuart from English custody. An heir could rally Protestant resistance to such regime change.

Banishing a royal child would endanger an otherwise childless queen. Ambitious nobles could seize countervailing power by gaining control of the royal heir.

A Tudor prince would spare Elizabeth the embarrassment of creating a Catholic martyr by beheading Mary Stuart in 1587. Elizabeth was reluctant to execute her cousin, but Mary's reckless embrace of the Catholic cause menaced the childless Elizabeth.

The rebellious Earl of Essex would not likely have been executed in 1601 if he were either Queen Elizabeth's wayward son or allied to the legitimate heir to the throne.

A foreign monarch would not likely have gotten the English throne in 1603 if a Tudor prince had survived Elizabeth. Whether or not we believe that the mortally ill Elizabeth gave a nod to her godson James Stuart, the Queen's Councilors supported the Stuart succession. The Queen's men deployed an espionage network that would track all claimants to the English throne. Royal bastards could be legitimated by finding or forging documentation of a secret marriage of an otherwise unmarried monarch.

Even unvarnished bastardy would not preclude a claim to the crown against the rival claim of James Stuart. The English would surely prefer the rule of an English bastard to a Scottish bastard. Fairly or not, Mary Stuart's husband challenged her son's paternity.⁴

The eyes and ears of the English Protestants' intelligence apparatus should have discerned the secret conversion to Catholicism of James Stuart's wife in 1593 and her political alliance with Catholic nobles.⁵ James' political interests lay in rejecting papal supremacy, but his commitment to Protestantism was otherwise shaky whereas the trio of hypothetical Tudor Princes named above were staunchly Protestant.

They were also all Englishmen. Yet the English had to swallow their pride and pledge allegiance to a Scottish King in 1603. All those English nobles, clergy and commoners complicit in the trial and execution of the former Queen of Scots were understandably nervous about bowing their heads to her son. History must have taken this dreadful turn because Mary Stuart delivered a son and Elizabeth Tudor died childless.

End Notes

1. Whalen, Richard F. "The Prince Tudor Hypothesis: A Brief Survey of the Pros and Cons" *Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter*, Spring, 2006, pp. 10-11.
2. Fellows, Virginia M. *The Shakespeare Code*, Snow Mountain Press, 2006.
3. Sterling, Carleton W. "Shakespeare's Monarchs and Mark Anderson," *Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter*, Winter, 2006, p. 2 ff.
4. Weir, Alison. *The Life of Elizabeth I*, Ballantine Book, p. 172.
5. Meikle, Maureen M. "A Meddlesome Princess: Anna of Denmark and Scottish Court Politics, 1589-1603," in Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch (editors), *The Reign of James VI*, Tuckwell Press, 2000, pp. 126-140.

*The DVS is greatly saddened to have lost our member
Sue Sybersma.*

We print here tributes by colleagues in the Shakespeare Oxford Society.

From the deVere Society Newsletter, submitted by Elizabeth Imlay

from Richard Joyrich

I first met Sue Sybersma in 1995 at the SOS Conference in Minneapolis. It was my first conference and Sue's as well. We hit it off immediately, finding our common interests. After that I saw Sue at all the SOS conferences, in Portland, Oregon and various other meetings until she began to stop coming due to failing health.

In between conferences and meetings I saw Sue every summer when I made my annual trip to Stratford, Ontario for the Festival. Frequently I would be at Stratford two or three times a season. It was rare for me not to stop by at Sue's place, or meet her for lunch or dinner, or even attend a performance together. It was a wonderful way to keep in touch and discuss all the impressions and questions which arise when watching or reading Shakespeare.

As mentioned in the other recollections of Sue I have included in this e-mail, she was on the Board of the SOS for many years. I joined the Board during her last term (it was she who persuaded me to do it) and the monthly conference calls were yet another way to hear her voice and see her great wisdom.

Sue was well known to all the booksellers in Stratford, ON and was almost single-handedly responsible for Oxfordian and other Authorship books being on offer, including at the official Theater Store for the Festival. Just imagine this kind of thing in a place called Stratford! She always increased my enjoyment of watching the plays there as well as the conferences we attended together. Her insights and dedication to the Authorship Question were amazing and something I desired to emulate.

The last time I saw Sue (August, 2007) at Stratford, she knew that fate was rapidly catching up with her. She desired that her somewhat extensive Authorship library might not go to waste. She wanted to donate the books to the SOS. I took them and they were sold at the Carmel Conference that October. In this way, more of Sue's legacy will live on.

I will miss Sue terribly. Already, my local Authorship group, Oberon, is planning a trip to Stratford, ON and we cannot think of it without remembering Sue. She certainly has touched many lives.

May she Rest in Peace.

From Jaz Sherwood:

Sue Sybersma was a long-time supporter of the SOS and when the Shakespeare Fellowship was founded, she supported its membership also. She believed in the authorship movement and for much of her life was an Oxfordian, though in recent years she began to research the possibility that Anthony Bacon, the brother of Sir Francis, might have potential for the authorship crown, a designation she had found not provable but worthy of further

study. She attended all the stage productions in Stratford.

Sue was one of the finest friends this movement had and we spent many, many hours discussing the existing facts of the subject and, more importantly, the future of the SOS, which she believed in with all her heart. She served as a member of the board, a correspondent and reporter for the newsletter and was a believer in reconciliation, in having the joint conference and of working toward again establishing one society for everyone interested in supporting Oxford. She believed in reasoned discussion, fair play and respect for people's opinions, even those with whom she disagreed. She was a great board member until she resigned prior to the conference in Ann Arbor.

She had Cystic Fibrosis and as a career professional nurse she knew the consequences of her diagnosis but never lost her spirit of joyous optimism and kindness toward others. Her voice rang with her spirit of wise counsel, happiness and positive thought toward all people and it will remain, a reminder of goodness that transcends her own life.

Sue traveled to the conference on the Ashbourne portrait held in Canada and to the SOS conference in Atlanta, the last time we saw her. She was a widow and mother of two sons, Mark and Paul. Her younger son preceded her in death about four years ago, but not before he had appeared as an actor in a motion picture, which was a great affirmation of his life and her tireless support of him. Paul had Downs Syndrome. Mark is married and Sue was a proud and happy grandmother.

Such a woman, of warmth and reason, of thought and energy, even when she was confined to home in her last year, will remain a lasting memory of how good a human being can be and I will count her as a friend for life, especially in how serenely she handled hardship. She made my life better each time she touched it. God Bless her.

From Matthew Cossolotto:

I served with Sue for a couple of years on the SOS board of trustees. I always found her to be an extremely dedicated, considerate, and refreshingly pleasant person. I remember meeting her for the first time in person at our Atlanta conference. She was sitting in the lobby of the hotel, completely content and centered even though there was a great deal of hustle and bustle all around. She seemed excited about the conference, but I was also struck by what I sensed was a radiance, a feeling of joy, emanating from her. I have the impression that the French expression *joie de vivre* was perhaps devised with Sue Sybersma in mind. I am deeply saddened by the news of her passing, but I am also extremely pleased that our paths crossed for a short while. She will be missed by many members of the SOS who knew her as a supportive friend and positive influence in their lives.

(Complaints continued from page 1)

So on the tip of his subduing tongue
 All kind of arguments and question deep,
 All replication [replies, a legal term] prompt and reason
 strong,
 For his advantage still did wake and sleep.
 To make the weeper laugh, the laugher weep,
 He had the dialect [rhetorics] and different skill,
 Catching all passions in his craft of will. (120-125)

This young man moves in a social circle of moneyed people – those who could afford to buy portraits of him, give him expensive presents, and those educated enough to know the sonnet form. He is rich; he gave jewels (of gold and amber) to the woman, and letters tied with silk. Expert horsemanship in so young a man implies that he had the leisure to learn this skill. The phrase, “all replication prompt and reason strong,” and the word “dialect” in the passage above hints that he was educated in rhetoric and the law. One of his paramours was a nun who was once wooed by noble courtiers (232-4). The woman’s description of a rich, educated and privileged young man, often using the word “grace,” indicates that he too is a nobleman.

Fully aware of the young man’s “falseness” and numerous affairs, the woman initially resisted his seduction, “with safest distance I mine honor shielded” (151). Eventually he persuaded her that his love was true, and when he started crying, she “daffed” her “white stole of chastity” (297). Later she learned “his passion” was only an act – “an art of craft” (295). He could blush, cry and turn pale whenever it suited his aims. The poem ends with the woman wondering if she would yield again if he tried another seduction. The poet, who opened the poem in his own voice and who was watching the scene and listening to her story, offered no final remarks. He let the deceived lover finish her story without comment. The poet’s eavesdropping and his silence at the conclusion of her story suggests that he was the young seducer. Almost certain confirmation of this comes from one phrase at the very beginning of the poem in the poet’s words:

Ere long [I] espied a fickle maid full pale (5)

Even before he heard her story, the poet describes the woman as “fickle,” a word of judgment, implying that he already knows her and her personality. In the final two lines of the poem, the woman gives it away herself that the youth had seduced her more than once, and that he

Would yet again betray the fore-betrayed
 And new pervert a reconciled maid.

“Again” means twice, but “yet again” means three times, so the woman is saying that the youth would attempt to seduce her a third time. Apparently, the woman was hot and cold with him, which inspired the poet’s “fickle” comment. It is clear, therefore, that the poet of *A Lover’s Complaint* was the young seducer of the poem. When one recalls that Shakespeare is the author, using the first person, one can see that he was poeticizing a personal incident,

and by doing so, indirectly revealed his high status. This makes *A Lover’s Complaint* a prime piece of anti-Stratfordian evidence, especially when viewed in conjunction with *SHAKE-SPEARE’S SONNETS*.

Resemblances Between the Young Seducer and Sonnets Author

A Lover’s Complaint and *SHAKE-SPEARE’S SONNETS* debuted at the same time in the same publication. They were both attributed to Shakespeare. They were both written in the first person, and all characters involved were unnamed. They both featured one similar character – a young man of high rank, beautiful, admired and sought after. One would think that the youth of *A Lover’s Complaint* and the “Fair Youth” of *SHAKE-SPEARE’S SONNETS* were the same person, but there are major differences. The youth of *A Lover’s Complaint* is verbally gifted, theatrical, seductive and is an excellent horseman – qualities Shakespeare never credited to the Fair Youth in over one hundred sonnets to him. But if one compares the profile of the *Sonnets* poet, who described himself as older in at least four sonnets, with the young seducer of *A Lover’s Complaint*, the only difference is age. The *Sonnets* poet reveals himself as a man of high rank and privilege, older with a tarnished reputation. As noted above, the word “grace” was used to describe the youth of *A Lover’s Complaint*, a word that implied nobility or royalty, and in Sonnet 62, the poet wrote, “Methinks no face so gracious is as mine”; the *Sonnets* poet also uses the phrases, “I am attained” (Sonnet 88) and “were it aught to me I bore the canopy” (Sonnet 125), implying he was of high rank and courtier status. In Sonnet 121, the *Sonnets* poet admits he has “sportive blood.”

For why should others’ false adulterate eyes
 Give salutation to my sportive blood?

The young man of *A Lover’s Complaint*, also a man of high rank and privilege, said his sensual “offenses”

Are errors of the blood, none of the mind. (183-184)

The youth of *A Lover’s Complaint* had affairs with married women (lines 171-75); the *Sonnets* poet admits he is breaking his marriage vow by having an affair with the “Dark Lady” (Sonnet 152). The youth of *A Lover’s Complaint* was a good actor, and the *Sonnets* poet said,

Alas! ’Tis true I have gone here and there
 And made myself a motley to the view (Sonnet 110)

indicating with regret that he acted on the stage, possibly the public stage; according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, “motley” refers to “the profession or practice of a jester, clown or (occasionally) actor.” There are enough parallels between these two characters to suggest they are the same person at different ages. Regardless, there are *two* Shakespeare works written in the first person using language applicable to noblemen-courtiers, which totally contradicts the Stratford Man’s biography. Due to the social conventions of the

time, a nobleman-courtier who wrote poetry would most likely have written anonymously or used a pen name, which the hyphenated *SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS* on the title page and throughout the work seems to imply.

Brief Commentary on Vickers's Case

Placed after the text of *SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS, A Lover's Complaint* featured a separate title and author listing. For a time, scholars were not sure about the poem's attribution to Shakespeare, but by the 1960s, enough convincing scholarship had ended the discussion. Suddenly, it is changing again. English professor Brian Vickers recently published a book claiming that John Davies of Hereford was the true writer of *A Lover's Complaint*, a poem he thinks is "un-Shakespearean." Among his reasons why: he finds the poem "extremely mediocre," has "clumsiness and lack of invention," and "the diction is both highly Latinate and archaic." Of course, in the Stratfordian world, Shakespeare had "little Latin and less Greek" despite the fact that his works display considerable knowledge of both. Shakespeare coined over two thousand words and at least eleven derived from *A Lover's Complaint* – is that not inventive, and Shakespearean?

Furthermore, Prof. Vickers claims that Thomas Thorpe, the poem's publisher, was an unreliable witness to credit *A Lover's Complaint* to Shakespeare. He believes that Thorpe pirated the *SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS-A Lover's Complaint* publication in collusion with printer George Eld. In his opinion, both were shady: Eld had printed the play, *The Puritan*, which had falsely named "W.S." as the author, and Thorpe as the publisher of *A Funeral Elegy for Master William Peter* had falsely attributed it to "W.S." Today, *The Puritan* is attributed to Thomas Middleton and *A Funeral Elegy* to John Ford. And because there are some verbal parallels between *A Lover's Complaint* and a few works of John Davies, Davies must be the true author. Prof. Vickers's theory also relies heavily upon stylometry, analysis of a literary style using statistics and computers. After forty years practice, this is still an imperfect, if not unproven, tool. The last work attributed to Shakespeare based upon stylometry, *A Funeral Elegy*, was initially accepted and then completely discredited. One knowledgeable critic, Joseph Rudman, posed the question: "[A]re these studies an ignis fatuus with just enough legitimate, successful techniques and results to lure unsuspecting practitioners into a quagmire full of half truths and flawed techniques?" (Love 152). This paper is not meant to be a book review, but here are some questions for Prof. Vickers: Davies lived nine years after *A Lover's Complaint* was published – if it were his work, then why did he not complain or correct the misattribution? And if Thorpe and Eld stole this poem from Davies, then why did Davies subsequently allow Eld to print his other works, *Muses Tears for the Loss of Henry, Prince of Wales* (1613) and *Wit's Bedlam* (1617)? This is enough for me to conclude that the Davies attribution is plain wrong.

Dating *A Lover's Complaint*

Scholars do not know when *A Lover's Complaint* was written but usually place it near the time it was first printed, in 1609. Yet

some words in the poem were archaic by 1600, for example, *eyne* (eyes), *feat* (elegantly), *real* (regal), *sounding* (swooning), *maund* (basket), and *teen* (suffering, hurt). The author invented many new words for this piece (*appertainings*, *fluxive*, *impleached*, *pensived*, *unexperient*, *encrimsoned*, *annexions*, *blusterer*, *acture*, *invised*, *enpatron*, etc.), so the poem is a strange combination of new and archaic words. The logical explanation for this contradiction is that the archaic words were current when the work was written, but this is rarely considered. Stratfordians believe for this work that Shakespeare borrowed from Edmund Spenser's poem, *Ruins of Time* (published in *Complaints*, 1591), and Samuel Daniel's poem, *Complaint of Rosamond* (1592). But the supposed borrowing did not end there. Lines 123-24 of *A Lover's Complaint*,

For his advantage still did wake and sleep.
To make the weeper laugh, the laughter weep

echo lines in Thomas Lodge's work, *Phyllis* (1593):

Then lay you down in Phyllis' lap and sleep,
Until she weeping read, and reading weep. (Induction)

(*Phyllis* was accompanied by the poem, *The Tragical Complaint of Elstred*.) Finally, one passage in *Parthenophil and Parthenophe* (1593) by Barnabe Barnes seemed to borrow lines from both *A Lover's Complaint* and one Shakespeare sonnet.

Barnabe Barnes's Sonnet 49

A Siren which within thy breast doth bath her
A fiend which doth in graces garments grath [clothe] her,
A fortress whose force is impregnable:
From my love's limbeck still still'd tears, oh tears! (6-9)

(Limbeck was an apparatus used in distillation.) Compare with *A Lover's Complaint* (Burrow, 716):

Thus merely with the garment of a grace
The naked and concealed fiend he covered (316-17)

Now compare Barnes's passage above with Shakespeare's Sonnet 119 (Doyno 156):

What potions have I drunk of Siren tears,
Distill'd from Limbecks foul as hell within ...

Two more phrases by Barnes in the same work (Madrigal 1 12-13),

From winds my sighs, from concave rocks and steel,
My sides and voices Echo ...

recall the opening lines of *A Lover's Complaint*:

From off a hill whose concave womb reworded
A plaintful story from a sist'ring vale,
My spirits t'attend this double voice accorded ...

That Shakespeare stole or borrowed from other writers is impossible to prove because there is no concrete dating for any of his works. It is far more likely that these four “lesser” poets were borrowing and imitating lines from the creative genius, Shakespeare, rather than the opposite. If this were the case, then *A Lover’s Complaint* was circulating in manuscript as early as 1590, the year that Spenser’s *Complaints* (featuring *Ruins of Time*) was entered in the Stationers’ Register. This earlier time period would explain the presence of archaic words in the poem, but would prove troubling and even untenable in the Stratfordian chronology of Shakespeare’s works.

The Earl of Oxford Parallels

What could prove to be even more troubling for Stratfordians are the parallels between the young seducer in *A Lover’s Complaint* and the Earl of Oxford – in fact, the two are a perfect match. Oxford was a well-known courtier. We know from one early portrait, the Welbeck, that he did not have much facial hair – at age 25, he only had “peach fuzz” for a mustache. The youth in *A Lover’s Complaint* had “small show of man on his chin” (92), and his hair is described in line 85:

His browny locks did hang in crooked curls.

The *OED* defines “browny” as inclining to brown, so it is not actually brown. Oxford’s hair color was auburn, which is reddish-brown, and it was curly. Oxford’s early popularity with the ladies can be attested to by contemporary commentary after his engagement to Anne Cecil was announced: it “caused great weeping, wailing, and sorrowful cheer of those that had hoped to have that golden day” (Ogburn 483). Oxford had two wives and fathered at least seven children, and was a bit of a cad: when he toured Europe, unaccompanied by his wife, he felt no compunction about taking a Venetian mistress (Nelson, 138), and upon his return, he renounced his wife, and took another mistress, Anne Vavasour. At age 21, his skill in horsemanship was praised by Giles Fletcher (Ogburn 49). Oxford was gifted with words, as evidenced by his signed poetry – several pieces written by age sixteen – and by his high reputation as a comedy writer. It is on record that he acted before Queen Elizabeth in a masque (Ward, 163) and that he sponsored acting troupes.

More evidence exists that Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford was the young seducer of *A Lover’s Complaint* and that he was its author. Oxford wrote a much shorter poem quite similar to *A Lover’s Complaint* that may have influenced it, which Stratfordians have never acknowledged. Written in the first person, Oxford as the poet observes a lady speaking out loud about a “youth” that has captured her heart. His name, “Vere,” is revealed in an echo.

Sitting alone upon my thought in melancholy mood,
In sight of sea, and at my back an ancient hoary wood,
I saw a fair young lady come, her secret fears to wail,
Clad all in color of a nun, and covered with a veil;
Yet (for the day was calm and clear) I might discern her face,
As one might see a damask rose hid under crystal glass.

O that infected moisture of his eye,
O that false fire which in his cheek so glowd:
O that forc’d thunder from his heart did flye,
O that sad breath his spongie lungs bestowed,
O all that borrowed motion seeming owed,
Would yet againe betray the fore-betrayed,
And new peruert a reconciled Maide.

FINIS.

The final stanza of A Lover’s Complaint is full of capital Os. Was the author “signing” the work with one of his real initials?

Three times, with her soft hand, full hard on her left side she
knocks,
And sigh’d so sore as might have mov’d some pity in the
rocks;
From sighs and shedding amber tears into sweet song she
brake,
When thus the echo answered her to every word she spake:

“Oh heavens! who was the first that bred in me this fever?
Vere
Who was the first that gave the wound whose fear I wear for-
ever? Vere
What tyrant, Cupid, to my harm usurps thy golden quiver?
Vere
What wight first caught this heart and can from bondage it
deliver? Vere

Yet who doth most adore this wight, oh hollow caves, tell true?
You
What nymph deserves his liking best, yet doth in sorrow rue?
You
What makes him not reward goodwill with some reward or
ruth? Youth
What makes him show besides his birth, such pride and such
untruth? Youth
May I his favor match with love, if he my love will try? Aye
May I requite his birth with faith? Then faithful will I die.
Aye”

And I, that knew this lady well,
Said, Lord how great a miracle,
To her how echo told the truth,
As true as Phoebus oracle.

In the opening lines of *A Lover’s Complaint*, the poet heard echoing sounds coming from a hill, and drawing nearer, saw they emanated from a woman’s voice.

From off a hill whose concave womb reworded
A plaintful story from a sist’ring vale,

My spirits t'attend this double voice accorded,
 As I laid to list the sad-tuned tale.
 Ere long espied a fickle maid full pale
 Tearing of papers, breaking rings a-twain,
 Storming her world with sorrow's wind and rain. (1-7)

The woman in *A Lover's Complaint* is distressed about her lover and is crying ("often did she heave her napkin to her eyne," 15), just as the lady in Oxford's poem is "sighing" and "shedding amber tears" for him. Both the poet of *A Lover's Complaint* and Oxford in his poem eavesdrop on complaining lady lovers, and each knows the woman in question. Both complaining ladies are in love with a youth who is adored by others, has lied to them, and who does not fully return their love.

Oxford's poem is undated, but because Anne Vavasour was named as the author in two manuscript versions (Oxford was named as author in three), it is assumed that this poem was composed during their love affair. This is doubtful. The "echo" twice describes Oxford as a "youth," the time between adolescence and maturity, and the Oxford-Vavasour affair began when Oxford was at least age twenty-six. The poor lady in Oxford's poem gives the impression that she was hoping to marry him ("may I his favor match with love...?"), which would date it to before his first marriage (age 21). If so, then she could have been one of many young ladies of the court chasing Oxford. She is described as a "fair young lady ... all clad in color of a nun, and covered with a veil." Could she be the same lady besotted with the young seducer in *A Lover's Complaint* who was described as "... a nun /Or sister sanctified of holiest note" (232-33)?

Oxford had other qualifications to be the author of *A Lover's Complaint*. Prof. Vickers complained that the poem is too Latinate for Shakespeare. Latin was included in Oxford's childhood curriculum, and at age 21 he contributed a letter to the reader in Latin for his sponsored translation of Castiglione's *The Courtier*. The rhetorical and legal terms in the poem can be accounted for by his attendance at university and law school (Gray's Inn). In the final stanza of *A Lover's Complaint*, five of the seven lines describe the young seducer, each one beginning with "O," which could have served as the author's true signature.

SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS, and its companion piece, *A Lover's Complaint*, were both written in the first person and published together. Scholars prefer to study these two pieces separately, as if they had no relationship with each other, when clearly they do. In both works, the author describes himself as a nobleman-courtier: as a younger man in *A Lover's Complaint* and as an older man and in the *Sonnets*. The archaic words employed in *A Lover's Complaint* and other signs of early dating accords with this perspective. Perhaps *A Lover's Complaint* is so neglected by scholars because the author's self-portrait does not resemble the Stratford Man; but it does resemble, in striking detail, the Earl of Oxford, who had also written a poem upon a similar theme. In conclusion, I propose that *A Lover's Complaint* was written by the courtier-poet Oxford after he started law school and before his marriage in December 1571, between ages 17 and 21 – over thirty years earlier than Stratfordian dating. At such a young age he was already a skilled poet who was

inventing new words. Oxford was the young seducer of the poem, which he based upon an actual event in his life, perhaps expanding upon the "echo" poem featured above. Circulating in manuscript in 1590 or before, Oxford's innovative poem, *A Lover's Complaint*, inspired the trend of "complaint" poems by other writers. This personal poem and his very personal sonnets were published together after his death under his pen name, "William Shake-speare."

Note: All underlines in quoted material were added for emphasis

This paper is based upon my talk presented at the 2007 OS-SF Conference in Carmel, California.

Works Cited

- Allen, Percy, *Anne Cecil, Elizabeth and Oxford*, London, 1934.
 Burrow, Colin, *William Shakespeare. The Complete Sonnets and Poems*, Oxford Univ. Press, 2002.
 Chiljan, Katherine, *Letters and Poems of Edward, Earl of Oxford*, San Francisco, 1998.
 Doyno, Victor A., *Parthenophil and Parthenophe: A Critical Edition*, Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1971.
 Love, Harold, *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002.
 Nelson, Alan H., *Monstrous Adversary*, Liverpool University Press, 2003.
 Ogburn, Charlton, *The Mysterious William Shakespeare*, New York, 1984.
 Vickers, Brian, *Shakespeare, "A Lover's Complaint," and John Davies of Hereford*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007.
 Ward, B.M., *The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford*, London, 1928 (1979 reprint).

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

Hamlet in 1603: A Quick-and-Dirty Quarto

By Carleton W. Sterling

My first essay on Shakespeare's identity, "Hamlet in Time and Place," suggested that whoever published under the name "William Shakespeare" rushed into print a crude draft of *Hamlet* in 1603 and a polished draft in 1604¹. That *Hamlet* was a work-in-progress in 1603-4 reinforces my point about the 1603 trifecta coincidence of the imprint date on the earliest publication of Shakespeare's tragedy of the Danish Prince, the takeover of England by the Stuart dynasty headed by the foreign-born James of Scotland, and the granting of the King's Men charter to a company of players that included William of Stratford on Avon. In my earlier essay, I noted that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* alludes to the threat of a foreign invasion and insults England's new King's family connections. One of the King's Men would hardly rush to write and publish such seditious literature on the heels of the 1603 royal succession. So attributing the authorship of *Hamlet* to the Stratford man must be in error.

Saying that the 1603 First Quarto and the 1604 Second Quarto are simply successive drafts of the author's *Hamlet* contradicts the current dogma that the 1603 imprint edition is the botched publication of a manuscript finished in 1601 or earlier when the Stuart succession to the English throne was not a sure thing. Shakespeare scholars speculate that the 1603 publication was a rip-off of Shakespeare's script by a ring of intellectual-property-rights thieves (Campbell 285). (To rebut this view, I will demonstrate the unfinished character of the 1603 edition before turning to the problem of scholars taking at face value false or misleading documents to infer that Shakespeare had finished writing his *Hamlet* before 1603².)

The simple bean-counting evidence is that the 1603 edition has far fewer lines of text than the later editions. Believers in a pre-1603 *Hamlet* may think that the 1603 edition dropped lines in transcription from a now lost text that was more fairly reproduced in the 1604 and subsequent editions. But that belief is contradicted by the title page of the 1604 *Hamlet* which describes the text as "Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie." My own line count confirms that the 1603 edition has only about 6 lines for every 10 lines in the 1604 edition.³ The 1604 title page can not refer to a pre-1603 text unless that earlier source was also a half-pint draft.

The swelling up of the line count between the 1603 and the 1604 quartos is quantitative evidence of a huge revision. This evidence is snubbed by Shakespeare scholars who can not believe that their "Bard" would publish an inferior edition of his masterpiece. In searching the Internet for what others thought about this issue, I found the Second Quarto's "true and perfect Coppie" quotation with an ellipsis deleting the explicit acknowledgement of a much smaller earlier version so the focus fell on the reference to a "true and perfect" copy, which was taken as a repudiation of the notoriously imperfect First Quarto.⁴ My contrary inference is that "Coppie" simply refers to the freshest *Hamlet* manuscript in 1604 and "as it was" refers to the prior edition. I detect no real repudiation of the Q1 publication by the Q2 publisher, whereas I would expect howling indignation if Q1 were a mangled printing

of Shakespeare's greatest drama. Sherlock Holmes would explain the reason the dog did not bark was that the Q2 hound recognized its former self in the Q1 pup.

The bulking up of the *Hamlet* text understates the extent of the rewrite because many lines in Q1 were deleted in later editions and most were recast. To illustrate the intensity of the revisions between the two quartos, compare the text in which the queen gives the king a less-than-forthright account of what her son has said and done in her room⁵.

First Quarto:

Enter the King and Lordes.

King Now Gertred, what sayes our sonne, how doe you finde him?

Queene Alas my lord, as raging as the sea:
Whenas he came, I first bespake him faire,
But then he throwes and tosses me about,
As one forgetting that I was his mother:
At last I call'd for help: and as I cried, Corambis
Call'd, which Hamlet no sooner heard, but whips me
Out his rapier, and cries, a Rat, a Rat, and in his rage
The good olde man he killes.

Second Quarto:

Eenter King and Queene, with Rosencraus
and Guyldenstern.

King There's matter in these sighes; these profound heaves
You must translate; tis fit we understand them.
Where is your sonne?

Ger: Bestow this place on us a little while.. {*R. & J.'s cue to
scram*}

Ah, mine own lord, what have I scene tonight?

King What Gertrard? How dooes Hamlet?

Ger: Mad as the sea and wind when they both contend
Which is mightier, in this lawlesse fit,
Behind the Arras hearing some thing stirre,
Whyps out his Rapier, cryes a Rat, a Rat,
And in this brainish apprehension kills
The unscene good old man. (Highlight, author's note).

In both versions, the queen adopts her son's cover story about being out of his mind and conceals her knowledge that Hamlet II believes that his usurping uncle murdered Hamlet I; thus, has motive for revenge. But the second version is longer and more polished. The redraft tightens the Queen's description of the skewering of the royal henchman from eight shaky to six solid lines. It also adds lead-in lines so suspense is pumped up as the King repeatedly asks what happened before the queen clears the stage of the extras and blurts out her story. The earlier exit of the King's Men in Q2 focuses attention on the royal couple's exchange. The metaphor of a storm

at sea for Hamlet's behavior is extended in Q2, which kicks off with the key-note word "mad." The rewrite deletes the Queen's two-line complaint that she was physically abused, not just tongue-lashed. By replacing "... as I cried, Corambis/Call'd," with "Behind the Arras hearing some thing stirre," Q2 scrubs the implication that the King's spy gave away his identity as well as his hiding place before Hamlet's blade shot into him. The rewrite fixes the confounding use of the first-person singular object in "whips me." In sum, Q2 looks like a detailed rewrite of Q1 by someone unsatisfied with the earlier draft. Even genius wordsmiths rework their writing.

Pursuing my interest in analyzing the politics of *Hamlet* I chose the text compared above because Hamlet's mother is shown shifting from the role of Queen Consort, serving the interests of her husband, to the role of Queen Mother, defending the interests of her son. But I'm confident that other passages also illustrate my developmental explanation for the differences between Q1 and Q2. So I reject the characterizations of Q1 as "bad" and Q2 as "good." If Shakespeare scholars could grasp the logic of seeing Q1 as a diamond-in-the-rough and Q2 as a polished gem, they could study Shakespeare's creative-writing process at work.

My identification of a heroic rewrite offers a straight-forward explanation for the differences between the 1603 and 1604 quartos. But the conventional wisdom imagines that Q1 is a corrupt rendering of a lost Q0 script by rascal printers who violated the standard operating procedure of acquiring a fair copy of a script before investing in setting it in type and so relied on unidentified actors' faulty memories. To swallow this interpretation, we must believe that the typesetters' unreliable sources forgot about half the original dialogue, botched much of the rest and suffered false memories of lines that did not exist elsewhere. Particularly hard to swallow is that the spy skewered in the Queen's room is "Corambis" throughout the Q1 text and "Polonius" in subsequent editions. If Q1 had named this key character "Polaris" or "Balonius," we could blame the mistake on tin-eared actors. As it is, the straight-forward explanation is that the author used "Corambis" as the working name for Hamlet's nemesis in Q1 and switched to Polonius in the Q2 rewrite.

The orthodox assumption that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was completed prior to 1603 derives from disinformation and misidentification. A superficial reading of the 1603 *Hamlet* title page seems to contradict my earlier essay's insistence that those enjoying King James's patronage would neither write nor openly perform the *Hamlet* that we know. The Q1 title page declares that the contents are "As it hath beene diverse times acted by his Highnesse servants in the Cittie of London: as also in the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and else-where." The "his" not "her" gender of the monarch recognizes the replacement of Elizabeth by James. The acting by the monarch's "servants" seems a sly reference to the King's Men, formerly the Lord Chamberlain's Men, the company of players that included the alleged author. And if Shakespeare's *Hamlet* were performed prior to its 1603 publication, then there *must* have been a prior script suitable for performance. Thinking the Q1 text too crude to perform, orthodox Shakespeare scholars assume a lost script in the image of Q2.

The tale of many stagings of *Hamlet* by the incoming king's

subordinates must be a joke. And what a grand joke it is to tag the King's Men as the perpetrators of the verbal barbs tossed at the royal authorities. Even without the specific insults to the Stuart takeover I discussed in my earlier essay, it is difficult to think that the royal "servants" would mark the inaugural year of a new dynasty by touring the country performing a play about death, betrayal, usurpation and dynastic extermination.

Yet the existence of an earlier script is supported by references to the character Hamlet and the play *Hamlet* prior to 1603. I can believe there were drafts prior to the existing quarto editions which might account for the 1598 citation of the Earl of Essex's appreciation of *Hamlet* (Campbell 285). But my developmental explanation of the quartos suggests that earlier drafts of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* would be even more embryonic than Q1. The key issue is whether *Hamlet* references in Elizabethan England were solely to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Consider the inference that the play was hatched before the July 26, 1602 entry in the Stationers' Register of "a booke called the Revenge of Hamlett Prince Denmarke as yt was latelie Acted by the Lord Chamberleyne his servants" (Campbell 284 and Jenkins 13). The author is unnamed in the registration, and the registered intent to publish a text so scantily described is no guarantee that the ensuing publication was anything like a "true and perfect" copy of an earlier script. And England experienced a political upheaval between the 1602 declared intent to publish a "Hamlet" and the 1603 Quarto. I suspect that the *Hamlet* we know was confounded with an earlier politically correct *Hamlet*.

In the Hamlet/Amleth saga passed down over the centuries, the prince, dispossessed by the coupling of his mother and uncle, sails to England and marries the king's daughter and so lays his dynastic seed. Returning to his Danish/Jutland home, he pretends to be crazy so he can freely plot to purge his sinning family with fire (285-6 and Jenkins 85-9). Restoring rightful rule is a happy ending for believers in royal succession by males-first, senior-child bloodline descent. An "Ur-Hamlet" based on this story may well have been performed by royalist players in Elizabethan England, perhaps using a Thomas Kyd script (Campbell 442-3 and Jenkins 97-101). But the *Hamlet* first published in 1603 is a radical transformation of the original story. Hamlet's new fate does not take him to the arms of an English princess; the hero's love life is lost with the alienation and death of his hometown girlfriend, and he is lured into a fencing match in which a lethal mix-up of blades, and poison wipes out the most senior dynasty in Europe to the advantage of the upstart Norway Prince. This revolutionary plot reversal would not amuse the royalists, and a company of court players would fear performing such a seditious script. This may explain an item under the *Hamlet* entry in Oscar James Campbell's *Shakespeare Encyclopedia*:

There is no record of an early performance at court, a fact that may lend support to the thesis that the play contains veiled allusions to prominent and controversial political figures, notably the Earl of Essex. The earliest recorded but improbable performance is that it was given on board the H.M.S. Dragon at Sierra Leon on September 5, 1607 (and probably repeated the following March) for the entertainment of Portuguese and English guests (Campbell 288).

Sierra Leon is thousands of miles from the British Isles, and a ship's captain in the 17th century would be lord and master of his vessel and might command a performance of a subversive script far from the noses of the royal censors.

In Shakespeare's England, censorship of scripts was in the hands of the Master of Revels, who reported to the Lord Chamberlain. It's laughable to think that these court officials approved a play in which the fictional King's scheming, spying hypocritical henchman surely satirizes William Cecil, the longtime Elizabethan chief minister and father of Robert Cecil, who after his father's death mid-wifed the Stuart succession.

Having come down from Scotland to take the English throne in 1603, James Stuart would hardly want published a story of foreign invasion, illegitimate royal succession, and a Prince with an insulting mouth toward those in power. Nor would King James' wife, a Danish Princess, appreciate a story climaxing with the extermination of the Danish royal family and the takeover of Denmark by the previously subservient Norwegians.

Where were the watchmen on the walls of media censorship? I believe that Shakespeare's revolutionary "Hamlet" slipped by the royal monitors in the guise of the traditional "Hamlet," just as Hamlet II used Hamlet I's royal seal to authenticate his rewrite of his own death warrant. Hence, the confusion of Shakespeare scholars about the tragedy's authorship, performance and political orientation.

The poet rewriting *Hamlet* in 1603-4 in defiance of the new order may once have written propaganda favoring the Elizabethan monarchy, but, whoever that masked man was, his *Hamlet* shows no deference to the Stuarts or their political doctrine of the divine right of kings.

My developmental explanation of the *Hamlet* quartos opens a door to further analysis of the author's work. But some readers may remain puzzled about why an author would rush to publish literature in a crude form when an enhanced edition would soon follow. Some possible reasons follow:

Topicality: It makes sense to put out an edition satirizing the 1603 royal succession during the year of that event.

Feedback: The author could circulate copies of his early draft to his chums for comments and suggestions before completing his polished draft.

Fireproofing: Authoritarians like to burn books that offend them, but printing many copies of a manuscript frustrates the destruction of all copies.

Deadline: The ultimate deadline for an author is death. Confronting death is a theme that runs throughout "Hamlet," and the author may have feared that he might not live to complete a polished edition of his crowning literary achievement.

None of these explanations fit the legend of the "Bard of Avon." On economic grounds, the "good businessman" William of Stratford would hardly bear the expense of typesetting and printing a rough draft. The reputedly "spend-thrift" Earl of Oxford might well have sprung for a preliminary printing. One reason for denying that Oxford wrote *Hamlet* is that he was perhaps mortally ill in the 1603-4 period. On political grounds, I infer that *Hamlet* was penned

precisely by someone who did not expect a long and gainful life under the new dynasty. That would exclude the King's Man from Stratford but not the expiring aristocrat Edward de Vere.

Notes

1. Technical note on the veracity of the imprint dates: Because I challenge the veracity of the 1603 *Hamlet* title page information, I must consider the veracity of the imprint dates. The 1603 and 1604 imprint dates for the two quartos are validated by the following argument: If the 1603 imprint date were false, it would reinforce my case that the publisher regarded 1603 as a particularly significant date. The Q1 title page author acknowledges that England's Virgin Queen was dead and seems to have known that the Lord Chamberlain's Men had been promoted to King's Men. So Q1 was published no earlier than the late spring of 1603. Under my developmental explanation, Q1 was printed before Q2 which has a 1604 imprint. Q2 was also printed with a 1605 date, and the printer would have no cause to re-plate his press with a later imprint date unless the 1604 dating had been correct in the earlier printing but the calendar year had changed before the later printing. So the dates are locked in.
2. My ability to rethink the relation of the two quartos was made possible by the huge scholarly contribution of Michael Best's *uvic.ca* web site postings of both quartos in multiple formats. I found the First Quarto simply by searching on "Hamlet" and "1603." Without access to the 1603 raw text, I would have continued to swallow the secondary-source fancies about its origins.
3. Because I didn't want to take the time to count all the lines of text in both quartos, I calculated a typical line count per full page, multiplied by the number of full pages and added the lines in the partial pages. I borrow from estimation science the term "quick and dirty," meaning an expedient but inelegant measurement. I use that term in the essay title to suggest the worthiness of the 1603 "Hamlet" despite its unpolished condition. A more patient scholar, Harold Jenkins, gives a precise Q1/Q2 line ratio of 2154/3723. Jenkins, p. 21.
4. Since completing this manuscript, I have found a published version of this argument in Harold Jenkins' introduction to his edition of *Hamlet*. The claim to give 'the true and perfect Coppie' is evidently intended to stigmatize the defects of Q1, and with a little latitude allowed to 'almost' the assertion of almost double length is fair enough." Jenkins, p. 14.
5. Opening lines of imputed Act 3, scene 4. In later drafts of this essay, I hurled back the copy editor's impulse to correct the quoted text for spelling and typographical errors. Although presenting text in the raw makes it more difficult to read, I was engaged in the issue of the relative quality of the two quarto and so reasoned that I needed to present the comparison, warts and all. However, I did follow modern typography by using "s" for that consonant rather than what looks too much like an "f," and using "v" for the consonant and "u" for the vowel rather than the mostly vice-versa (or vica versa) Elizabethan typescript (typecript).

End Notes

- Campbell, Oscar James. ed. *Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare*. New York: MJF Books, 1966.
- Jenkins, Harold, ed. *Arden Shakespeare Hamlet*. London: Thompson Learning, 1982.
- Mowat, Barbara A. and Paul Werstine, ed. *Hamlet: Folger Edition*. Washington Square Press, 1992.

(President's Page continued from page 2)

organizations in carrying out said purposes. More particularly, the definite purpose of this research and the objectives of the corporation are to explore and verify the evidence bearing on the authorship of the Shakespearean works, particularly the evidence indicating that Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford was the author thereof."

As that description clearly indicates, the objectives of the Society are extremely broad and far-reaching. The membership and Trustees have periodically refined the purposes of the Society over the ensuing decades, but the central mission of researching the Shakespeare authorship question and compiling evidence to support the case for the Oxfordian claim has remained constant over the years.

Our newest formulation of the Society's mission simplifies the language contained in the above quote from Richard Horne. The updated mission statement – as posted on our website— says the following:

"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."

As you may have noticed on the website and on the masthead of this Newsletter, the Board of Trustees also adopted a revised tagline to describe our mission: "Dedicated to Researching and Honoring the True Bard."

Our updated mission statement and tagline are meant to help communicate creatively and clearly what we're all about.

In delving into the distant history of our Society, I was fascinated to come across the Certificate of Incorporation, which was filed in 1957 in New York. I was not aware until quite recently that the original name of the Society was the Eved Foundation. Eved (de Vere spelled backwards!) is not especially catchy. So I'm glad the Society decided to change the name to the Shakespeare Oxford Society two years later.

It is interesting to me, looking back 50 years, to read about the original objectives as set forth in the original Certificate of Incorporation, dated January 18, 1957.

Article Two reads as follows:

"The purposes for which the corporation is formed are to engage in, foster and promote scholarly research into the history and literature of England during the period of Elizabeth I, with especial emphasis upon the facts and circumstances pertaining to the authorship of the works generally ascribed to William Shakespeare, and to disseminate the results of any such research to the fullest extent possible, and to perform all necessary, desirable and appropriate acts in furtherance of such purposes, and to acquire by purchase, gift, bequest or devise and to hold, use and dispose of all manner of property, including literary copyrights or other proprietary interest in any literature or products of research."

The three people designated as Trustees until the first annual meeting were Charlton Ogburn of New York, New York; William

Mason Smith of Staten Island, New York; and Francis T. Carmody of Long Island, New York.

In reading Article Two above, I am struck by the fact that our original purpose was so broad—to research the history and literature of the Elizabethan era with an emphasis on the Shakespeare authorship issue. And although the original name of the Society was the Eved Foundation and the new name in 1959 was the Shakespeare Oxford Society, Oxford himself was not even mentioned in original certificate of incorporation.

I mention this now in part because, as you may recall, last year the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution calling for the creation of a blue ribbon commission comprised of impartial experts to explore and hopefully help to resolve the Shakespeare authorship question. I also wrote about this commission proposal in my Foreword to the 50th anniversary anthology. My view is that such a commission could help attract enormous attention to the Authorship question. And I strongly believe that once unbiased people open up their minds to the Shakespeare authorship mystery, they will inevitably become attracted to compelling authorship claim of Edward de Vere.

Youth Outreach

I want to mention an exciting initiative that's still in its formative stages. We have formed a Youth Outreach Task Force to explore opportunities and programs for reaching young people, primarily in high school and college, with regard to the Shakespeare authorship question and the case for Oxford's authorship. Two members of the Board of Trustees are leading this effort—Michigan high school English teacher Andrew Frye and Montana English Instructor Brian Bechtold. Two young members of the Society are also involved: Stuart Green and Allegra Krasznecwicz, the high school student who spoke with such eloquence at our 2007 conference in Carmel, CA. If you want to become involved in or have any ideas regarding the work of the Youth Outreach Task Force, please contact either Andrew Frye (email: pjfryeman@yahoo.com) or Brian Bechtold (email: brian033@centurytel.net).

The Oxfordian Update

Finally, a quick word about *The Oxfordian*. The 10th edition of *The Oxfordian* has gone to the printer and should be arriving in members' mailboxes. I want to take this opportunity to once again express the heartfelt thanks of the entire Society to Stephanie Hughes for shepherding *The Oxfordian* as its Editor so ably for the past ten years. I also want to inform members that the search for Stephanie's successor has not yet been finalized. Needless to say, Stephanie leaves behind some awfully big shoes to fill! We had hoped to make an announcement on this important position in this Newsletter by now but the selection process is still ongoing. We expect to be able to announce a final decision on the new Editor in the near future. Please stand by.

Best wishes,
Matthew

Who Was the Author of Five Plays that Shakespeare Rewrote as His Own?

by Ramon Jiménez

Among the dozens of anonymous plays that were printed or performed in London during the 1590s is a group of five—a comedy, and four histories based on English chronicles—that have an obvious association with analogous plays in the Shakespeare canon. Each of them bears a strong relationship in terms of structure, plot, and characters to an accepted Shakespeare play, in some cases one that was not printed until its appearance in the First Folio, about thirty years later.¹

Furthermore, the five plays have obvious similarities with each other in terms of structure, plot, characters, dramatic devices, and language, suggesting that the same person wrote them all.

The list of authors proposed for these five plays includes nearly all the major playwrights of the period and several minor ones. But on no one author of any particular play has there been anything like a consensus. Who, then, was this mysterious dramatist whose plays were connected in some way with those of William Shakespeare?

The five plays and their Shakespearean counterparts are as follows:

<i>The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth</i>	—	<i>Henry IV, Part 1</i>
1st record: 14 May 1594 (SR)	⇔	1st record: 25 Feb. 1598 (SR)
1st printing: 1598 (1563 lines)	⇔	1st printing: 1598 (3180 lines)
		<i>Henry IV, Part 2</i>
	⇔	1st record: 23 Aug. 1600 (SR)
	⇔	1st printing: 1600 (3349 lines)
		<i>Henry V</i>
	⇔	1st record: 4 Aug. 1600 (SR)
	⇔	1st printing: 1600 (3381 lines)
<i>The True Tragedy of Richard the Third</i>	—	<i>Richard III</i>
1st record: 19 June 1594 (SR)	⇔	1st record: 20 Oct. 1597
1st printing: 1594 (2223 lines)	⇔	1st printing: 1597 (3603 lines)
<i>The Troublesome Raigne of John, King of England</i>	—	<i>King John</i>
1st record: 1591	⇔	1st record: 1598? (Meres)
1st printing: 1591 (2936 lines)	⇔	1st printing: 1623 (2570 lines)
<i>The True Chronicle History of King Leir</i>	—	<i>King Lear</i>
1st record: April 1594 (Henslowe's Diary)	⇔	1st record: 26 Nov. 1607 (SR)
1st printing: 1605 (2681 lines)	⇔	1st printing: 1608 (3105 lines)
<i>The Taming of a Shrew</i>	—	<i>The Taming of the Shrew</i>
1st record: 2 May 1594 (SR)	⇔	1st record: 1609 ²
1st printing: 1594 (1520 lines)	⇔	1st printing: 1623 (2597 lines)

("SR" refers to the Stationers Register, which contains listings of about three-quarters of the Elizabethan and Jacobean plays printed.)

With respect to their counterparts in the canon, these plays have been variously described by scholars as genuine Shakespearean sources, as plays derived from the same unknown source as the Shakespeare play, as memorial reconstructions of the Shakespeare play by actors or pirates, and even as imitations or adaptations written after the canonical play. With few exceptions, all modern scholars maintain that Shakespeare had no hand in them.

In 1995 Eric Sams proposed a different explanation: "... several of Shakespeare's Folio plays, though none of anyone else's, exist in two or more very different versions, including totally different treatments of the same theme. The simple and obvious explanation, now universally overlooked, is that the earlier publications were his first versions" (180).

The evidence summarized below demonstrates that it was

none other than Shakespeare himself who at an early age wrote all five of the anonymous plays, and then rewrote them years later as the plays in the accepted canon. These conclusions are based on three categories of evidence—the striking similarity between the anonymous plays and the corresponding canonical plays, the numerous parallels of all types between the anonymous plays and other canonical plays, and the multiple similarities among the five anonymous plays themselves.

The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth

The play recounts the traditional story of Henry IV's oldest son Prince Hal, the prodigal son-hero, who rejects the disreputable companions of his youth and matures into the ideal king who wins

“There is not a single scene in Famous Victories that is not repeated in Shakespeare’s Prince Hal plays.”

a great battle at Agincourt. It is written in unaffected and colloquial prose that is divided into twenty scenes that alternate briskly between historical exposition and comic relief. The language is vigorous, formulaic, repetitive, and peppered with staccato dialogue. There are few set speeches and a minimum of literary pretension. Oaths and coarse language are frequent; literary and classical references are absent, as are legal terms. There is little in the way of metaphor or other rhetorical devices. The English characters routinely engage in patriotic boasting and belittling of the French.

More notable than the author's narrative and language are his innovations. *Famous Victories* is the first English history play since John Bale's *King Johan* (1530s) to depict a historical English king on the public stage. The author also employed for the first time in the English theater the dramatic device of alternating comic and historical scenes, a technique duplicated in Shakespeare's Prince Hal trilogy (Ribner 70-1).

The time period, structure, and events depicted in *Famous Victories* closely match those of the trilogy. The first scene of *Famous Victories* corresponds with the second scene in *1 Henry IV*, and the last scene, in which King Henry woos the French Princess Katherine, corresponds with the last scene in *Henry V*. The fifty-seven scenes in the Henry plays are a logical expansion of the twenty scenes in *Famous Victories*. There is not a single scene in *Famous Victories* that is not repeated in Shakespeare's Prince Hal plays.

Most modern editors readily admit to Shakespeare's debt to *Famous Victories*. J. Dover Wilson wrote that “a very intimate connection of some kind exists between Shakespeare's plays and this old text” (3). There are at least fifteen plot elements that occur in the anonymous play and in the Henry trilogy, including the robbery of the King's receivers, the meeting of the robbers in an Eastcheap tavern, the reconciliation of the newly-crowned King Henry V with the Chief Justice, the new King's rejection of his comic friends, the gift of tennis balls from the Dolphin, and Pistol's encounter with

a French soldier (Dericke's in *Famous Victories*). Not only are all fifteen plot elements common to *Famous Victories* and the Henry plays, they all occur in the same order.

There are also more than forty specific details of action and characterization that occur both in *Famous Victories* and in Shakespeare's trilogy. For example: the total of ten comic characters in each, four of whom are exactly duplicated; Gad's Hill as the name of both a robber and the location of a robbery; the reference to Prince Hal boxing the ear of the Chief Justice (dramatized in *Famous Victories* and referred to in *1 Henry IV*); Prince Hal's theft of the crown at his father's deathbed; the arrogance of the French in saying that Englishmen cannot fight without beef. Again, not only are all forty-two specific details common to both, they occur in the same order.³

Sir John Falstaff, one of Shakespeare's most celebrated characters, has been identified as an amalgam of several of the comics in *Famous Victories*. One of them, Sir John Oldcastle (alias Jockey), is punningly referred to in *1 Henry IV* (1.2.41), and his abbreviated name actually appears as a speech prefix in the quarto (1600) of *2 Henry IV* (1.2.119). In this connection, an item of external evidence strongly supports Shakespeare's authorship of *Famous Victories*. In a letter of November 1621, the antiquary Richard James wrote that “in Shakespeare's first show of Harry the Fifth, the . . . buffoon was not Falstaff, but Sir John Oldcastle” (Chambers, II, 242).

Certain other characterizations, themes, and dramatic devices link *Famous Victories* to other plays in the Shakespeare canon. The character of the stubborn porter, for instance, appears in *Comedy of Errors*, *Timon of Athens*, and *Macbeth*. The idea of the dagger as a proof of remorse recurs in *Julius Caesar*, *Cymbeline*, and *Richard III*. Prince Hal's condescending banter with the coy Princess Katherine, whom he calls Kate, is similar to that between Benedick and Beatrice, and Petruchio and Kate/Katherina in later comedies. The exchange of identities by which Dericke and John Cobler pretend to be Prince Hal and the Chief Justice in *Famous*

**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

Victories, duplicated in Act II of *1 Henry IV*, is another Shakespearean marker—the play within the play. There are numerous other examples (Pitcher 6, 182-3).

To accomplish his revision Shakespeare completely rewrote the banal prose dialogue of *Famous Victories* and inserted several new episodes dramatizing the Percy and Northumberland-York rebellions. Adding over eight thousand lines of dialogue, he transformed the simple plot into the three brilliant history plays that are still being performed over four hundred years later.

The True Tragedy of Richard the Third

After a brief framing scene, this play dramatizes the actions of Richard Plantagenet, subsequently Richard III, in almost the same way and in the same order as Shakespeare does in *Richard III*. Act 2 of *Richard III* opens at the identical time and place that *True Tragedy* begins—in 1483, with Edward IV on his death-bed attempting to reconcile his nobles. The cast of characters is nearly the same, and the remainder of both plays is based on the same events in the sixteen-month period ending with the Battle of Bosworth and the crowning of Henry VII in August 1485.

“The logical conclusion from this evidence is that True Tragedy was Shakespeare’s first attempt to dramatize the story of Richard III.”

There are multiple instances of similar language, incident, and detail in *True Tragedy* that are repeated in *Richard III*. About a dozen are clearly derived from the chronicle sources. But at least another eighteen are unsupported by any source, and are peculiar to the two plays. For instance, the repeated references to Thomas, Lord Grey, as the uncle of Prince Edward are identical errors in both plays. He was actually the Queen’s oldest son by her first husband, Sir John Grey, and therefore Edward’s half-brother. None of the sources contains this error. The King’s death-bed scene is described in the chronicles and occurs in both plays. But in both plays Richard is present, whereas none of the chronicle accounts places him there, and he was actually in Yorkshire at the time. Several dramatic devices, such as the slip of the tongue that reveals Richard’s assumption that he will soon be king, and the dialogue between the two murderers, are absent from the chronicles, but common to both plays.⁴

In both plays the depictions of the role of Thomas Stanley, subsequently Earl of Derby, in the final months of Richard’s reign depart in identical ways from the relevant chronicle accounts. Similarly, Richard’s treatment of him and his son George is identical in both plays, but is different from that related in the chronicles. Furthermore, both Thomas Stanley and his brother William were present in the vicinity of Bosworth in the days before the battle, each with his own cadre of troops. Although the chronicles refer to both men and their movements, both plays ignore the important role of William Stanley at Bosworth and refer only to Thomas Stanley,

and they contain similar language and behavior in connection with him that are not found in the sources.

The well-known scene in Act 5 of *Richard III*, in which Richard is visited by the ghosts of those he has murdered, is another example of Shakespeare’s extension and elaboration of a device he first used in *True Tragedy*, in which he is visited by the ghost of Clarence. Although Richard’s disturbing dreams and “horrible images” are mentioned in the chronicles, no ghosts appear in any of them. His role in *True Tragedy*, though one-dimensional, is the most powerful portrait of a dominating protagonist in any early history play. Although his soliloquies lack any wit or humor, they are clearly the antecedents of the powerful speeches he delivers in *Richard III*.

Richard’s famous cry, “A horse! A horse! My kingdom for a horse!” had its obvious origin in his line in the last act of *True Tragedy*, “A horse! A horse! A fresh horse!” With this simple revision, Shakespeare transformed an ordinary line into the most memorable one in the play. Finally, even in the manner of Richard’s death, Shakespeare repeated the modification he had introduced in *True Tragedy*. In both plays the Earl of Richmond personally slays Richard, a detail contrary to all the sources, which uniformly report that Richard died in the general fighting.

There are also numerous similarities of vocabulary and style in the two Richard plays. Shakespeare’s preferences for such words as *them* over *em* and *hath* over *has*, his infrequent use of *I’m*, and his frequent use of “T forms” (*thou*, *thy*, *thine*, and *thee*) in his history plays have been amply documented (Lake, 281; Hope, 61-3). Each of these preferences is obvious in *True Tragedy*. In his death-bed scene in *True Tragedy*, King Edward IV uses the word “redeemer.” In *Richard III* the same word occurs twice in the same scene (2.1.4 and 124), but is used nowhere else in the entire canon. Jane Shore’s question about a name in *True Tragedy*, “O Fortune, wherefore wert thou called Fortune?” is echoed in a similar context by Juliet: “O Romeo, Romeo! Wherefore art thou Romeo?” (*R & J* 2.2.33). The article cited in note 4 contains many more examples.

In their aggregate these parallels are unmistakable and cannot be found in the work of any other dramatist. It might be objected that they are merely Shakespeare’s echoing and improving on another man’s play, but, as Kenneth Muir wrote, “if this were so, *it would be unique in his career*” (my emphasis). He also referred to “Shakespeare’s usual custom . . . to refine on a passage he had written earlier” (47).

Furthermore, certain dramatic devices in *True Tragedy* reappear in other anonymous plays in this group. For instance, one of the murderers hired by Richard to kill the young princes loses his confidence briefly before going ahead with the act in the same way that Hubert does in *Troublesome Raigne* before blinding Arthur. Similarly, the Messenger-Murderer sent by Ragan to kill her father in *King Leir* has a debate with his conscience before abandoning the task. The use of the two characters Truth and Poetry as a framing device for the action in *True Tragedy* is similar to the use of the Christopher Sly episode to frame the action of *The Taming of a Shrew*.

The logical conclusion from this evidence is that *True Tragedy* was Shakespeare’s first attempt to dramatize the story of Richard

III. In rewriting it, he deleted the irrelevant Jane Shore subplot, introduced several new women into the action (Richard's mother, Margaret of Anjou, and Anne Neville), and completely rewrote the dialogue to produce the powerful melodrama that is arguably his most popular history play.

"the plays match so closely . . . that they cannot have been written independently."

The Troublesome Raigne of John, King of England

This play has the distinction of being the only one of the anonymous plays that was attributed to Shakespeare on its title page. No author's name appeared on Q1 of *Troublesome Raigne* (1591), but on the title page of Q2 (1611) are the words "Written by W. Sh." On the title page of Q3 (1622) are the words "Written by W. Shakespeare." Five different printers and publishers are named on the three quartos, none of them twice. Shakespeare's *King John* was not published before it appeared in the First Folio in 1623. It was not included in the lengthy Stationers' Register entry for the plays in the Folio, suggesting to E. K. Chambers that it was "regarded as commercially identical with its predecessor [*Troublesome Raigne*]" (I, 365).

In the present context, the most noticeable thing about *Troublesome Raigne* is its remarkable similarity to Shakespeare's *King John*. Both plays tell the same story in the same sequence of events, with

only minor variations. The same characters appear in both plays, except that Shakespeare added a single inconsequential character, James Gurney, to the cast of *King John* and removed ten or so minor ones. Both plays contain the same scenes in the same order, except that in *King John* Shakespeare deleted three and shortened several others. Both plays treat the identical time period, the entire reign of King John (1199-1216). One recent editor of *King John* wrote, ". . . the plays match so closely in the selection of characters, the sequence of events, and the management of scenes that they cannot have been written independently. Sometimes they parallel not just scene for scene but (substantially) speech for speech" (Beaurline 195).

This close similarity of structure and plot is all the more significant because neither play adheres to the historical order of events and both attribute the same results to historical events that did not cause them. For instance, both plays make the death of Arthur, which occurred in 1203, the immediate cause of the nobles' rebellion (1216) and both events occur just before John surrenders his crown to the Pope's legate (1213). In both plays the fictional Philip the Bastard becomes King John's right-hand man and plays essentially the same role throughout, even to the final scenes, which end with his patriotic speech containing nearly-identical lines about the need for England to remain united. There are many other examples of this type.

Many inaccurate or invented names and details in *Troublesome Raigne* are repeated in *King John*: the use of the title "Dauphin" ("Dolphin" in *Troublesome Raigne*) for the French King's son, a title that came into use only in the mid-14th C.; the confusion of

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).

2008 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: _____

the town of Poitiers with the province of Poitou; John's creation of Arthur as Earl of Richmond, an act that never took place; the anachronistic reference to cannons, which did not come into use for another one hundred years; and the suggestion by a Citizen of "Angiers" (modern Angers) that the two Kings' differences could be settled by a marriage between Louis the Dauphin and John's niece, Blanche of Castile. Although this marriage actually took place, both plays present it, unhistorically, as the arrangement that ended the siege of "Angiers."

Scholars have found abundant instances of phrasing and vocabulary in *Troublesome Raigne* that are repeated or echoed in *King John*. E. K. Chambers wrote that "in some 150 places [in *King John*] a few words from T.R. are picked up and used" (I, 367). Many of these borrowings are distinctive or unusual words and phrases, such as Constance's use of the word *perjured* to describe King John, King Philip's claim that Englishmen have greeted him with shouts of *Vive le roy*, and Blanche's complaint that her wedding will be marred by warfare—*dreadful drums* in *Troublesome Raigne*, *churlish drums* in *King John*.

There are also dozens of images, allusions, and figures of speech in *Troublesome Raigne* that are repeated, directly or indirectly, in plays in the Shakespeare canon, most often in the Henry VI and Henry IV plays, and in the Richard plays, but many in later plays, such as *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *King Lear*.

Besides the similarities mentioned elsewhere in this article, a capricious mixture of different styles and an erratic alternation of prose and verse are characteristics that *Troublesome Raigne* shares with the four other anonymous plays in this group. The doggerel and ribaldry of the monastic scenes in *Troublesome Raigne* are reminiscent of such scenes in *Famous Victories*, *King Lear*, and *The Taming of A Shrew*.

Nearly all of those who have examined the two plays agree that *Troublesome Raigne* was written before *King John* and was its direct source. In view of the extraordinary similarities of structure, plot, characters, language, and dramatic detail in the two plays, it is not hard to conclude that they were written by the same person—William Shakespeare.

The True Chronicle History of King Lear

By the late 16th C. more than fifty chroniclers and poets had produced versions of the fable of the old king who wished to divide his kingdom among his three daughters that first appeared in Geoffrey of Monmouth's 12th century *Historia Regum Britanniae*. *King Lear* was the first dramatization of the story, and its thirty-two carefully constructed but undivided scenes comprised the lengthiest retelling to that time. The playwright adhered generally to the traditional legend, except that the youngest daughter's defeat and death ("Cordeilla" in Geoffrey, "Cordella" in *Leir*) are scrapped in favor of a happy ending in which she survives and Lear is restored to his throne. The story was thus converted from a tragedy into a romance in which goodness is rewarded and wickedness punished. The play's strengths are the construction and movement of its tightly-knit plot, with its detailed exposition and logical development. There is no sub-plot.

With the possible exception of Cordella, the one-sided characters in *King Leir* are little more than abstractions similar to those found in Morality plays. They neither change nor develop, but each of them prefigures a counterpart in Shakespeare's later play. Besides the king and his daughters, Perillus and the Messenger-Murderer in *Leir*, for instance, are the obvious originals of Kent and Oswald in *Lear*. None of the four exists in the original tale in Geoffrey. *Leir* is written mostly in end-stopped blank verse, but contains many rhyming couplets and some prose. With few exceptions the nobility speak in blank verse, the comics and lower class characters

"Scholars have identified repetitions and echoes of phrases and thought from King Leir in more than a dozen canonical Shakespeare plays . . ."

in prose, as was Shakespeare's general practice. There are a great many feminine endings, as was the case in the earliest plays in the canon. Although the verse is pedestrian and repetitive, it is fluent and energetic. There are many classical and Biblical allusions, and several crude farcical interludes in prose.

Modern scholars agree on the considerable evidence of Shakespeare's use of the characters and plot of *Leir*, which is considered to be the "*King Leare*" that was performed in Henslowe's Rose theater in the spring of 1594 (Chambers, I, 53). To the same basic plot he added pieces—the Fool and the subplot of Gloucester and his sons—rearranged some of the interactions, and redrew the characters as more complicated, more individual, and more articulate. He rejected the exaggerated poetic justice of the old play's conclusion and brought Lear to madness and death, and Cordelia to capture and hanging.

Some of the similar incidents in both plays include: the two dismissive asides by Cordelia as her sisters profess their love for their father; the scene in which the king and his daughter alternately kneel in reconciliation, the exchange of messages between the elder daughters, Regan's violent treatment of subordinates, the mildness of Goneril's husband, and the references to the tearing of an incriminating letter. These incidents are peculiar to the two plays; none occurs in the sources. Both plays omit the incident in Geoffrey of the rebellion of the sons-in-law.

The similarities between the two plays are not limited to plot, structure, and characters. More than sixty years ago W. W. Greg described "some two score parallels" of language, thought, and expression that go "far beyond what we should necessarily expect in any two dramatic versions of a common theme" (386-97). As several critics have pointed out, the Fool's line in *Lear*, "That lord that counsell'd thee / To give away thy land" is actually a reference to Skalliger, who gives such advice in *Leir*, there being no one in *Lear* who does so.

Scholars have identified repetitions and echoes of phrases and thought from *King Leir* in more than a dozen canonical Shakespeare

plays, and in *Sir Thomas More* and *Venus & Adonis* (Lee, 109, 114, 117, 119-21, 125). The echoes of language and thought are especially striking in *Hamlet*, *Merchant of Venice*, and *Richard III* (Meuller, 195-218; Law, 117-41). Thomas McNeal has shown that, in their characteristic strong wills, wickedness, and contempt for their husbands, Leir's older daughters, Gonorill and Ragan (they are queens in the anonymous *Leir*), are the originals of Margaret of Anjou in the Henry VI plays, as well as of Lady Macbeth (41-50).

There are also significant similarities between *Leir* and the other anonymous plays described above. Mumford, for instance, companion to the King of Gaul, has the same personality and fulfills the same function as the Bastard Falconbridge, King John's companion in *Troublesome Raigne*. Numerous parallels of language, thought, and dramatic device between *Leir* and *Troublesome Raigne*, too many to be detailed here, have also been detected by scholars attempting to ascertain the plays' authors (Furnivall and Munro, xiii; Sykes, 130-40).

*"The two plays agree in theme, plot,
and sub-plot, and the sum of their
similarities is extraordinary."*

The clear import of this evidence is that *Leir* was one of Shakespeare's earliest plays, and that the "Pied Bull" quarto of 1608 was his first revision, and the play we have in the Folio his second.

The Taming of a Shrew

Internal and external evidence link the two Shrew plays more closely than in any other pair in this group. In the year of its first registration and printing (1594) *A Shrew* was performed in the theater at Newington Butts during the same two-week period in June as were *Hamlet* and *Titus Andronicus* (Chambers II, 319). *A Shrew* was reprinted in 1596 and then registered again in 1607 in a list of sixteen titles that included *Romeo and Juliet*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and *Hamlet* (Miller 31-2). In his *Metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596) Sir John Harington referred to "the book of Taming a Shrew" and apparently owned a copy (153).

Shakespeare's name was not associated with any Shrew play until *The Taming of the Shrew* appeared in the First Folio in 1623.⁵ *The Shrew* was not included in the lengthy Stationers' Register entry by Blount and Jaggard for the Folio plays. John Smethwick, one of the Folio's publishers, had obtained the printing rights for *A Shrew* in 1607, and this apparently allowed *The Shrew* to be included in the Folio.

The two plays agree in theme, plot, and sub-plot, and the sum of their similarities is extraordinary. All the main characters (except Gremio) and several minor ones have counterparts in the same role in the other play. But except for Sly and Kate/Katherina, their names are different. Of the fifteen scenes in *A Shrew*, all but three occur in *The Shrew*. The three structural components in each play—the Christopher Sly frame, the "taming," and the sub-plot—are the

same, except that in *The Shrew* Sly disappears after the second Induction scene; in *A Shrew* he reappears throughout the play, and in the twenty-three line closing scene.

Within each structural component the plays share numerous specific details of action—ten in the opening Sly scenes that are practically identical. There are twenty-one such identical details in the taming component, and sixteen in the sub-plot (Miller 24). In both plays, for instance, the shrew is tamed by the same means, the tamer behaves in the same boorish way at the wedding, he compares taming of wives to taming birds, and he rejects the cap and gown after offering them to Kate/Katherina. In both plays his wife agrees to call the sun the moon, pretends that an old man is a woman, and offers to put her hand under the tamer's foot, etc.

The origin of the sub-plot in both plays lies in Ariosto's *I Suppositi* (1509), an imitation of the Roman comedies of Plautus and Terence, translated by George Gascoigne as *Supposes* in 1573. In both Shrew plays a visiting student falls in love with a rich man's daughter, he disguises his identity and gives his servant his clothes, the servant obtains a "false father," but the actual father eventually agrees to his daughter's marriage, etc. Both plays dramatize events that are only narrated in *Supposes*. According to *A Shrew*'s latest editor, the two Shrew plays "have more in common with each other than either has with *Supposes*," supplying further evidence that "one must derive from the other" (Miller 16-17).

As he does in the other anonymous plays in this group, the playwright employs largely end-stopped blank verse, often turgid, repetitive, and monotonous. But in their simplicity, directness, and racy vernacular, large portions of the dialogue are similar to those in the comic scenes in *Famous Victories*, and closely resemble the corresponding scenes in *The Shrew*. Although in dozens of places the language in *A Shrew* is identical to that in *The Shrew*, or so close as to dictate a relationship, most of the text has been entirely rewritten. Except for the Sly figure, characterization in *A Shrew* is somewhat thin and weak. It is in the plotting and structure of *A Shrew* that the playwright demonstrates an exceptional competence.

In the words of a modern editor, "The structural and thematic sophistication of *A Shrew* (which contains all three of the plot-strands of *The Shrew*) is . . . outstanding . . ." (Thompson 9). This unusual feature is admitted by nearly all commentators, and has led a few to speculate that Shakespeare himself was responsible for *A Shrew*. In the words of Geoffrey Bullough, "*A Shrew* may not be so much the source-play as Shakespeare's first shot at the theme" (I, 58). Another critic admitted that if Shakespeare weren't the author it would have to be an unknown playwright who, in 1593 or so, "was capable of devising a three-part structure more impressive than the structure of any extant play by Lyly, Peele, Greene, Marlowe or Kyd" (Hosley 294-5).

But nearly all commentators on *A Shrew* reject the idea that he had any hand in it, and contend that it was (1) an imitation or "bad quarto" of *The Shrew* by an actor, a pirate or a "compiler," or (2) an independent effort by an earlier playwright, or (3) an imitation of an earlier play about a shrew that was *written by Shakespeare!* It appears that orthodox scholars are willing to contrive and endorse any scenario, no matter how fantastic, so long as it absolves Shakespeare of any responsibility for *A Shrew*.

But the body of evidence surrounding *A Shrew*—its stylistic deficiencies, its one-dimensional characters, its early printing, its striking similarity to the later Shakespeare play, and the treatment of the rights to print it—all point to a single, simple conclusion: it was Shakespeare's first attempt to dramatize the story, a version that he eventually completely rewrote, as he did the four other anonymous plays in this group. Scholars routinely associate it with the other four. E. A. J. Honigmann, who once called Shakespeare a "reviser of genius," described the *Shrew* plays as "the non-identical twins whose relationship so strangely resembles that of *KJ* [*King John*] and *TR* [*Troublesome Raigne*]" and speculated that the authors of *A Shrew* and *Troublesome Raigne* were "perhaps one and the same man" (124-5). Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor wrote that "[b]oth plays [*A Shrew* and *Troublesome Raigne*] resemble 'bad quartos' less than they do plays like *King Leir* and *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*, which served as sources for plays by Shakespeare" (85-6).

Editors have identified parallels of language and thought from *A Shrew* in a dozen Shakespeare plays, especially *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Hamlet* (Miller 66, 83, 89, 114, 117). Considering the comments by most scholars about *A Shrew*, if Shakespeare's name were on its title page they would readily accept it as one of his earliest plays.

*"A scenario in which these unpolished and
inexpert plays were transformed by a more
mature writer into the accomplished dramas
that appeared in the First Folio accords
perfectly with this evidence.*

Conclusion

The summary of evidence presented here is a reasonable and coherent explanation for the origin of these five anonymous plays and for their strong connections with those in the Shakespeare canon. Their anonymity is also consistent with that of the six or more canonical plays that were initially printed anonymously. Both the detail and the breadth of the similarities between the five anonymous plays and their Shakespearean counterparts demonstrate that the dramatist constructed his later plays upon templates of the earlier ones, which he treated as his own. The myriad instances of language, thought, characters, and dramatic devices found in these anonymous plays that subsequently appeared in canonical plays support this conclusion. Lastly, the fact that these anonymous plays also share with each other numerous characteristics of the same type indicates that they are the products of the same pen.

If not Shakespeare, the author was an unknown dramatist who shared his linguistic habits, his dramatic devices, and his ability to organize characters and plot elements into a believable, coherent,

and entertaining dramatic narrative. No other playwright of the time shared these characteristics. For no other playwright does there exist a similar pattern of multiple anonymous plays that are analogous to his acknowledged plays—a fact that suggests that the former were written by the same person.

The five anonymous plays are so strongly connected to the analogous Shakespeare plays that he either wrote them or was guilty of several startling acts of plagiarism, a practice that was severely condemned by Tudor and Jacobean authors. Moreover, no contemporary of Shakespeare, except possibly Robert Greene, ever accused him of plagiarism, not even the alleged authors of these anonymous plays.

During the last few decades overwhelming evidence has emerged that Shakespeare was a persistent and meticulous reviser of his own plays. The nature and extent of his occasional use of characters, stories, and language from earlier works, usually classical or foreign authors, is well known, and is nothing like his wholesale appropriation of the characters, incidents, and plots of these five early plays. A scenario in which these unpolished and inexperienced plays were transformed by a more mature writer into the accomplished dramas that appeared in the First Folio accords perfectly with this evidence.

I have omitted any discussion of the dates of composition of these anonymous plays because there is very little evidence to consider, except the fact that they were all mentioned and printed before their canonical counterparts. One significant fact is that four of them were in the repertory of the dominant playing company of the 1580s, the Queen's Men, a company that has been repeatedly linked to Shakespeare (McMillin & MacLean xv, 160-1).

As Shakespeare is the Elizabethan dramatist with the largest number of surviving plays, it is puzzling that none of his apprentice work has been securely identified. Even his earliest accepted plays reveal, at the least, a journeyman's skill at creating believable characters and compelling stories. It stands to reason that this prolific playwright, before he wrote *Comedy of Errors* or *Titus Andronicus*, or whatever was the earliest canonical play, must have written a bad play, or at least a play with the defects of the five described here.

Obviously, these plays will not replace their familiar counterparts, but they deserve to be acknowledged, printed, and studied and, perhaps in their own category, admitted to the canon.

Endnotes

1 I deliberately omit from this article *The First Part of the Contention* (1594) and *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke* (1595) because they have already been exhaustively analyzed and because they are now generally regarded as the products of Shakespeare's pen.

2 In the play by Samuel Rowlands, *A Whole Crew of King Gossips*, published in 1609 (Chambers I, 328).

3 These are described in detail in my article on *Famous Victories* in *The Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter*, v. 37:2 Summer 2001.

4 These are described in detail in my article on *True Tragedy* in *The Oxfordian*, v. 7, 2004.

5 Francis Meres did not mention it in his list of six Shakespearean comedies in *Palladis Tamia* (1598).

Works Cited

- Beaurline, L. A., ed. *King John*. Cambridge: CUP, 1990.
- Bullough, Geoffrey. *Narrative & Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. 6 v. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957-75.
- Chambers, E. K. *William Shakespeare: Facts and Problems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Furnivall, F. J. & John Munro, eds. *'The Troublesome Reign of King John': Being the Original of Shakespeare's 'Life and Death of King John.'* 1913. Rprt. Folcroft, Pa.: Folcroft Library Editions, 1971.
- Greg, W. W. "The Date of *King Lear* and Shakespeare's Use of Earlier Versions of the Story." *The Library*, ser. 4, v. 20 (1940) 377-400.
- Harington, Sir John: *A New Discourse of a Stale Subject, called the Metamorphosis of Ajax*. (1596) Elizabeth S. Donno, ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.
- Honigmann, E.A.J. "King John, *The Troublesome Reigne*, and 'documentary links': A Rejoinder." *Shakespeare Quarterly* v. 38:1 (Spring 1987) 124-126.
- Hope, Jonathan. *The authorship of Shakespeare's plays: a socio-linguistic study*. Cambridge: CUP, 1994.
- Hosley, Richard: "Sources and Analogues of *The Taming of the Shrew*" *Huntington Library Quarterly* v. 27 (1963-64) 289-308.
- Lake, David. *The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays*. Cambridge: CUP, 1975.
- Law, Robert A. "Richard the Third, Act I, Scene 4." *PMLA* v. 27:2 (n.s. 20) (1912) 117-41.
- Lee, Sidney. *The chronicle history of King Lear: the original of Shakespeare's King Lear*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1909.
- McMillin, Scott & Sally-Beth MacLean. *The Queen's Men and their Plays*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
- McNeal, Thomas H. "Shakespeare's Cruel Queens" *Huntington Library Quarterly* v. 22 (1958-9) 41-50.
- Miller, Stephen Roy, ed. *The Taming of a Shrew The 1594 Quarto*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
- Mueller, Martin. "From *Lear* to *Lear*." *Philological Quarterly* v. 73 (1994) 195-218.
- Muir, Kenneth. "A Reconsideration of Edward III." *Shakespeare Survey* v. 6 (1953) 39-48.
- Pitcher, Seymour M. *The Case for Shakespeare's Authorship of "The Famous Victories."* New York: State University of New York, 1961.
- Ribner, Irving. *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare*. New York: Octagon Books, rev. ed., 1965.
- Sams, Eric. *The Real Shakespeare*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Sykes, H. D. *Sidelights on Shakespeare*. Stratford-on-Avon. 1919.
- Thompson, Ann, ed. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Cambridge: CUP, 1984.
- Wells, Stanley and Gary Taylor. *William Shakespeare, A Textual Companion*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1987; 1997 reprint with corrections.
- Wilson, J. Dover. "The Origins and Development of Shakespeare's Henry IV." *The Library*, ser. 4, v. 26:1 (June 1945) 2-16.

New Eric Sams Website

A new website has been created containing the essays and reviews of Eric Sams on the subjects of music, cryptography, and Shakespeare. It also contains an interview with Sams and a sound archive of leiter and other musical selections. Of particular interest to Shakespeare scholars are Sams' numerous writings on additions to the canon

and on new editions of the plays. The site contains several reviews of Sam's books, as well as more than fifty of his own essays, reviews, and letters. It also contains more than twenty of his unpublished essays, lectures, and letters, as well as the last interview with him, conducted in 2003. It can be seen at www.ericams.org.

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

Reverend Ward (cont'd from p. 1)

1½ pages. There follows a chapter about Stratford-Upon-Avon occupying 3 pages. That's it. The rest of the book comprises 1) the diary itself, a collection of Dr. Ward's observations, musings, anecdotes, and so on covering the period 1648-78, some dated, most not, and arranged topically under chapter headings "Diary," "Shakspeare," "Stratford-Upon-Avon," "Theology, Politics, etc.," "Medicine, Surgery, etc.," and "Miscellaneous Remarks," and 2) Dr. Severn's preface, life of Ward, and chapters about Shakspeare's name, his youth, his property, his illness and death, his marriage license and bond, and his friends.

Dr. Severn's preface indicates that he was chosen by the Medical Society of London to publish the papers after discovering them in the Society's library, 17 excellently preserved "duodecimo volumes, in the original binding, carefully and legibly written, which proved to be genuine common-place books, extending from 1648 to 1679, a portion of time fraught with intense interest." (viii) He describes his excitement upon noting references to Stratford-Upon-Avon that perhaps there would be firsthand information about the great "Shakspeare."

Now, from our perspective in the 21st century, it seems not surprising that the good doctor's lengthy and rhapsodic build-up is all out of proportion to the diary's rather brief mention of the Stratford Shakspeare with a total of three brief anecdotes, for that has been the proportion of fantasy to substance throughout the history of Shakspeare biography. This is just an early example of it. It shows the powerful influence of the hallowed Shakspeare created by Garrick's Stratford exposition approximately 50 years earlier. That seed was firmly planted, fertilized abundantly by the apparently overwhelming need for such a national hero (who better than Shakspeare who, since so little was known about him, could be made into practically anything they wanted or needed?), and appeared 50 years later in full flower in Dr. Severn's testimony.

The doctor recognizes that "few, if any, undoubted particulars are known" about the hero's personal history. (ix-x) He quotes a letter from Rev. Dr. James Davenport, vicar of Stratford-Upon-Avon

dated Nov. 8, 1838: "It is astonishing that so little has been obtained respecting the life of so great and eminent a poet as Shakspeare." (60)

Despite that, Dr. Severn waxes eloquent and at length about the poet's kind, benign nature, his noble sentiments, and his transcendent, worshipful qualities. He admits that "the notices of Shakspeare made by Mr. Ward are, alas! very few and brief, as they supply information at once novel, interesting, and of strict authenticity, they are of great value." (xi-xii) Dr. Severn sums up thusly:

In the absence of all documents of a date so near the time of Shakspeare as those of the Reverend Vicar of Stratford-Upon-Avon, his Diary must be deemed the most credible authority yet published, as it is the only record extant of the income enjoyed by the Poet while living, and of the illness which terminated his existence. (xix)

As all Stratfordians blindly devoted to "that divinely-gifted being," Dr. Severn busily constructs scenarios to fill in the blanks. As others, he inevitably runs into the black hole that is Shakspeare. He supposes that as the Reverend made his rounds, "many interesting conversations must have been entered into" with the denizens of Stratford, "but, regardless of a 'pearl richer than all their tribe,' it appears they talked not of Shakspeare," despite the retired bard's kindness and fame. (19) Yes, one would suppose so, as Diana Price wrote more recently², and so the enthusiastic Dr. Severn raises reasonable doubt.

So does his treatise upon Shakspeare's name which opens by debunking the need to justify the difference of a letter or two between Stratford Will's name and the name as it appears on the works, which was not the name ever used by Shakspeare in spelling his own? "The difference of one or more letters is of trivial importance, where individual identity so nobly asserts triumphant claims....The poet need not be cited into court to prove his identity,--he painted from and to the soul" (31) and so on as fact and logic vaporize into mysticism as so often traditional Shakspeare biography does.

The following example of this process of myth-making cannot be ignored: "Of Shakspeare himself it seems almost like irreverence to speak, language falls so infinitely short in the adequate expression of his high attributes. Even thought fails to pay the just tribute of praise and admiration to his resplendent genius, which, in truth, resembles in its might and power the Divinity from whence it emanated." (36) Such are Shakspeare's "glowing thoughts," his "ingenuous, honorable feeling," his "sacred sentiment." (37)

None of this worshipful verbiage ever becomes specific. It is as though it is written without the author's acquaintance with what Shakspeare actually wrote. So seems the tenor of Shakspeare comment until the 20th century. In the mean time, look what is lost! For example, Dr. Severn writes, "True it is that his...fools [are] very flippant; but it was to render...folly despicable, that he makes their personifications speak the plain, unquestionable language of fatuous imbecility." (38) Has this man ever read *King Lear*, *Twelfth Night*? *The Merchant of Venice*? *As You Like It*? *Winter's Tale*? Has he totally missed the purpose of Shakspeare's fools? the truths they tell? the political and social comment they make? the satire they play out?

Suffice it to say that the doctor's characterization of Shakspeare's life is as fatuous as his characterization of the role of some of Shakspeare's most important characters. Prominent among this part of the story is the doctor's suggestion that Shakspeare's playwriting produced capital and income enough for New Place and for other financial ventures and the mind-bending explanation of why the second best bed was really the best bed³. We learn of "the measureless content of domestic happiness" which he shared in his retirement with his "wife, who had gently ministered to and tenderly shared in these scenes of untroubled felicity." (62-63) His descriptions of Shakspeare's fatal dinner, his illness, and his final demise are so cloying that the only cure can be the vomitus recommended by the Rev. Ward's doctor friends. Here we have pages of fantasy supported by not one fact although Dr. Severn states, based on Ward's story, that regarding the cause of Shakspeare's death, "the veil of

apparently impenetrable obscurity is now removed" (60)

And what basis does Dr. Severn have for his 56 pages of fantasy? He has two miniscule anecdotes from 17 volumes of Rev. Ward's note books. This following sentence of 23 words is the whole basis provided by Ward for the pages and pages conjured up by Dr. Severn describing Shakspeare's last illness, funeral and celebration: "Shakspeare, Drayton, and Ben Jonson, had a merie meeting, and itt seems drank too hard, for Shakespear died of a feavour there contracted. (183) No sources, no attribution, no history, no nothing. Just a story.

The other anecdote Ward relates is this: "I have heard that Mr. Shakspeare was a natural wit, without any art at all; he frequented the plays all his younger time, but in his elder days lived at Stratford, and supplied the stage with two plays every year, and for itt had an allowance so large, that hee spent at the rate of 1,000*l.* a-year, as I have heard." (183)

The wonderful aspect to this story is, of course, that another candidate for the true author received an allowance of 1,000*l.* per year. We know that for sure. It is well documented. Rev. Ward may have gotten this one right, but again it is the wrong Shakespeare, just as there is evidence that references to the writer Shakespeare are to a pen-name, eventually confused with the Stratford man. It has never been documented otherwise.

Ward makes four other short references to Shakspeare. First, he states, "Shakspear had but two daughters, one whereof Mr. Hall, the physitian, married, and by her had one daughter married, to wit, the Lady Bernard of Abbingdon." (183) Second, he notes to himself, "A letter to my brother, to see Mrs. Queeny, to send for Tom Smith for the acknowledgment." (184) The editor adds a note that Mrs. Queeny is probably Shakspeare's daughter Judith.

The third reference could tell us something about authorship, "Whether Dr. Heylin does well, in reckoning up the dramattick poets which have been famous in England, to omit Shakespeare." So much for Dr. Severn's universal praise for the Poet.

Finally, Rev. Ward confesses that he is perhaps not as current on Shakespeare as he should be. Here is one of the most

surprising and damning statements that this "most credible authority yet published," can make as an authority, and it is about himself! He writes, "Remember to peruse Shakespeare's plays, and bee much versed in them, that I may not bee ignorant in that matter." (184) Of course, Rev. Ward had no thought to present himself as a Shakespeare authority, but in the arid desert of Shakespeare biography, Severn grasped at mirages which succeeding generations all too readily have taken as facts.

Severn's view is clearly part of the hangover from Garrick's Stratford party which informs the perception of William Shakspeare even today. Chafing under royalty while the colonies and France were liberating themselves, the country needed a hero for and from the common man, and here he was. Shakspeare was England's common man ascendant, triumphant. It is the commonest of Stratfordian defenses. It is a view which has persisted to current times, blindly defending and glorifying the Bard without regard to the disconnect between Shakspeare's life and Shakespeare's work. Toward the end of the 19th century, both Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry Howard Furness, the eminent Shakespeare scholar, and others voiced the disconnect but allowed Shakespeare's greatness to wipe away all concern.

More recently and to his credit, Samuel Schoenbaum has toned down Severn's bardolatry.³ But his more reasoned approach still belies basic faults of Shakespearean scholarship. In the first place, Schoenbaum calls Ward's notes about what he has heard from who knows what source a "record" (217), thereby dignifying hearsay and elevating it into the realm of fact. After touching on the lack of reliable information about Shakspeare's later years deriving from "tradition" and "speculations," Schoenbaum turns to Ward's diary. "Greater authority," he writes, "attaches to an account of Shakespeare's final illness and death preserved in the notebooks of the Revd. John Ward, the first individual in Stratford to take an antiquarian interest in the poet." (77) This whole sentence is misleading.

Ward provides no "account" calling such undocumented hearsay an "account... preserved in the notebooks" elevates it to

an authority way beyond what it deserves. It is an anecdote without attribution, and no authority at all should attach to it. 300 pages later, Schoenbaum does distance Ward's "record" of Shakspeare's fatal dinner by referring to "the doubtful warrant of Ward's apocryphal anecdote." (373) Even later, he does relate historian John Semple Smart's relegation of Ward's story to "things that never were." (509) But Schoenbaum's primary account of Ward's diary lacks such caution and implies that Ward provides biographers with something to work with.

Furthermore, Ward as much as says that he took no antiquarian interest in the poet, as Schoenbaum states. Ward was recording in his diary a story he heard not much different from stories, musings, factoids and other miscellany on dozens of other subjects recorded there. Schoenbaum takes Ward's statement that he had better read Shakespeare's plays so as not to be "ignorant" of them as evidence of Ward's interest in "the great man who had resided in the town a half-century earlier." (77) If Ward had read nothing of Shakespeare, then it was ignorance he was recording, not interest. We never do find out if Ward ever read a word of the "great man's" work.

At the same time, and again without basis, Schoenbaum finds fault with Ward's entry about Shakspeare's spending at 1,000 pounds per year, writing that Ward "goes badly off-base" in estimating Shakspeare's earnings. (78) If "Shakespeare" proves to be Oxford's pseudonym, then his 1,000 pound yearly stipend from the Queen might be the only fact Ward got right in his whole diary, and Schoenbaum rejects it.

The net result is that from Severn to Schoenbaum, Stratfordian biography hungrily seeks out any possible information about the Bard and ends up swallowing anything it can get to support the Garrick construct. Severn imbues Ward's "notices" of Shakspeare" with "strict authenticity" (xi-xii) and "the most credible authority yet published." (xix) Schoenbaum is more cautious. But the essence of their view of Shakspeare as Shakespeare is the same. It is the uncritical willingness to transform the Stratford business man into one of the greatest authors of all time, and that has been the failing of orthodox Shakespeare

biography for all time.

The following excerpts from Rev. Ward's diary are presented to give the flavor of what the book is about and to give an idea of its eclectic content of musings, factoids, groaners, and miscellaneous items which various people had related to him. Some of the more interesting and humorous follow. Some relate to English history, literature, and even authorship. You might want to pay special attention to the entries from pages 131 and 174 touching on the Veres and from 179, a perhaps surprising statement about Leicester.

(92-3) St. Paul's church was built by the sinnes of the people, which was thus; their ghostly fathers would lay penances upon some penitentiaries, as masons, carpenters, bricklayers, plaisterers, and others, to work so many days gratis in the building before they could get absolution; and so it came to be built.

(93) One used to call washing days execution days, in regard they were so troublesome.

(95) Nick Culpepper says that a physitian without astrologie is like a pudden without fat.

(95) One being desired to ask three things, which hee would have graunted, hee askt, 1st, as much ale as would serve him all his life; then what hee would have in the second place, as much tobacco as would serve his life; then what in the third place, he stood still awhile: the King prest him to speak quickly; hee then said, 'more ale.'

(96) A tyler, falling off a house, killed a man, but was not much hurt himself; hee was arraigned for murther, and his prosecutor had this justice afforded him, that he should tumble off the house, and trie if he could kill the tyler as he walkt by.

(101) King James used to say merily, he had three things which no prince ever had—a secretarie that could not write, a bishop that could

not preach, and something else.

(104) I have heard that the phraze Scott free came first thus; the Scots in King James his time, if they committed crimes still escaped, even when Englishmen were hanged.

(106) I have heard of a gentlewoman in Oxford, who hearing that one was accounted a beautie who had a heavie, sleepeie look with her, when shee went to the play, sate uppe the night before, that shee might look sleepily too.

(107) I have heard of a parsonage in Kent that is called Tilburie Kill-parson; few parsons live above two or three years in the place.

(107) I have heard of a parson who ust to say this of his parishioners, that they were troubled with a Sunday ague, for hee could never get his parishioners to church on that day, though all the rest of the week they were very well.

(108-9) The Lord Strange, or Earl of Derby, came to his honour and estate thus: there was an eagle built

her nest near Lathom Hall, now this man had no children, and hee and his wife walking out one day saw a red cloth in the eagle's nest, whereuppon they sent upp to see what itt was, and there was a child, which hee took and made his heir, and for the unexpectedness of the thing named him Lord Strange, and att this day in his armes hee bears the eagle and child; some thought it might bee his own, and conveyed thither: this story I heard.

(110) Six things required to a proverb; 1. short, 2. plaine, 3. common, 4. figurative, 5. auncient, 6. true.

(111) Some say when man lost free-will, woman found itt, and hath kept itt ever since.

(126) Bishops have always governd their clergie by canon law, not by canon shott.

(127) The curate replied, hee would rather bee excommunicated thirty years than hanged a quarter of an hour.

(128) A good match might be be-

JOINT CONFERENCE – OCT 9-12

The 4th Annual Joint SOS/SF Conference will be held at the Tarrytown Hampton Inn (Westchester County, NY) Thursday to Sunday, October 9-12 (Columbus Day Weekend). The hotel is located at 200 Tarrytown Rd, Elmsford, NY. The closest airports are Westchester County Airport in White Plains, NY (about 10 miles away) and LaGuardia Airport in Flushing, NY (about 26 miles away). Currently there are 30 guest rooms being held at the discounted rate of \$159/night until 9/8/08.

Further details as to the conference agenda, other events, registration information, travel information, and a list of alternate nearby lodging will be forthcoming.

Anyone interested in presenting a paper should send a title and abstract to either John Hamill (hamillx@pacbell.net) or Bonner Cutting (bonnermiller@gmail.com)

tween a blind woman and a deaf man.

(129) I have heard that Mr. Harrington, an apothecarie at Stratford, when hee had no mind to hear his wife talk, us'd to desire her to goe and beat some sassafras.

(131) My Lord of Oxon hath an estate of 4,000 pound a yeer, which hee had by marriage with one of the Bannings: hee hath not above 800 pound a-yeer belonging to the earldome. Hee loosed his estate yeerly by horse racing, as I have heard. Hee hath a son by Roxalana, called Aubrey Vere.

(131-2) My Lord Cherburie's eldest sonne died with drinking at Ludlow, and was found dead in his vomit and blood: they us'd means to trie if there was any life in him, as putting up sneezing powder into his nostrills, and cupping and scarifying him to make him feel, but all to no purpose; he was perfectly dead.

(132) A judge that used to lay his hand uppon his ear when hee heard a cause, and being askt the reason of itt, said, that hee reserved the other for the opposite party.

(147) Arden signifies a woody place, and was so used by the Galls and the old Britons. The last of the Ardens, which was Robert, dyed at Oxford, unmarried, an. 1643.

(156) The great fire in 1666 beganne in Pudding Lane, in one Mr. Ffarmer's house, a baker.

(158) The 28th of Henry the Third was the first time the word parliament was ever used, before itt was called concilium magnum, commune concilium regni, magnatum conventus.

(160) An instrument calld a way-wiser, by the motion whereof a man may see how many steps he takes in a-day: I have seen one worth thirty shillings.

(160-1) In King Richard the Sec-

ond's time physitions and divines were not distinct professions; for one Tydeman, Bishop of Landaph and Worcester, was physician to King Richard the Second.

(161) A massy crucifix plact on the table in the Chapel royal, in Queen Elizabeth's time, for some years, till Peach, the queen's fool, broke itt, att the instigation of Sir Francis Knowles.

(161) Edmund, Earl of Derby, who dyed in Queen Elizabeth's days, was famous for chirurgerie, bonesetting, and hospitalitie.

(162) Mr. Graunt observes, that the number of christenings in 1660 was greater than anie three yeers foregoing; whence he observes the benediction of the kingdome in the restitution of monarchy: but something else may be inferred from itt.

(166-7) The Lady Arabella was daughter to Charles, Earl of Lenox, third sonne to Margaret, sometime Queen of Scotland, daughter to Henry the Seventh, but after married to the Earl of Angus, 1514.

(167) The treason with which Sir Walter Rawleigh, and Cobham, and Grey was charged was some talk that they had in the Privey Councill about the Lady Arabella's succession in the Crowne, and securing King James.

(172-3) The dissolution of abbeys caused the books in their libraries to bee spread, to the increase of learning, which their former slothful possessors would not make use of.

(174) I saw Ben Jhonson's play, calld the Alchymist, acted, in which two parts were acted wel, the Dr. and the Puritan, the latter incomparably well, att the playhouse, which is the King's, betwixt Lincoln's Inn Field and Vere Street.

(179) It seems to mee to bee one of the greatest blemishes of Queen Elizabeth's reigne, that shee suffered

the Earl of Leicester, who was so wicked, to domineer as hee did.

(196) Good schollars seldome take things uppon trust.

(201) Hee that being able, takes to himself libertie of inquirie, is in the onlie way, in all kinds of studies, that leads and lies open to the sanctuarie of truth. The old scepticks, that never would professe they had found a truth, showed yet the best way to search for any.

(208) a distinction without a difference

(209-10) There is a disease in infants, when their heads are too bigg for the rest of their bodie. This is a great disease among schollars; they have a great deal of head knowledg, but, alas! what little practice is there in their lives!

(211) Believe itt, that iff conscience will not speak sometimes, ye shee always writes.

(230) Confession on the rack is nothing, because men in pain will confess anything.

(232) A man is not better knowne by his face than by his writing, if hee draws his discourse out of his own braine, and is not a book botcher.

(286) In printing books, this method for the copies in the first impression; they give the author 200 copies att half the price, that they may bee sure to have some taken off; the second edition they give him intirely one in ten.

(288) Then true religion is most like to prevail in the world, when men's other vertues commend their religion, and not when zeal for their religion is their only vertue.

(301) Dr. Barrow, who was Bishop of Man, and is like to bee of Asaph, is said to bee the author of the "Whole Dutie of Man," and other peeces usually ascribed to Sterne.

(302) Tis better to conclude from certaintie to conjecture, than from conjecture to certaintie.

(303) William the Conqueror, perceiving in himself a defect of learning, exhorted his sons to gett itt, saying that without itt, a king was but a crowned asse.

(307) One Pearcie, a Welshman, was the chief penner of a pamphlet called "Martin Mar Prelate:" he was afterwards indicted of felony, and executed.

(311) The titles of kings have much

alterd. Grace was the title of Henry the 4th, excellent grace of Henry the 6th, and majestie of Henry the 8th; before they were usually calld soveraigne lord, leige lord, and highnes.

(314) Some reckon 57 millions expended in the civill warres of England. The estates of 12,000 noblemen and gentlemen wasted these late times.

Notes

At the rate of 6/each for the 17 or so plays that

Book Review

by Lew Tate

Review of *Macbeth: Fully Annotated from an Oxfordian Perspective* edited by Richard Whalen, published by Horatio Editions/ Lumina Press

Richard Whalen has edited the first in a series of plays from the Shakespeare canon attributing authorship to Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford, offering introductory material and annotations from the Oxfordian perspective. The book is a scholarly edition of *Macbeth* in which attempts to elucidate the play for the reader and inform him or her concerning the Oxfordian interpretation are the foremost motivations. Whalen presents the unorthodox view of the authorship issue without shouting, "It's Oxford, stupid!" In this edition he stands, as should we all, above that.

Though there is unorthodox material, the format of the book is relatively familiar. It offers an overview including the following sections: "The Dramatist's Life, His Stage, and His Audience"; "The Composition and Publication of the Plays"; and "The Question of the Author's Identity." In the introductory sections the author also gives the reader a short list of selections for further reading, a note on the texts, and an introduction to *Macbeth*.

Early in the overview Whalen synthesizes the Oxfordian stance, "The plays commented on court affairs, sometimes satirically, and writing plays performed in

the 'vulgar' public theaters and publishing them were considered beneath the dignity of aristocrats. And so Oxford used the pen name William Shakespeare..." Later, he (Whalen) gives some information on Edward de Vere's life: He was born at Castle Hedingham in 1550 to the 16th Earl of Oxford who died in 1562 causing the twelve year old Edward to be raised as a ward of the crown under William Cecil, Lord Burghley, the queen's chief counselor. Most scholars recognize Lord Burghley as Polonius in *Hamlet*. Also, it is relevant that de Vere spent most of life highly placed in the Court and near Queen Elizabeth. Whalen further mentions Arthur Golding, the first translator into English of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Golding was de Vere's uncle who was involved in de Vere's estates and likely his education. Ovid's work was one of Shakespeare's most important influences. Oxford traveled the reader is told. For a year and a half he traveled in France and Italy. As readers of Shakespeare know, France and more so Italy provide a great deal of source material, settings, and characters for the Shakespeare canon. de Vere also traveled as a soldier. One campaign in which he participated was in Scotland where *Macbeth* is set. He died in 1604 under virtually unknown circumstances.

In the section "His Stage and Audience" Whalen relates information on theatrical performances in Elizabethan England

were even known before Shakspeare's death in 1616, only 100 or so pounds would have accrued from writing the plays for the public stage, far less than the price of New Place, not to mention Shakspeare's many other ventures.

Endnotes

- 1 Ward, John, Reverend. *Diary of the Rev. John Ward, A.M., Vicar of Stratford-Upon-Avon, Extending from 1648 to 1679, from the Original MSS. Preserved in the Library of the Medical Society of London.* Ed. Charles Severn, M.D. Henry Colburn, Publisher, London, 1839.
- 2 Price, Diana. *Shakespeare's Unorthodox Biography: New Evidence of an Authorship Problem.* Greenwood Press, Westport,

and ties Oxford to them. He makes the point that Elizabeth loved entertainment and that her Court was the site for a great many plays. Noblemen were free to present plays at court, and some had their own acting companies, including Oxford. More Oxford connections to theater are included; for example, his ownership of the lease to Blackfriars Theater, a private theater wherein his troupe of boy actors performed. This section of the book gives the reader a look at theater activity and Oxford's involvement but with the caveat that, as with Shakspeare, not much is known.

Whalen's section on the composition and publication of the plays is much the same as any of the myriad editions of the plays. He starts with the "First Folio" of 1623 and works back. Some of the more aggressive Oxfordian scholars may wish for a more combative tone, but the points are well made that it is Oxford's connection being presented and that the two camps have in common a lack of definitive evidence. Dating is important for a full interpretation of *Macbeth*. On the subject of dating the author does take aim at orthodox conclusions and makes his own conclusion, "Under scrutiny, however, none of the Stratford evidence, such as performance dates, purportedly topical allusions and allegedly post-1604 (Oxford's death), is valid."

Whalen takes on the authorship debate in "The Question of the Author's Identity"

section. He briefly outlines two areas of research traditionally thought to be Stratfordian strong arguments and refutes them. He mentions the Jonson and Digges references in the *First Folio* and the effigy in the Holy Trinity Church in Stratford. The effigy, which is mentioned in the *First Folio*, is of a man holding a quill pen poised to write on some paper on a pillow. Through a sketch of the effigy in 1634 by William Dugdale, we know that the original effigy was a man and a sack of grain. It obviously had been altered. Whalen also points out problems some scholars have had with the lack of evidence that Shaksper of Stratford was a writer, and problems some have had accepting traditional authorship leading to other candidates. An example is J. Thomas Looney who, in the face of finding no evidence that Shakesper was the author of the canon, changed his focus to Edward de Vere.

The introduction to the play provides information and some interpretation which provides a balance, giving the first time reader a good start into his/her reading and the more experienced reader a helpful review. Whalen includes an idea not found in many introductions, a brief look at the character, the Thane of Ross, as a villainous courtier providing an interesting subplot.

The layout of the play is pleasing, providing the reader easy access. The text is on the right page, and the notes are on the left. The font is larger than in many Shakespeare plays, and there is ample spacing between speakers. The notes are in the same font, not the microscopic fine print often encountered. Many of the notes are those expected and found in any publication of the play. They are there to help the reader understand the play. For example, in Act One, scene one, the First Witch says, "I come, Graymalkin." The second Witch follows with "Paddock calls." The notes offer us: "Graymalkin: a grey cat that is a witch's companion in witchcraft", and "Paddock: A toad..." Some of the notes are necessarily the same one finds in many, perhaps all, of the plays offering notes. Others are characteristic of this volume only. For example, in Act Three, scene four during a banquet with lords in attendance, Macbeth

has left to speak with hired murderers of Banquo. Lady Macbeth says to him, "My royal lord./ You do not give the cheer. The feast is sold/that is not often vouched, while tis a-making,/ Tis given with welcome. To feed were best at home:/ From thence the sauce to meat is ceremony; /Meeting were bare without out it." Macbeth responds, "Sweet remembrancer!/ Now, good digestion wait on appetite,/ and health to all." Whalen's note on "Remembrancer" reads, "Remembrancers were the Officers of the Exchequer in Queen Elizabeth's court. One of them was the Queen's Exchequer, who was responsible for collecting debts owed the queen. Lady Macbeth has just reminded Macbeth that a feast is only a commercial meal if the host does not assure his guests that they are welcome as guests and presumably may or may not be in his debt. Macbeth seems to be making an in-joke for his audience of courtiers. Oxford would have known about the remembrancer." In scene two of the fourth act, Ross is present prior to the murders at Macduff's castle. Whalen's note tells us that Ross may be in on the murders and that this crime is a continuation of Ross's villainy. In Act One, scene seven, Macbeth, in his speech wherein he is considering the murder, says "...He's here in double trust; /First, as I am his kinsman and his subject, /Strong both against the deed; then as his host, /Who should against his murderer shut the door,/ Not bear the knife myself..." Whalen's note, in part, tells us, "...a fine point of Scottish law that raised to the level of treason the murder of someone of rank who was also a guest of the assailant, hence, 'double trust'. The concept of double trust was not in English law, which suggests that Oxford learned of it during his sojourn in Scotland."

Whalen's edition of *Macbeth* concludes with another gem, an essay by Derek Jacobi entitled "Acting Macbeth". It is no hyperbole to say that Derek Jacobi is one of the greatest actors of our time, perhaps any time. In this essay he takes the reader through the mental and physical preparation for and performing of *Macbeth*. He discusses thoughts on characterization,

interpretation, staging, costumes, props, and other components of the production of the play. A notable example of the actor's process is shown in his description of the dagger scene, a moment before Macbeth goes in to kill Duncan (2.1.33): "...Is this a dagger...?" like 'To be or not to be' (Hamlet 3.1.58) is the line they're all waiting for. Once again, it's a question of choice. Is he surprised to see the dagger or did he expect it to be there? Is he frightened of it? Do his eyes attract him to it? Does his choice of the word 'clutch' mean that the dagger is pulling him forward, or is it repelling him as he tries to grasp it? (I think I tried for both-a bit of repel, a bit of attract.) Does 'let me clutch thee' mean "dare I clutch thee"? And so on - all choices." The essay is rife with such insights into the actor's craft in performing *Macbeth*, in performing Shakespeare. The essay was reprinted from *Players of Shakespeare 4* with permission of the Cambridge University Press. It speaks of an Adrian Noble production of *Macbeth* at the Barbican Theater, London, in 1993.

The text of the play appears to be uncut and unedited in this edition. Though the words are the same, the reader will see it through new eyes as a result of the introductory material and the notes. One who fancies Shakespeare, whether as a dabbler, student, performer, or scholar, will find Richard Whalen's *Macbeth: Fully Annotated From an Oxfordian Perspective* a worthy read and a worthy study.

The above book is the first in a series of plays annotated from the Oxford perspective presented by Horatio Editions. Richard Whalen, M.A. and Daniel L. Wright, Ph.D. are co-general editors.

Ensuing editions will include:

Othello, Ren Draya

Antony and Cleopatra, Michael Delahoyde

Hamlet, Jack Shuttleworth

*The Tempest, Roger Stritmatter
and Lynne Kositsky*

Henry the Fifth, Kathy R. Binn-Dray

King John, Daniel L. Wright

Love's Labour's Lost, Felicia Londré

Much Ado About Nothing, Anne Pluto

Shakespearian Character Pairs Anagram Puzzle

The names of 18 pairs of characters are hidden in the 36 words or phrases in the following table, one member in the first column of the table and the other one in the fourth column (although the pairs do not necessarily line up in the same row of the table).

The two members of each pair have some relationship with each other, such as husband and wife, family members, friends, enemies, lovers, etc.

To find the names, you must first drop a letter from one of the words or phrases, then anagram (rearrange) the remaining letters to form the name. Write the name of the character in the second (or fifth) column of the table to the right of the original word or phrase, then write the dropped letter to the right of the name in the third (or sixth) column. When finished, read down the letters in the third and sixth columns for the final answers.

EXAMPLE: From the pair of words INVENTABLE and POSTURED (which do not appear in the table) drop the B in the first word and the D in the second word and rearrange the remaining letters of the words to spell VALENTINE and PROTEUS.

Adapted from a puzzle by Mark L. Gottlieb, Mike Selinker, and Teeuwyn Woodruff published in the March 2007 issue (Volume 31, Number 2) of GAMES magazine, page 8

GEARED			ANYTOWN		
LIMEADE			MYTHICAL BEAD		
LOWERING			NICKEL BED		
OPERA PROS			LONE ORB		
RICH TROUPE			UNDID ME		
DONATION			SO CHALKY		
PAROLEE ACT			AMIGO		
ALOOF			EARLS		
AUGMENTOR			HAIL HOPE		
TABLE RICE			TRUE GRADE		
HECATOMB			TACKLE UP		
MAN OF DEEDS			ENRAGE		
I BOO AN ASS			HORSE		
I RELAX			PLOTHOLE		
FOUL ACID			I BALANCE		
ACIDULOUS			IN A DRAMA		
THERMAL			AIRPORT		
DATA IN IT			A TAKEN HAIR		

Answers to puzzle are on the following page.

Report on Oxfordian Activity In Seattle, Washington

– submitted by Richard Whalen

Sam Saunders of Kirkland, near Seattle, now has not one but two groups of Oxfordians who meet monthly. And he has also persuaded the Seattle Shakespeare Company to schedule an Oxfordian preview before one performance of each production of every Shakespeare play during the year.

And before a performance of a new play, *Swansong*, about the Shakespeare-Bacon rivalry, a historical over-view was presented.

What's next? A Proclamation drafted by Saunders and issued by the mayor of Seattle recognizing the birthday of Edward de Vere, 17th earl of Oxford, as the true author of the works of Shakespeare? Not likely, but Saunders did ask the artistic director of the Seattle Shakespeare Company to recognize Oxford's birthday, April 12, shifting it to the Gregorian calendar of April 22, so that the Oxfordians might join in their celebration of "Bill's Birthday Bash" on April 23. No reply, however, was received.

The two groups in the Seattle area are the Essex and the Wessex. The need for two groups resulted from the difficulty traveling across Lake Washington at meeting times

and the membership of retirees and daytime workers. The significance of Essex/Wessex? Well, says Saunders, both groups are interested in sex but one is on the Eastside and one on the Westside of the lake.

Wessex meets evenings each month at the Barnes & Nobel bookstore near the University of Washington. Essex meets mornings at the Kirkland community center. Saunders makes the arrangements, coordinates the agenda (very informal) and emails members the agenda for each meeting, although, he notes, the discussions cannot always be kept under control. There are thirty persons on his e-mailing list with interests, according to Saunders, that extend from the lunatic to the scholarly fringes.

Notably, these are the only Oxfordian monthly meetings that are international: Ian and Jo Haste drive down from Canada.

With his celebrated wit, charm and openness to discussion by everyone, Saunders draws about twenty people to meetings of the two groups. An added attraction is that his groups elect no officers, charge no dues and prohibit all talk of religion or politics later than the 17th century.

Saunders is professor emeritus of mathematical statistics at Washington State University. (He does not, however, gamble.) He previously taught at the University of Washington and worked at the Boeing Scientific Research Laboratories. His paper on how Oxford calculated the odds in the duel between Hamlet and Laertes appears in the current issue of *The Oxfordian*. Stratfordian scholars have long been bedeviled by the mathematics and how the dramatist set the odds. Saunders may well have solved the puzzle and demonstrated that the dramatist had a sharp, subtle, well-informed knowledge of both fencing and odds-making. Not something to be learned in Stratford.

A few years ago Saunders worked with Richard Whalen and his Cape Cod group of Oxfordians to try to determine the odds that any given boy in Stratford, such as Will Shakspeare, might have attended the one-room school holding 30-35 boys aged seven to fifteen. The uncertainty of the demographics defeated a precise solution, but the approximate odds looked very long.

Shakespearian Character Pairs Anagram Puzzle Solutions

E	KATHARINA	A TAKEN HAIR	D	TITANIA	DATA IN IT
R	PORTIA	AIRPORT	R	HAMLET	THERMAL
A	MIRANDA	IN A DRAMA	O	CLAUDIUS	ACIDULOUS
E	CALIBAN	I BALANCE	F	CLAUDIO	FOUL ACID
P	OTHELLO	PLOTHOLE	X	ARIEL	I RELAX
S	HERO	HORSE	O	BASSANIO	I BOO AN ASS
E	REGAN	ENRAGE	F	DESDEMONA	MAN OF DEEDS
K	CAPULET	TACKLE UP	O	MACBETH	HECATOMB
A	GERTRUDE	TRUE GRADE	L	BEATRICE	TABLE RICE
H	OPHELIA	HAIL HOPE	R	MONTAGUE	AUGMENTOR
S	LEAR	EARLS	A	FOOL	ALOO
M	IAGO	AMIGO	E	CLEOPATRA	PAROLEE ACT
A	SHYLOCK	SO CHALKY	D	ANTONIO	DONATION
I	EDMUND	UNDIR ME	R	PETRUCHIO	RICH TROUPE
L	OBERON	LONE ORB	A	PROSPERO	OPERA PROS
L	BENEDICK	NICKEL BED	W	GENERL	LOWERING
I	LADY MACBETH	MYTHICAL BEAD	D	EMELIA	LIMEADE
W	ANTONY	ANYTOWN	E	EDGAR	GEARED