

Occulist Influence on the Authorship Controversy

Roger Nyle Parisious

This monograph is dedicated with admiration
to John Price, an honest and passionate Oxfordian

It would be unprofitable and futile to engage any prominent public representative of the Tudor Rose (née Royal Birth) theory in further debate. It is now merely symptomatic of a larger social malaise and belongs in a history of sociology, advertising, or conspiracy theories, not literary scholarship.

The history of this Oxfordian sub-movement, since it is primarily a story of concepts derived from obsessive literary metaphor and personal emotion, must be told through the lives of its progenitors, as it has no other real life. Oxfordian critics have always maintained that the life becomes the work. And the lives of the original Tudor Rose proponents, Capt. B. M. Ward (son of Col. B. R. Ward), Percy Allen, and Dorothy Ogburn, explain their work on Tudor Rose theory, though both their writings and their lives offer us many finer hours. As these hours are too frequently unrecorded, the present author places himself in the difficult position of suddenly interjecting as defense counsel, while indicting friends to whom he owes much. We are scholars here, hopefully, dealing with documentary evidence, but documents are only part of the story that we will never see completely. Anyone is free to reject the memorial portion of this article. They do not affect the thrust of the argument.

Capt. Ward was a very brave man and his published work is of a high standard, while the Tudor Rose theory was merely a private Freudian aberration. Percy Allen remains a useful reference source and was, at his best, a

Archivist, translator and author, Roger Parisious is currently at work on three books—a history of the Shakespeare authorship controversy, Yeats and the Tarot, and royal birth claimants.

brilliantly perceptive critic, but he ruined his reputation in an only fleetingly successful search for creative renewal. Dorothy Ogburn was the present writer's genuinely loved friend, a literary lady well-versed in New School textual criticism. She gave Arthur Golding recitations which could have delighted Ezra Pound, but she had no sense of historical discipline and was too tender-minded to brook any criticism of a slowly evolving belief which increasingly sustained her through very difficult periods.

From a critical viewpoint, the basic distinction between the school of Looney and the school of Allen-Ogburn (Royal Birth theory apart) is that Looney is always governed by the concrete structure of a complete work, and Allen and Ogburn by the controlling metaphors. Looney does not "identify" Oxford as the protagonist of the Sonnets, Hamlet, Bertram, Prince Hal, and Othello, on the basis of common psychological characteristics, for such apparent characteristics are few. What he does find is a common juxtaposition between the material which is new and particular, and that which does not deviate from the known textual sources; he invariably discovered close and repeated structural resemblances to parallel historical documents pertaining to Edward de Vere. Looney never raised his argument beyond a maximum total of ten Shakespearean works, but in these instances, his postulations were repeatedly confirmed in his lifetime and as often after his death, a fact which was never properly appreciated by the Ogburns. We shall cite four excellent examples of Looney's historical objectivism, and a posthumous fifth, the Adon identification, in this article.

Percy Allen scored a number of similar successes in his published books (see his *Romeo and Juliet* parallel cited below), but he depended on Capt. Ward *files* for his history, and when Ward went into decline, Allen followed. Still, his basic Oxford—Hamlet—Chapman—D'Ambois metaphorical configuration may well stand the test of time, in which case it will more than redeem his errors.

As much cannot be said for the contemporary neo-Oxfordians, who exhibit all of the same emotional and intellectual fallibilities with scarcely any of their predecessors' more conspicuous redeeming virtues. In 1993, the writer called to the attention of three leading Tudor Rose theorists many of the imbroglis related below. One said she would never read a book like Hester Dowden's, though, if she had traced Dorothy Ogburn's sources, she could have spared herself numerous ludicrous errors exposed by Diana Price (*Elizabethan Review*, autumn 1996). Another said he did not object to psychic research and would hire his own medium when the time was right. And a much junior third likened the Tudor Rose methodology favorably to the logical method of Oxfordian founder J. Thomas Looney (see *The Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter*, Winter 1997). At this point, a bit of remedial education seems in order.

I

The modern post-1856 anti-Stratfordian movement was militantly rationalistic in its origins, and since then predominantly secularist in its presentation. As Geoffrey Ashe pointed out in the *Catholic World* during the early 50's, no conspicuous Roman Catholic anti-Stratfordian had yet emerged. He missed two eminent Dublin Jesuits, Fathers William Sutton (1904) and G. O'Neill (1909) who went for Bacon, but the statement is substantially correct.¹

Both 19th century Stratfordians and anti-Stratfordians, whether rationalist or not, were primarily armchair textual critics—Justice Nathaniel Holmes's utilization of the then newly discovered Northumberland Manuscript, and Mrs. Constance Pott's decidedly amateurish but laborious edition of Bacon's *Promus* being the honorable early exceptions. The lady had a preface from academic specialist E. A. Abbott who understandably found her *Romeo and Juliet* parallels striking.² Agnostic Appleton Morgan's trail-blazing *The Shakespeare Myth* (1884), and a long series of Baconian books by legalist Edwin Reed (late-1880's to early 1900's) received widespread recognition through the United States and parts of Europe. Morgan went on to become president of the ultra-respectable Shakespeare Society of New York.

1887 saw the first (and still one of the two best) efforts to comprehensively re-interpret the Baconian theory against a broader background of Elizabethan literature by a still very young solicitor, E. J. Smithson.³ He was followed in 1903 by the eminent antiquarian Rev. Walter Begley's *Is It Shakespeare?* (London, 1903). Despite the prestigious imprimatur of Darwin's publisher, John Murray, Begley likewise found it expedient to mask his identity under the pseudonym "A Graduate of Cambridge." He garnered a mass of little-known historical information linking Bacon to theatrical and poetical activity of his time and also first published documents which implied Bacon's homosexuality, thereby becoming the first modern scholar (as distinct from the Swineburne-Wilde literary cliques) to argue that a rational interpretation of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* was dependent on this alleged fact. In so doing, Begley set aside, while for the first time calling attention to, the thesis of Samuel Smith Travers of Tasmania, who had argued in the early 1880's that the *Sonnets* were addressed to an illegitimate son.⁴

As in the case of Smithson, a projected greater work never appeared, due to the onset of Begley's terminal blindness. His three-volume *Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio* (1905) is essentially a useful compendium of raw notes for what might have proved a much finer book. One of the most tantalizing sections calls attention to the utterly unknown registration, October 22, 1593, of Thomas Edwards's *Cephalus and Proclus. Narcissus*. (The only surviving copy is dated 1595.)

Edwards introduced a series of his contemporary writers under the names of their recent creations, i.e. Leander, Marlowe; Amyntas, Watson; Colin Clout, Spenser; Adon, Shakespeare. It is the second oldest reference to *Venus*

and *Adonis*, and the first allusion to its author.⁵ Begley identified Adon as Francis Bacon, as he had earlier, and very successfully, identified Bacon as Labeo.⁶ However, he adds that “some” unnamed critics had identified Adon with Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford. “Some,” on reference back to the Roxburghe edition, proves to be the great scholar Edward Dowden of Trinity, Dublin, in a letter to Furnivall of *OED* fame.⁷ Dowden, apparently realizing the consequences of his identification, did not care or dare to publish it himself.

Begley’s first work passed unreviewed by the Bacon Society. (The now matriarchal Mrs. Pott never forgave him for opening the question of Bacon’s homosexuality.) But his research formed a cornerstone of a freelance Baconian movement that included the late Chief Justice, Lord Penzance; Thomas Webb, Regius Professor of Law, Trinity; qualified academics in Holland and Germany; and the American scholar James Phinney Baxter, whose grandson would assume the presidency of Harvard. But the Bacon Society, having barred its collective doors to the historicism of Begley and Smithson, succumbed post-World War I to a perhaps inevitable occultist reaction.

The counter-current had been working since the late 1880’s, when Orville Owen, a well-known Detroit dentist and highly placed Mason, received a dream revelation from Francis Bacon. Owen was commanded to construct a great wheel on which were to be attached Bacon’s collected works, i.e., Shakespeare, Marlowe, parts of Greene and Peele, Spenser, and Robert Burton. Using the pre-computer technique entrusted to him, Owen would find the proof that Bacon and Essex were the sons of Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Leicester, as well as proof of many other state secrets.⁸ Owen’s visitor neglected to tell him that he was also founder of the Rosicrucians as well as the Masons, but other Royal Birth enthusiasts were only too happy to provide the requisite revelations. In 1910, with financial backing from wealthy Massachusetts Masons, Owen opened a five-year archeological dig at varying locations under and along the River Wye. He failed to find either the sixty boxes of Bacon manuscripts or the Holy Grail which was buried with them. But the end of the Great War found his second-hand disciples a majority in the Bacon Society, the same Bacon Society which had, under sober leadership, formally condemned the Cipher theories in 1900.⁹

In the meantime, neo-Baconianism had received an unexpected push from a calculating and uncaring ally, Mrs. Annie Besant, a former leftist free-thinker and, post-1909, the dictatorial head of the Theosophical Society, in Adyar, India. Until the 1930’s, she remained one of the most politically influential women in the world. Unfortunately, as she claimed supernatural as well as temporal powers, Dr. Owen received no acknowledgment whatsoever when she added Francis Bacon to the ranks of the Theosophical Society’s Masters of Wisdom. Still, a lot of Adyar true believers drifted into the formal Bacon organization, and they determined where the power structure would remain for thirty more years. Perhaps the real question in Baconianism during this period

was not “who wrote Shakespeare?” but “is the Bacon Society to become a scholarly society with a lunatic fringe or a lunatic core with a scholarly fringe?”¹⁰

True, the Bacon Society had once tried to stay the messianic tide, but it was Mrs. Pott herself who, as early as 1888, had postulated that Bacon founded the Rosy Cross.¹¹ And she, like some 19th century Charles Hamilton or Donald Foster, was only too happy to expand her super-hero’s holy canon *ad infinitum* on spurious “scientific principles.”

Baconian intellectuals, including Owen’s supporters Mrs. Elizabeth Wells Gallup¹² and James Phinney Baxter, distanced themselves as far as possible from this appalling metamorphosis. But the interim mantle of what was now neo-Baconianism passed from Frank and Parker Woodward directly to Alfred Dodd, another Mason and enthusiastic spiritualist who contributed a series of very influential books on the subject between 1931 and 1949. These were widely distributed by the Theosophical (Adyar-Besant branch), occultist, and fringe Masonic circles. (On the Woodwards, see further my Postscripts, “Rose Upon the Rood of Time” and “Lilies that Fester.”) They have much for which to answer.

Dodd’s first major work, *The Personal Poems of Francis Bacon* (Liverpool, 1931),¹³ was to run through ten editions in fourteen years, and reached a receptive public far beyond the normal milieu of neo-Baconianism. In place of Begley’s tormented homosexual, Dodd gave his readers a Tudor heir, eventually martyred by the evil state which had deprived him of his rightful throne, but, like Christ, taking on the role of invisible king through his holy Masonic and Rosicrucian assemblies. Dodd supported his expansion of Owen with a revised Sonnet sequence that placed more appropriate emphasis on Tudor- and Rosicrucian-Roses.¹⁴

In the early 20’s, E. W. Smithson, believing that there were too few intelligent readers anymore (and even fewer among Baconians), put a bullet through his head; a friend and sincere admirer, Sir George Greenwood, edited the all-too-brief remains of twenty-five years worth of unassuming labour as *Baconian Essays* (London: Cecil Palmer, 1922). Free-thinker Greenwood had already written *The Shakespeare Problem Restated* (1908) in reaction to this growing and ominous tide, and perhaps, his friend’s suicide spurred him to accept the Presidency of the newly-formed, and then non-partisan Shakespeare Fellowship in 1922, at the invitation of its organizer, Col. B. R. Ward *père*. By the time the more reasonable Baconians regained control of their Society in the early fifties, the irreparable public damage was long done, and major intellectual interest shifted almost entirely to the Shakespeare Fellowship. G. R. S. Mead, the old Theosophical Society’s one internationally known scholar, lost the fight for honesty and reason to Besant in 1909, but continued to publish good maverick Shakespearean scholarship (Col. Ward, Roderick Eagle, G. Wilson Knight, and Caroline Spurgeon) in his *Quest* magazine throughout the 1920’s.

It was in 1930 that the first signs of counter-culture appeared, innocently enough, in the Shakespeare Fellowship.¹⁵ Three of the second-generation Oxfordians, Capt. B. M. Ward *films*, the well-known drama critic Percy Allen, and Gerald Phillips publicly rejected Henry Southampton as The Fair Youth of the *Sonnets*. Now this primal identification was the absolute keystone of J. Thomas Looney's case for Edward de Vere, Southampton's prospective father-in-law, as author of the *Sonnets*.¹⁶ And it was Capt. Ward's father, Col. B. R. Ward, who had furnished the first concrete demonstration of the Oxfordian hypothesis with the discovery, July 12, 1922, of the marriage of printer's tout Mr. W. H.[all] in Hackney, August 4 (old style), 1608. This identification's endorsement by senior Stratfordian R. B. McKerrow in the *Times Literary Supplement* helped to gain Oxfordians international recognition.

Still, these younger men, two of whom had been with the Oxfordian movement for a couple of years, preferred an unknown illegitimate son by an unknown woman of rank. The son was called Will and later went on the public stage (shades of Lord Alfred Douglas!) Both Phillips and Allen, who certainly knew of Dodd's accelerating success, would shortly offer alternative sonnet arrangements more suitable to their revisionist biographies.¹⁷ They may also have known Justice Jesse Johnson's *Testimony of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (New York, 1899), which argued that a much older man had fathered the plays upon the actor William and addressed the *Sonnets* to him.

Senior Oxfordians generally ignored such hijinks,¹⁸ but B. R. Ward *père*, who edited the official Fellowship page in the *Shakespeare Pictorial*, Stratford, hoped to steer the younger generation in a different direction without calling further public attention to their delinquency. The opportunity came quickly when an orthodox Stratfordian reviewer, D. Willoughby, writing in the *Saturday Review*, May 2, 1931, (firstly) offered the opinion that the Oxfordians had a "fighting case" but for lack of literary sensibility and psychological apprehension were not fighting it. "For greater quarry let them look in the direction of Anne Vavasour, that dubious maid of dubious honour. . . . Already she is a more substantial figure than Mary Fitton, yet of her shining possibilities scarcely anything so far has been made."

On July 12, 1931, (secondly) Percy Allen, following Looney, hypothesized "in view of the fact that Sir Thomas Knyvet, who fought a duel with Oxford in 1582, can be identified with Tybalt who fights a duel with Romeo; and that Tybalt was a Capulet and kinsman of Juliet; I confidently anticipate we shall find that Sir Thomas Knyvet was a relative, and not as has been previously assumed a lover, of Anne Vavasour."¹⁹

Col. Ward *père*, recollecting that it was exactly nine years to the day since he discovered William Hall, sent his son over to Surrey to inspect a recently announced collection of de Knevett archives. It took less than five minutes on July 16, 1931 (thirdly) to ascertain that Tom (Tybalt is King of Cats) Knyvet's sister Henrietta was the mother of Anne Vavasour and grandmother to the

changeling boy that Anne bore to Edward de Vere in 1580, thereby precipitating a new war of Montegues and Capulets through the streets of London. Col. Ward had it in print for his August issue.

Since Allen had already committed himself to the thesis that a part of the sonnets were addressed to a child,²⁰ the theoretical ten to twelve year old contemporary of Southampton should have been the next grist for his mill in the then unlikely event that Oxford's still nameless son could be identified after 350 years. He and Capt. Ward *filed* chose not to wait. Now, the publication of Canon Gerald Rendall's *Shakespeare's Sonnets and Edward de Vere* (1930) had already confirmed the wisdom of Looney's original appraisal. Largely due to Rendall's senior status in British academic circles, Oxfordian books, including Allen's, were generally received with respect throughout the 1930's.²¹ The first hard-covered reply to Oxfordian claims, John Drinkwater's *Shakespeare*, came out in approximately February 1933 and is reviewed by Allen's friend, Marjorie Bowen in the April *Shakespeare Pictorial*.²²

At some unknown period between then and the Shakespeare Fellowship dinner on May 16th, 1933, Percy and Ernest Allen jointly wrote and published a small hard-bound book of sixty-nine pages, *Lord Oxford and Shakespeare: A Reply to John Drinkwater* (London: Dennis Archer, 1933). In the course of that work (one of the rarest of Oxfordian memorabilia), the Allens stated with "certainty" that Southampton was the son of Queen Elizabeth, born "probably" in 1574 (*op. cit.*, pp. 24-5, 40-2, 65). The anonymous source of Allen's certitude was Capt. B. M. Ward *filed*, as revealed in a memoir two years after:

By far the most striking arguments raised by Mr. Phillips, throughout the book [*Sunlight on Shakespeare's Sonnets*, 1935], are those by which he seeks, very skillfully, to show that the words "Truth" and "Beauty," in these poems, seem often to stand for the boy's father (Vere), and his mother; and that the frequent references to the "sun" almost invariably mean "son." . . . They have been "in the air" for several years past; and taking up my own annotated copy of the sonnets, I find the following entries, made in ink, beneath sonnet one, *some two years ago*, [emphasis added] after a talk with Capt. Ward:

"True" and "Truth" are Lord Oxford; "Beauty" is Queen Elizabeth.

"Time" is the Royal Succession, and "Rose" is the Tudor Rose.

As for the interpretation of sonnet XXXIII:—

Even so my sun (son) one early morn did shine
With all triumphant splendour on my brow —

it was at a Shakespeare Fellowship dinner, two years ago [emphasis added], that I read aloud, and put that meaning upon the 33rd sonnet. Questions of precedence are, however, unimportant and secondary.²³

Actually, a question of precedence is quite important here. John Drinkwater is reviewed in the April *Shakespeare Pictorial*, with no allusion to the forthcoming reply by Percy Allen; this proof copy could have been submitted as late as March 15, 1933. Col. Ward *père* had covered nearly every issue since he began editing the Oxfordian page in January 1929. Had he been physically able, he would obviously have replied himself to the first hard-cover critique of Oxfordian claims ever made. Instead, Col. Ward *père* was replaced as of the March issue by Marjorie Bowen. Ward's death occurred on April 30, 1933.

In unleashing the incestuous²⁴ Tudor Rose theory surreptitiously through Percy Allen within, at most, two weeks of his father's death, Capt. Ward *fils* was steering down an Oxfordian road that Sigmund Freud had declined to travel.²⁵ The son had just assumed the dead father's position, and within two weeks of that father's death, on the first public occasion available, he simultaneously destroyed the two historical Sonnet theses (Anne Vavasour and, by inference, William Hall), on which his father's reputation rested. To make the situation worse, the displacement of the father was effected by a direct and unacknowledged graft from the henbane of mad Baconianism that his father had organized the Fellowship to combat. Percy Allen agreed to play the role of "Will Shakspere" and anonymously mouthed the offending words at the funeral banquet.

Significantly, Capt. Ward did not report Allen's Tudor Rose "discovery" (in fact, his own discovery) in the two-column account of that May 16th dinner which was published adjacent to his father's obituary and portrait on pp. 16-17 of the *Shakespeare Pictorial*, July 1933. Nor is *Lord Oxford and Shakespeare* ever mentioned again by an English Oxfordian.

The phrase "Tudor Rose," rallying cry of all neo- and post-Oxfordians, comes directly from Dodd (*op. cit.*, p. 30 last line, and again, p. 43 last line). On this second occasion, Dodd places it directly opposite a citation from *The Phoenix and the Turtle* and two citations of "Truth" with capital letters (p. 42), of which we have heard much further reiteration by neo-Oxfordians. Allen, in 1935, still did not know whence his friend was deriving his theories.

When Allen did publish *Anne Cecil, Elizabeth, and Oxford* (London: Dennis Archer, 1934) without mention of Southampton, he curiously based his argument for an illegitimate Tudor heir on *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, where Oberon and Titania quarrel for possession of the little changeling boy.²⁶ Since it is explicitly stated by Titania that the mother is "a votress of my order," the only logical reading for an historicist critic would be a reference to the illegitimate child by Anne Vavasour. There simply were not all that many bastards being produced by Elizabeth's ladies-in-waiting. None, in fact, till

another Dark Lady nominee, Mary Fitton, did the service for William, Earl of Pembroke.

In other words, Ward *films* and Allen fostered a perverse textual misreading which set back by over a decade the system of historical exegesis which Looney, Col. Ward *père*, and many other Oxfordian scholars had already been applying with success for fifteen years. Since Anne Vavasour rapidly disappeared from the English Oxfordian scene, vice-president Abel LeFranc was still unaware of the link when he wrote his comprehensive study of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in 1945.²⁷

So Capt. Ward *films* waited one more year (1935) to finally take responsibility for the potential slaying of the father figure, and in the very act of confessing (again indirectly through the pen of Percy Allen), he repudiated his intention of doing anything of the kind. Allen writes, "I . . . in collaboration with Capt. B. M. Ward have a study of the subject [the Sonnets] in draft . . . Further Phillips, Ward, and myself all agree with Lord Alfred Douglas, that the fair youth became an actor. If that be so — *and the evidence to me seems conclusive — that youth cannot have been Southampton, Pembroke, nor any other peer* [emphasis added]."²⁸

Nevertheless, when, after much further procrastination, the small pamphlet did appear, it was not noted in either the *Times* or *The Shakespeare Pictorial*.²⁹ The nine-year run of the *American Fellowship News-Letter cum Quarterly*, which later gave Capt. Ward a lengthy obituary, never referred to it. Did Ward secretly wish to kill a misconceived child even as he brought it into the world?

By then an unexpected and unknowing surrogate heir³⁰ was already claiming the father's newly discarded funeral meats. Charles Wisner Barrell appeared in England in late 1934 to early 1935, hot on the trail of the bastard Vere. As he later described it:

This was the beginning of a seven-years search which has led through the dusty files of the Public Records Office and Somerset House, various Courts of Chancery, Queen's Bench, Prerogative and Request, among the yellowing pages of many thousands of volumes of genealogical records, State Papers, personal letters, diaries, armorial devices, biographic commentaries, histories — and finally to privately-owned collections of Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits.

As a result of this gradgrindish pursuit of fact, I acquired much gray hair, permanent eyestrain and a bad disposition, but at the same time I may say without false modesty that I emerged from the long and continued paper-chase with documentation that appears to play a vital part in the permanent identification of Edward de Vere.

Complete corroboration of Mr. Looney's pioneer studies is now available.³¹

Barrell published a small portion of his documentation in a six-part preliminary paper which appeared in the *Shakespeare Fellowship News-Letter*, Dec. 1941 to Oct. 1942.³²

The April '42, no. 3, Barrell Part III reached J. Thomas Looney on May 15. Looney immediately replied:

I have read this the critical chapter of your Sonnet researches with a more absorbing interest than I have read anything else for quite a long while. You have certainly fulfilled every promise and expectation suggested in the preliminary articles, and I congratulate you most heartily on a very notable elucidation of the age-long Sonnets Mystery. This and your unique work on the Shakespeare portraits will, I am confident, give your name an enduring and prominent place in the history of Shakespearean research.

Thanks to your very capable "sleuth-work," as you call it, the perplexing enigmas of the Sonnets have been finally resolved. At long last the Dark Lady and the Fair Youth — or, as we must now say the *two youths* [original emphasis] — have been brought forth out of the shadows and made to stand in the full light of day. It is an outstanding event in literary history, and the honour belongs wholly to you. I sincerely trust that you will live to see your discoveries take their rightful place in Shakespeare annals and your labour recognised as they deserve.

In view of your disclosures respecting Anne Vavasour's relationship with the Earl of Oxford and her whole career, I suggest that you re-read his poem on *Women* which furnished the first clue to Shakespeare's identity and set going the whole Oxford movement. Every word of the poem seems to point directly to her personally . . . Incidentally I would mention that the lady in his "Echo Poem," which is also given in full in "*Shakespeare*" *Identified* was Anne Vavasour. This is indicated at the lead of the poem, but as I knew nothing of this lady at the time, the words were unintelligible. . . . Now, of course, everything is perfectly clear.

It is unpleasant that our Shakespeare researches should compel us to stir up so much Elizabethan mud, but when we have settled down to the new viewpoint, we shall be able to enjoy the literature just as we are able to read the poems of Burns, Byron and Shelley without an

undue consciousness of their irregularities. In the Oxford-Shakespeare case there is at any rate the satisfaction, in bringing forward one set of irregularities, that suspicions of worse irregularities seem to be conclusively disposed of.

May I take the liberty of commenting upon one minor point in the early part of the article, which, however, in no way affects your argument. On page 28 you make reference to Henry Howard as the Iago of Oxford's matrimonial rupture, just as it is suggested in Captain Ward's life. In "*Shakespeare Identified*" I refer to Oxford's receiver as the Iago of the tangle. This however was not a mere supposition: it actually appears in the Burghley documents dealing with the rupture: a document which is published in the "Hatfield MSS." Captain Ward had in some way overlooked this very relevant memorandum of Burghley's; hence his theory about Henry Howard. Oxford's receiver as Iago, furnishes one of the strongest points in the *Othello* argument, whilst Iago's repeated: "Put money in thy purse," and his oft-quoted speech: "Who steals my purse, &c.," is so evidently suggestive of the receiver's functions as to place the matter beyond doubt, if Burghley's memorandum had left any room for such doubt. So explicit, however, is Burghley's statement upon the point, that it was Oxford's receiver who had aroused suspicion and that the trouble had arisen "through the double dealing of servants," that I should consider the *Receiver-Iago* identification as strong, probably, as any that I have established.

I am sorry that being cut off from the necessary books and papers, I am unable to furnish the precise references, but if the Calendared Hatfield MSS. are accessible, there should be no difficulty in locating the particular document.

I should be much obliged if you would find a means of making the correction in the pages of the *News-Letter* sometime, as I consider the *Othello* argument of special importance and the *receiver as Iago* a vital part of it.³³

This is one of Looney's finest hours. It is to be regretted that Charlton Ogburn, Jr., in *The Mysterious William Shakespeare*, managed, by following in the steps of his parents, to confound Looney utterly with this mishmash: "The villain of the drama became Oxford's receiver, Rowland Yorke, with Henry Howard added to him: 'Iago' is almost [!] a transliteration of 'Y-orke.'"³⁴ He does equally badly with Col. Ward's William Hall argument ("I cannot see the publisher of the *Sonnets* dedicating . . . to the likes of William Hall . . . even if

he was about to be married, as we are told that Hall was.”)³⁵ Mr. Ogburn *filis* does not appear to know that Hall was associated with Thorpe in previous raids on the papers of dead Catholics; further, that as Hall married on August 4, 1608, and the *Sonnets* were registered on May 20, 1609, the word “begetter” reflects the precise nine month difference necessary to beget an heir; and finally, that Thorpe acted with obvious malice aforethought toward the original author in appending the fraudulent and satirical *Lover’s Complaint* to his publication, a final *coup de grâce* in a book opened with a gloating dedication to long-time fellow pillager William Hall. And there are many other instances where Mr. Ogburn has followed his parents’ romantic suggestivism to the detriment of Looney’s demand for a rigorously demonstrable objective correlative to any opinions that the reader might first have subjectively conceived.³⁶

The only hard-cover writers, since the senior Ogburns published in 1952, who attempt to get back to Looney’s original historical constructionism are Abraham Bronson Feldman, his student Warren Hope, and Dr. Ruth Loyd and Judge Minos Miller, deriving from Charles Wisner Barrell. Both generations of Ogburns did splendid work, but paradoxically, by virtue of being better *littérateurs* than their followers, or often their critics, they have frequently exerted a very bad influence on emotionally excitable people who do not appreciate the finer nuances, or indeed the role, of the romantic imagination.

Barrell’s “impressive evidence” received a solid endorsement from Col. M. W. Douglas, president of the English Fellowship (*Fellowship News-Letter*, May 1943, 2-3):

The opinion has long been current among supporters of the Oxford theory that there was a second youth, in addition to Southampton; whether a natural son, or Henry de Vere the son and heir of the author, named perhaps after Henry Southampton, or one of Royal descent. *The third hypothesis has been considered and rejected by Mr. Barrell [emphasis added].*

...
The *Sonnets* are the cornerstone of the Oxford Shakespeare fabric... The solution of the riddle was commenced by Mr. J. T. Looney, and has been continued by the late Colonel Ward, Dr. Rendall and Mr. Percy Allen.

Mr. Barrell has contributed much important evidence which goes far to establish the identity of the prominent characters.

Capt. Ward *filis* is conspicuous by his absence from a short list. Could it be that Capt. Ward had finally rid himself of the pernicious influence of Alfred Dodd and this is why Col. Douglas appealed to the often wavering Allen, the last known Southamptonite, to re-adapt his 1930 Baby Henry de Vere theory,

from which something could still be salvaged?

Too late. Allen was receiving other —and higher — advice. He inserted a notice directly beneath Douglas's remarks stating that he was himself already at work on "a detailed review of the whole case" which he had not attempted before.

That result, entitled *The Dark Lady and Fair Youth of the Sonnets*, was finished in the summer of 1943, and is now apparently lost. A 12,000-word epitome, limited to 70 copies, appeared in typescript sometime between late fall and winter, 1943-44.³⁷ The prospectus described "evidence from Elizabethan plays and poems . . . strongly supported by an examination of certain contemporary portraits and prints, including the Ditchley portrait of Queen Elizabeth (1592)³⁸, and Camden's print of her funeral procession (1603). Barclay's allegorical romance, *Argenis* (1621) also supplies corroborative evidence."³⁹ But readers received from the prospectus no advance hint that Shakespeare's son was heir to the throne. This was the first time — after eleven years of promises — that a complete exposition of the Royal Birth theory hit print. It sold out within three months and sank without a ripple. No one, save Dorothy Ogburn, is on record as ever reading it again. However, much of its content can be reconstituted from Allen's even stranger and final work, *Talks with Elizabethans* (London: Rider & Co., n.d. [1946]).

Percy Allen had published no less than seven books and two pamphlets on the Oxfordian case between 1928 and 1934. The next eight years saw him a nearly ruined man: disastrous depression investments, the death of his beloved twin brother Ernest on their birthday in October 1939, the loss of an eye, a physical assault by thieves, separation from his family, flights from bombings. He had not written in eight years. His old friend Capt. Ward, with whom he had formerly wintered, became a militant Stalinist and had literally gone underground (i.e., chose to live in a basement as a mark of solidarity with the working class).

Fortunately, another old friend resurfaced in 1939, Fredrick Bligh Bond, a gifted, ardent, and quixotic archeologist, psychological researcher, and most recently, an Oxfordian. By 1942, he had steered Allen to one of his most remarkable psychic finds, the automatic writer Hester Dowden (daughter of the great Shakespearean scholar Edward Dowden of Trinity), adviser to many internationally famous literary people. The Wilde family, the James family, W. B. Yeats, Thomas Wolfe, the Prime Minister of Canada and Stratfordian guru G. Wilson Knight, among others, passed through Mrs. Dowden's door.⁴⁰ She had not raised her fee since the First World War, and kept no records; all automatic scripts became the sole property of the sitters. To eke out her income, she boarded an occasional artist in her comfortable home off Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, London.

In 1936, Baconian Alfred Dodd, who did not foresee that he would raise seventy years of hell in the opposition camp, had already gone to the same

psychic to communicate with his Master Francis, but the infuriated medium had turned both Dodd and his spirit guide out of her house, and, she thought then, her life. She frankly told him, "My father . . . and Judge Webb used to argue over the problem when I was a little child. My father never believed it, and he was impartial and honest. And I cannot believe it. I am sick of this controversy. It cost my father a fortune in research and books. He spent a lifetime in the study." And further, when Dodd remonstrated, she added, "I am aware that my hand has written something contrary to my views, but that does not imply that I am to change my opinions for yours. Oh, no! I simply do not want to trouble myself about the matter."⁴¹

Percy Allen went to Hester Dowden to talk with, not Shakespeare, but his late brother Ernest. He continued to go back to Hester for at least three years, having conversations — through her control Johannes — with a second Francis Bacon, a first Will Shakspeare, and Edward de Vere. These conversations began on Dec. 15, 1942, and the last published example is from September 1945.

More than one client had done well by Hester Dowden's counsel and, in the beginning, Allen was no exception. His sudden creative outburst in the summer and fall of '43 (he did a second, now also missing manuscript on *Bacon's Share in Shakespeare* in 1944) was the direct result of Edward de Vere's assurance that Southampton was indeed his son by Elizabeth; but in place of the dark incest out of which the Tudor Rose theory was born, Mrs. Dowden gave Allen a clear vision of "Father, mother, son, that's how all stories, natural or supernatural, run," as her lifelong friend, W. B. Yeats, had put it.⁴²

Automatic writing aside, Mrs. Dowden had suffered for many years from intense literary inhibition. In 1917, she had produced a complete translation from the German of the romantic poet Grillpanzer's *Hero and Leander*. It remained unpublished. Now, after many years, she was moved to poetry herself. She — or something using three fingers of her left hand — produced four competent fourteen-liners. The last and best was written in less than an hour in the early morning of August 20, '45.⁴³ Lord Oxford considered it the best proof of his identity (it took three sonnets to warm up, as he had not composed for earthlings in centuries). Shakespearean? Well, a moving, ebullient, sonnet certainly. Probably the best ever written by a lady past seventy with three fingers in less than an hour.

I remember Dorothy Ogburn reciting it to me. This was the first and only time I received any indication that she knew of the Allen séances. Her eyes glowed and her voice lilted. It was approximately summer 1967. Dorothy was an excellent judge of good theatre and performable poetry, an excellent performer herself in very small groups, like Hester Dowden:

When from the star-strewn heavens I gaze around,
And mark the narrow compass of the Earth,
Small as an atom in the sunlight drowned——

I marvel how within such narrow girth
My love for thee found sustenance and space;
The wine too close was housed, too small the cup;
My precious draught o'erflowed the narrow place,
Lost all its perfumed flavour, soon dried up.
Now has my love found her true path of grace;
Deep in thy soul she hides herself and me.
Here is no fear of time, of age no trace;
Forever of restraining fetters free——
 So we enjoy the glory of the sun,
 In sure affinity — for we are one.

“You know,” she said hesitantly, slightly embarrassed now, but still glowing, “it’s almost like a religion.” Yes indeed, but I refrained from explicating to her Yeats and his circles’ studies in Celtic Sophiology.⁴⁴ Still, from that moment forward (though I asked no questions), I was always haunted by the conviction that if Dorothy had not loved this sonnet, the *second* Tudor Rose movement would have died aborning like the first.

II

The Shakespeare Fellowship elected Percy Allen to its leadership on August 22, 1945 with acclamation and unanimity, unaware of the revelations he would soon publish. Now the blessed recipients of psychic gifts are often exalted only to be swiftly struck down, as Bligh Bond had previously discovered at Glastonbury.⁴⁵

Allen returned his scripts to Mrs. Dowden for further annotation and she, contrary to her normal practice, agreed to further help a man who had become as much a friend as a professional therapist dare allow a client to become. She quickly saw that the communicators were not all what they professed to be. Will Shakspeare, among others, made the blatant historical howler that John Fletcher wrote *Titus Andronicus*, and soon after, *The Taming of the Shrew* in the early 1590’s, when Fletcher was a provincial schoolboy. Conscious Hester, who kept copies of most Elizabethan dramatists (one of her few inheritances from her father whose ruinous collecting habits brought the family to near penury) and who would readily travel a hundred miles to view a rare Jacobean revival, knew this well. The subconscious communicators had displaced time by at least fifteen years; perhaps they remembered that late Fletcher had written *The Tamer Tamed*, a pre-feminist sequel to *The Taming of the Shrew*. Or had the control Johannes gone out of control as badly as he did in the Dodd case, in 1936?

Allen, who in a less bemused state, could have recognized such gaffes himself, would not be stayed. He published his book, *Talks with Elizabethans*, with a preface absolving Mrs. Dowden of responsibility, but not warning

readers about the misinformation.⁴⁶ On the affirmative side, his two appendices based on his unpublished *Who Were the Dark Lady and Fair Youth?* contained some admirably suggestive sonnet readings, notably the relation of sonnet #121 to *Hamlet*. It likewise contained his identification of Avisia of *Willobie His Avisia* fame as Elizabeth Tudor, for which he was, years after, ripped off without the slightest acknowledgment by a Stratfordian researcher who then took a scholastic award on her only slightly covert claim that Will Shakspeare numbered himself among the Queen's suitors.⁴⁷

An *ad hoc* meeting of under twenty Oxfordians swiftly followed the publication of Allen's *Talks with Elizabethans* (1946). Allen, their leader who had been elected less than a year earlier as "pre-eminently marked out by his investigations, writings, and lectures, as successor to the Presidential chair. . . with acclamation and unanimity," was unanimously removed as head of the Fellowship, not, as report has it, for indulging in psychical activity but for embarrassing the Fellowship with an irresponsibly researched book. He continued his usual energetic Oxfordian activities for a few more months but gradually lapsed from sight. One further brief lecture appeared in the *English Newsletter*, 1950.

When Hester Dowden died a few years later, the broken Allen re-appeared to beg, at any price, the possession of her planchette, by which he believed he could, without benefit of medium, contact his lost friends. Her daughter, Mrs. Lennox Robinson, was moved by Allen's plight but also blamed Allen for compromising her mother. Fighting down her mixed emotions, she told him, "No. It is ended," and placed the offending and desired instrument on top of her mother's body to be burnt with her.⁴⁸

It is uncertain when the Americans Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn, who would next launch this nearly defunct theory onto a national publicity drive, first contacted Allen. In their book, they acknowledged that there were only two other Oxfordians who shared their belief, "Mr. Allen and, toward the end of his life, Capt. B. M. Ward," but "it must, however, be stated that we had arrived at the conclusion that Southampton was the son of Oxford and the Queen almost a year before we heard that anyone else had entertained the suspicion."⁴⁹

Now there are a surprising number of deplorable historical gaps and inaccuracies in this naïve statement. First, as has been seen, Capt. Ward *files*, not Percy Allen, founded the Tudor Rose theory, as stated in *The Shakespeare Pictorial*, available since 1935 in the New York Public Library. Second, Ward was not then late in life but thirty-nine years of age. Late in life, he was promulgating a bizarre power theory — and fighting D-Day on the beaches of Normandy. Third, the only previous hard-bound version of the Southampton claim, *Lord Oxford and Shakespeare*, has been in the New York Public Library since 1933, along with every other book written by Percy Allen on Shakespeare up to 1934. Only one, *The Life Story of Edward de Vere as Shakespeare*, is cited in the Ogburn's bibliography.⁵⁰ It is surprising if the Ogburns never bothered

to check back on their readily available predecessor in the six years between 1946, when they discovered there was a prior Southampton theory, and 1952 when they published.⁵¹ Finally, the undated Allen-Ward *Enquiry*, which is the only other Allen work in the bibliography, is cited a single time in the text, and classified so carelessly that an unforewarned reader would naturally think that the Ogburns were quoting from a single pamphlet which title they had slightly varied, rather than utilizing two quite distinct publications, which were not certainly ever in their possession simultaneously.

Evidently the Ogburns did little or nothing to enlighten themselves concerning the little that there was to be known about the Southampton arguments till a very late stage in their labors, though they were certainly exposed to the Royal Birth theory near the beginning of their relatively brief period in formal Oxfordian circles. The first notice of Dorothy Ogburn in the *Fellowship News-Letter* (January 1945, p. 2) quotes her as, justly, praising Charles Wisner Barrell for his "brilliance and scholarship. . . . I am amazed by the scores of your references, as well as the keenness of your perceptions." Barrell had cited and dismissed the Royal Birth theory in his Sonnet article (August 1942, 64). Looney's endorsement of Barrell appeared posthumously only eight months earlier in the April '44 issue.

If the Ogburns became aware of the Royal Birth theory without originally connecting it to the Earl of Southampton, it is strange they never bothered to ask their then-friend, Charles Wisner Barrell, as by whom or under what circumstances this Royal Birth theory was being applied and discussed. Of course, had the senior Ogburns, without evidence, made the same intellectual pre-suppositions from which Phillips, Ward, and Allen all originally proceeded, Dorothy's extraordinarily quick and metaphorically perceptive mind would readily reach the same conclusion. If you can have only one Fair Youth (contra Looney) and there is only one Royal Birth (contra the neo-Baconians), who else can you nominate except Southampton? Still, the fact that they apparently did not check with Barrell suggests that they first attached relatively small importance to their independent discovery.

The one year which elapsed between the time that the Ogburns independently conceived the Southampton theory and, on their own statement, the time that they learned of the Allen—Ward thesis, must extend roughly from a period at the end of February '45 forward to late '45 or Feb.-March '46, because the Ogburns's run of the *English News-Letters* (now in the author's possession) begins with March 1946, and this contains the news of Allen's demotion. Contact would inevitably have followed first word of the only other living Southamptonite.

*Who Were the Dark Lady and Fair Youth?*⁵² had long since sold out, and the fact that the Ogburns directly cite it only in the very late pages of their book and do not incorporate it into their bibliography, indicates that it was not the source of their certitude. Since they never saw *The Shakespeare Pictorial* or the

earlier Allen pamphlet, *Lord Oxford and Shakespeare*, the only possible printed matter available to them on Royal Birth theory was the just-published *Talks With Elizabethans*, which offered potted summaries of the arguments both pre-dating and post-dating the 1943 private issue.

When Charlton Ogburn, Jr. for once joined forces with Samuel Schoenbaum in striking a happy medium, he described Allen as suffering “the mental debility that sometimes comes with advanced old age” [he was not yet in his seventies and lived till 1958] when he “wrote about séances in which the spirits . . . had speaking parts” [Mrs. Dowden was an automatic writer]. He obviously did not know that these memoirs of the pseudo-Will Shaksperre under the uncontrollable control Johannes are the stuff of which the Tudor Rose theory was reborn.⁵³

Ms. Price (*op. cit.*, 4-13) provided a solid alibi for Elizabeth at the time of her alleged delivery, and understandably censures the Ogburns for faulty research. However, according to Gerald Phillips, who had been following the Royal Birth theory from its start, the Ogburns are directly indebted to Ward and Allen for their non-research (cited by Warren Hope & Kim Holston, *The Shakespeare Controversy*, Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1992, p. 131). If the ordinarily reliable Ward, not the Ogburns, muffed his long years of opportunity so badly here, it is yet another indication of how obsessed he was by his symbol. But, if Dorothy Ogburn was deceived by over trusting a usually reliable English source, she fared even worse when resorting to American historian William Kittle, whose posthumous *Edward De Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford and Shakespeare* (Baltimore: Monumental Printing Co., 1942) contains the warning that the author died before editing his considerable historical researches. How badly the book needed editing, which the senior Ogburns and the neo-Oxfordians failed to give it, has been shown by Ms. Price (*op. cit.*, 17-18).

In the early 30's, Mr. Kittle published a totally ignored book identifying Oxford as the author George Gascoigne, a thesis taken up by the elder Ogburns (*op. cit.*, p. 823, p. 1258) in a strictly modified form: Oxford wrote everything not signed by Gascoigne in *An Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. Dorothy graciously presented me with her amply, censoriously annotated copy of Kittle.⁵⁴ Her use of such words as “crazy” and “absurd” on the margins is yet another indication that her incorporation of evidence from Kittle's last book was born of haste and, possibly, desperation.

Before publication of *This Star of England*,⁵⁵ the Ogburns broke once and for all with their old friend Charles Wisner Barrell, the only trained Elizabethan researcher whom they knew (he could have saved them the Kittle gaffe). They further showed their pique by reducing the *second* Edward de Vere to a single reference in a book of 1,300 pages, with no indication that they were consciously interring founder Looney as deeply beneath the “Tudor Rose” as Allen and Ward *filis* tried to bury the late Col. Ward *père* in 1933. When the English Fellowship, which did not lack trained historians, subjected *This Star* to

inevitably stringent but impersonal criticism over two issues (April and September 1953), the Ogburns responded to the entire British readership by announcing, "So long as English men and women insist on the virginity of Elizabeth Tudor, they will never establish the authorship of Edward de Vere" (*op. cit.*, April, 1954, p. 12).

From this second break, there was no turning back. They now stood utterly removed from the past. The semi-comedy became a tragedy. For reasons unknown, Barrell never published again after 1948. The few scholastically qualified students who inevitably gravitated to him rather than the Ogburns were in no position to draw widespread attention to their discoveries. For lack of any other comprehensive text, the first Ogburn book became the standard Oxfordian reference work for the next thirty years, despite the definitely superior but poorly distributed works of Dr. Ruth Loyd and Judge Minos Miller in the 1970's. And the worser half remains prominently behind.

In August 1943, Kittle's last book prompted this non-review in the American *Fellowship News-Letter* (p. 67):

The Shakespeare Fellowship disclaims extravagant theories which have no basis in documentary proof. . . . The most recent unsubstantiated claim . . . is that Lord Oxford was . . . George Gascoigne. . . . There is no reason to believe for a moment that the Earl had anything to do with any verse or prose written by George Gascoigne. . . . Evidence must be collected and it must be interpreted, but interpretations must accord due regard to facts and sane reasoning.

Well, my friends and the rest of us had fair warning.

POSTSCRIPT I

"Rose Upon the Rood of Time": Pseudo-Rosicrucianism in the Authorship Controversy

A bird's-eye view of the appendix to Alfred Dodd's *Shakespeare's Sonnet-Diary or the Personal Poems of Francis Bacon* (10th ed., Liverpool: Daily Post Printers, 1945) exposes an entire underground network of British-American pseudo-Rosicrucians. The oldest Rosicrucian authority cited by Dodd (p. 234) is Kenneth Mackenzie (1877) who assures his readers that "The Brethren of the Rosy Cross will never and should not . . . give up their Secrets. This ancient body has *apparently* disappeared from the field of human activity, but the labours are being carried on with alacrity and with a sure delight." Next cited is Dr. Wynn Wescott, then coroner of London, who in 1894 lectured before his Masonic Lodge [unidentified by Dodd], and "proved the connection between Rosicrucianism and Free Masonry, and that the unity of the Orders was a fact" (*op. cit.*, p. 234).

Now, Kenneth Mackenzie and Dr. Wynn Wescott are to Masonic criticism

what J. Payne Collier is to Shakespearean criticism: genuinely scholarly, affable, industrious, and on occasion, absolute liars and endorsers of forgeries. On the death of Mackenzie in 1886, Wescott had moved with alacrity to procure all of Mackenzie's considerable remaining papers. Largely on the basis of these documents and the probable continental sources to which he was led by them, Wescott produced a "Rosicrucian" order called The Golden Dawn founded on a forged charter from a non-existent German Rosicrucian chief. One of his most notorious breakaway members, Alistair Crowley, went on to become, among many other remarkable things, a spy for both sides during World War I. As part of his cover, he passed on his bogus Rosicrucian transmission to an American, "Dr." H. Spence Lewis, who set up shop in southern California under the initials AMORC, and became the first wealthy mail-order occult teacher in America.

It should not surprise us to find "Dr." H. Spence Lewis, Imperator for North America, assuring Alfred Dodd, "I was delighted from the very first page [of Dodd's book]. . . . We know he [Bacon] became the Imperator for the whole of Europe. We are proud to name our new Auditorium the Francis Bacon Auditorium."⁵⁶

Further, the Secretary of the Rosicrucian Lodge (AMORC, Bristol, UK) wrote, "I have read [Dodd's] book with the greatest interest . . . The present Imperator of the Order for North America possesses the most authentic evidence of Francis Bacon's Imperatorship, having access to many secret MSS of Rosicrosse tradition . . . not available to the public. . . . More I cannot say."⁵⁷ The Imperator incidentally published a life of Christ based on unavailable MSS which he saw in Tibetan monasteries: "Even Judas Iscariot left an outline of his part in the affair."

Dr. Wynn Wescott hailed from a town adjacent to Bristol, and Bristol remains a hotbed of devious Golden Dawn promotionalism, and international political aggrandizement, sometimes masquerading as scholarship, to this day.

Now, this bogus lineage extends from Mackenzie to Wescott (Golden Dawn) to Crowley to A. Spence Lewis back to Bristol AMORC, and gullible Dodd gets a double feedback, from the London and southern California branches, of the same fake information without recognizing that everything originates from the Bristol area ca. 1885, not from Renaissance German Rosicrucians or Elizabethan Masons. Dodd adds Royal Birth to the royal stew. With this boost from Dodd, Lewis, being a successful California ad-man, not a mystic, soon had Francis Bacon's picture plastered on top of Rosicrucian correspondence course ads placed in The New York Times and thence down the entire American publishing hierarchy. Pictures of many other long-dead intellectuals then further opened the gates of respectability to occultism in middle class Depression America. Copies of Dodd were promoted for years in Lewis's Francis Bacon Auditorium to people who had no interest whatsoever in Elizabethan or any other literature.

If Mrs. Dowden were aware (and she had excellent connections) that Dodd was being used as a tool by a pack of international con-men moving in on the English occult scene, it is understandable why she turned him out of her house. For the low price of the sitting (scripts became the client's sole property), Dodd — and AMORC — obtained thousands in free advertising from Britain's most respected psychic; and, after seven year's wait (1936-1943), Dodd decided to chance a belated claim on her unwilling endorsement for a carefully launched pseudo-religious campaign. Johannes countered through Mrs. Dowden-Percy Allen by bringing on a *second* Francis Bacon (who would be repudiated in his turn once he had served his purpose) to undo the damage that the Dodd-ite forces, who included the President of the Bacon Society (Bertram Theobald), were doing to the English cultural scene. But in the process of cleansing the house of one devil (it was assumed that the emergence of a second Bacon would be discretely passed about in literary-psychic circles), the door was opened to two more false spirits, i.e., Will Shakspeare and Edward de Vere. Nobody anticipated that Allen would insist on going quickly into print, and that the Baconian Royal Birth theory would thereby be re-imported into America as the Oxfordian Royal Birth theory under the aegis of occultly naïve Dorothy Ogburn.

In 1929, Dodd received corroboration from Frank and Parker Woodward on "Rosicrucian" ciphers which they had first published privately in 1915 while Dr. Owen was still excavating. But Frank Woodward, a President of the Bacon Society, was *also* a mail-order Rosicrucian and probably a member of a Masonic organization then under the control of Dr. Wynn Wescott.⁵⁸

The reader who has not had enough occultism by now may consult *The Theosophical Enlightenment* by Joscelyn Godwin (Albany: SUNY Press, 1994) to which I contributed much of my own research on Mackenzie and the origins of pseudo-Rosicrucianism, notably in Chapter 11. The reader will be introduced to finer minds than this article would suggest. But the more prudent the mind, the less likely to mingle with the neo-Baconians. For one of the few serious attempts in the twentieth century to get back to the hard structure behind all this phantasmagoria, see René Guénon's *The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times* (English tr., London: Luzac, 1946).

It has been obvious since Lefranc and Brooks that a thorough study of the Shakespeare plays in relation to (a) Hermeticism, (b) Platonism, (c) Rosicrucianism, and (d) possibly, Freemasonry would eventually be in order. However, considering the historical quagmires involved, and the lack of intellectual consensus on which to proceed, it is understandable that they did not proceed.

The one academic who did take up Lefranc (with all too scant thanks), Francis Yates, made so many sins of omission and commission that it would take an article as long as the present one to guide the beginner through them. To name no more, she ignores the large hermetic library held by Southampton's

friend, Sir Edward Dyer, only a few blocks from the Globe Theater; and also the alchemical laboratory kept by the Countess of Pembroke and Dyer in the woods behind Wilton House. Charles Nicholl's work on *King Lear* and alchemy suffers from similar problems.

I would suggest the uninformed reader start with academic A. O. Lovejoy's *The Great Chain of Being* (long out of print), and E. M. Tilyard's succinct *The Elizabethan World Picture* which shows the part that Platonism and Hermetic correspondence played in the non-initiated Elizabethan mind.

The simple fact is there are no surviving Rosicrucian rituals (German) prior to 1780 while the Freemasons, after the 18th century secularist revival, made frantic efforts to mutilate and destroy the surviving memorials of their traditionalist past. There are no pertinent Masonic rituals surviving within a hundred years of the death of William Stanley, the last plausible Shakespeare candidate. One thing official Masons certainly did not do was go around burying their manuscripts in tombs or immersing them under huge quantities of water as certain neo-Baconians and very recently neo-Oxfordians are beginning to claim.

For a reliable account of recent historical research which could link William Stanley, Oxford's son-in-law, and William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, to proto-Masonic and Rosicrucian movements see Ronald Heisler in the annual *Hermetic Journal* (London, 1994). Mr. Heisler also produced evidence for an *ur-Two Noble Kinsmen* in the early 1590's. The remaining readers of the *SOS Newsletter* will be interested to know that Heisler finds close parallels between Du Bartas's work and the Hermetic societies of the time. As both Oxford and the author of *Venus and Adonis* were interested in Du Bartas, they probably shared this further hermetic interest (cf. *SOS Newsletter*, Winter 1997). We may also note the Plato that de Vere purchased along with his Chaucer and Geneva Bible and his reference for the Greek Orthodox Rite when in Italy. But this is a long, slow road.

POSTSCRIPT II

Lilies that Fester

Yet another by-blow of the Baconian Royal Birth theory unexpectedly surfaced recently in neo-Oxfordian circles. It derives from the very first book to defend Dr. Orville Owen, *The Strange Case of Francis Tidir* (London: Robert Banks & Son, 1901). The author, solicitor Parker Woodward, charmingly disclaimed any literary expertise, and in addition to providing some mixed *curiosa* relevant to Royal Birth Theory, also advanced the opinion, under the chapter title "Practical Joking in 1592," that one of Bacon's masks, Robert Greene, never existed. He thought the contradictions in the many accounts of Greene's dying hours and funeral obsequies proved as much. (Mercifully, he did not go on to argue that the much more contradictory accounts of the death of Christopher Marlowe, the lost Dauphin, and later, the Russian Royal Family prove that these worthies never existed either.) More-

over, as Dr. Owen previously “translated” a play by Bacon in which his mask “Greene” was brought in as a character along with Shakspeare and Marlowe, Woodward was shooting up his own client.⁵⁹

Undeterred, Woodward further reproduced parallels between Bacon’s early mask (John Lyly) and Greene to substantiate his thesis that Lyly, Greene, and Shakespeare formed three consecutive *personae* of Francis Bacon. Now, he was not only shooting up Dr. Owen, but also Mrs. Pott, President of the Bacon Society, who in her edition of the *Promus*, had correctly pointed out the lack of John Lyly’s influence on the proverbs in Bacon, and found even fewer parallels in Greene.⁶⁰ So far as we are aware, no second Baconian has ever revived this doubly heterodox theory.

But a hundred years later, it is back lock, stock, and barrel under the auspices of neo-Oxfordian Stephanie Hopkins Hughes (“The Relevance of Robert Greene to the Oxfordian Thesis,” Portland, OR: Paradigm Press, 1997), who coyly refers to her mentors as a “handful of renegade Baconians,” and note the plural.⁶¹ Since Ms. Hughes cited no specific authority in her paper, which also attributes the work of George Gascoigne to Oxford, either she has independently made the same mistake as Parker Woodward, or, more plausibly, absorbed her sources and techniques at second hand from, say, “The Poet’s Death as a Jest,” (Kittle, 1930, chapter 26), where it is suggested that Oxford killed off his non-existent mask (or, if Gascoigne did exist, he can be dissolved into several people who were not seen around London). Still worse, despite methodical replies to her Greene theory from Jerry Downs and Diana Price on “Phaeton,” the Oxfordian e-mail discussion group, she was invited to keynote an Oxfordian conference before many naïve beginners insufficiently instructed in the dark by-ways of neo-Oxfordian politics. One can only hope that the sponsoring academics will curb Ms. Hughes once they become aware of the arbitrary and perverse sources from which her opinions are derived. They do not offer an acceptable role model to the unforwarned young research students at the recent Concordia, Oregon conference. Is *Edmund Spenser and the Impersonation of Edward de Vere* to follow shortly?

Bear in mind, all Oxfordians prior to the Ogburns are reductionists. One cannot ever know how much a man wrote until one knows how little he could have written. Once again, the Ogburns and their disciples are not in the classic Oxfordian tradition.

POSTSCRIPT III

“Truths Out of a Medium’s Mouth”

A final irony in this tragical-comical-historical-pastoral. While acting as Anne Yeats’s archivist in the early 70’s, I passed an obscure auction house on the Dublin Quays. It specialized in the estates of deceased priests, and that particular day was offering the effects of the respected Jesuit art collector, and leader of the Irish Oxford Shakespeare Society, Gerard Schine. Least noted among the treasures at auction was Fr. Schine’s collection of annotated

Oxfordian books, which I acquired reasonably enough.

On the flyleaf of Percy Allen's *Life Story of Edward de Vere, Fr. Schine* had inscribed three stanzas from the *L'Envoi* to Thomas Edwards's *Proclus and Cephalus. Narcissus* (see fn. 5):

Adon deafly masking thro
Stately troupes rich conceited
Shew'd he well deserved to
Loves delight on him to gaze
And had not love her selfe intreated,
Other nymphs had sent him baies.

Eke in purple roabes distaind,
Amid'st the Center of this clime,
I have heard saie doth remaine,
One whose power floweth far,
That should have bene of our rime
The onely object and the star.

Well could his bewitching pen,
Done the Muses objects to us
Although he differs much from men
Tilting under Frieries,
Yet his golden art might woo us
To have honored him with baies.

with the following quote from a source I could not then identify, and not noted by Barrell:

"The Queen wooed the Earl of Oxford, but he would not fall in."⁶²

Beneath, he listed his source "from Hester Dowden." This conversation, which must have occurred either pre-World War II or post-1945 (Ireland stayed in essential quarantine during the World War), went otherwise unreported. Yet the priest had obtained better in five minutes from conscious Hester than Allen got in his three years with Johannes. And the additional weight of Hester's identification (or was it her father's before her?) rests on the fact that Oxford, like Adon, had refused "love's baies," and, astonishingly, the memory of this ancient scandal still intrigued court circles long after Edwards wrote.

Acknowledgments. For queries courteously and extensively answered in the course of my research, I wish to thank Dr. Ruth Loyd and Judge Minos Miller; the editor of *The Elizabethan Review* for the loan of otherwise unobtainable

copies of the English *News-Letters*; Christopher Dams and Fr. Francis Edwards for information concerning English archives; and Derran Charlton for his exceptional kindness. Sources for Mrs. Dowden are: her daughter, Mrs. Lennox Robinson; Dr. Oliver Edwards, who spoke to me of Hester and Grillpanzer; Mrs. Sophie Jacobs, sister of Estelle Solomons; Miss Norah McGuinness and family; Thomas Purefoy; Harold Rutledge; Isabel de Lockyer; Dr. Robert Cummins of Cork; Arthur Power; the novelist Francis Stuart; Ned Lysett; Dr. Eric Dodds of Cambridge; Dr. Eric Dingwa of the British Society for Psychical Research; friends and members of the Dublin Unitarian Church; and Estelle Solomons' close friend, Miss Goodbody of Morehampton Road, Dublin. Except where specifically noted, the author, who gathered his materials between 1967 and 1973, has included no material that was not independently vouched for by at least three witnesses, and further omitted any accounts, however interesting, on which there was a conflict of testimony.

Endnotes

¹ The contributions of Fathers Francis Edwards and Ernest Ferlita are more recent and fall outside the scope of this article. That other most formidable Jesuit and psychical researcher, Father Herbert Thurston, staunchly defended orthodoxy against Rev. Walter Begley in the pages of *The Month* (London: February, 1902).

² Mrs. Henry Pott, *Bacon's Promus Illustrated by Passages from Shakespeare* (London: 1883), pp. 62-69, esp. 66-67. Mrs. Pott showed the making of a fine scholar, had she continued her preliminary investigations. Unfortunately, she quickly discovered that her greater talent lay in political administration rather than literature. As the generation gap among Baconians left the leadership of their newly-formed Society (1888) up for grabs, it soon became quite easy to patronize and be patronized by malleable people less able than oneself. We hope that the preliminary De Vere Bible report does not go the way of the *Promus*. But as the graduate student who issued that report on the De Vere Bible early in the 1990's has gone on record as endorsing the Royal Birth methodology, and further has failed to answer or even comprehend criticisms from Jerry Downs on Shakespeare's alternative available sources, a fresh consideration of the De Vere Bible by independent anti-Stratfordian scholars is to be desired.

³ E. J. S[mithson], *Bacon-Shakespeare: An Essay* (London: Schoenstein, 1899). Smithson was so fearful of the social consequences that he held off publication for over a decade.

⁴ Samuel Smith Travers, *Shakespeare's Sonnets: To Whom Were They Addressed?* (Hobart Town, Tasmania, 1881), cited by Begley, *op. cit.*, pp. 364-65. Smith Travers was no relation to Dr. Travers-Smith, at one time married to Hester Dowden, on whom see below. Charles Wisner Barrell certainly knew Begley when he proposed that Oxford wrote the Sonnets to his illegitimate son

(*American Fellowship News-Letter*, February 1942), p. 12, and therefore may have derived telling examples from Smith Travers.

⁵ Thomas Edwards, *Proclus and Cephalus. Narcissus*, ed. Rev. W. E. Buckley for The Roxburghe Club (London: Nichols and Sons, 1878). See also Postscript III in this article. The reference was finally taken up in C. M. Ingleby's *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse* (2nd ed., London: 1879), pp. 17-18. The revising editor, Lucy Toulmin Smith, arbitrarily separates the first stanza from the latter two. The only other critic ever to publicly pick up on this reference is Charles Wisner Barrell (*Fellowship Quarterly*, Spring 1948 [pp. 1-7] & Summer, 1948 [pp. 9-12]). The American Society was in the process of breaking up, (I received my copies from Barrell himself); they do not appear to have received general circulation and are never acknowledged by any subsequent writer. Curiously, while Barrell gave his source, he himself did not actually name Dowden as the near-discoverer of the Oxford theory.

⁶ Begley, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-27. Also Bacon's *Nova Resuscitatio* (London: Gay and Bird, 1905), 2:22-30. Begley's identification of Labeo is endorsed, surprisingly, by the Stratfordian H. N. Gibson in *The Shakespeare Claimants* (1962; Reprint, New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1971), pp. 59-65, and was commended by Garnett and Gosse in the first decade of the twentieth century. Alfred W. Pollard, in *The Times Literary Supplement* during the mid-twenties, resurrected the only coherent Stratfordian identification of Labeo as Michael Drayton, a thesis which has been chillingly passed over by his fellow Stratfordians. The present author, with John Michel, tends to come down heavily on the side of Gibson and the Baconians here, contra Charlton Ogburn, Jr., Patrick Buckridge (*The Elizabethan Review*, autumn 1996), and Fred Manzo (*The Elizabethan Review*, autumn 1995).

⁷ Edwards, *op. cit.*, pp. 340-41. Begley preferred the claim by Richard Grossart on the pages immediately following (pp. 341-43) that Francis Bacon was the man.

⁸ We suspect that Dr. Owen, an avid bibliophile, saw a copy of John Barclay's *Argenis* (French edition, 1621; 2nd English version, 1629 with revised key), a political *roman à clef* indicating that Elizabeth Tudor had borne an unidentified, but not unidentifiable, child who went to France under an assumed name and there made love to Margaret of Navarre. By an odd coincidence, Bacon, who spent two years in France during the late 1570's and whose brother Anthony's passport (British Museum, Add. MSS. No. 4125, noted by James Phinney Baxter, *The Greatest of Literary Problems*, Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1915, pp. 515-16), bore the signatures of the same three lords featured in *Love's Labour's Lost*, was cast for that role in Dr. Owen's cipher narrative. (Baxter is virtually the only Baconian to call attention to the passport, though it is certainly one of their best points.) Bacon's intimate, Ben Jonson is put down in the Stationer's Register, Oct. 2, 1623 as the first would-be English translator of the potentially seditious *Argenis*, though he never

published. The 1629 edition, appearing under other auspices, included a key which identified Queen Elizabeth as a concealed mother. If Owen had fessed up to his actual sources, his theory might have had a less bizarre reception. For a Baconian who believed he had discovered *Argenis*, see Granville C. Cunningham's *Bacon's Secret Disclosed in Contemporary Books* (London, 1911), pp. 128-65.

Bacon's Navarre connection was first discovered by Rev. James Wilmot in the post 1770's. And Abel Lefranc independently rediscovered new Navarre-Shakespeare links in the pre-World War I era through his investigations into the life of William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby. These have been noted by Stratfordian as well as Oxfordian scholars, but none of them, into the 1960's, made any use of his later contributions embodied in *À La Découverte de Shakespeare* (Paris: Edition Albin Michel, 1945), 2:175-272. Dr. Felicia Londré (*The Elizabethan Review*, Spring 1995) is the first academic in English to call attention to these and to Lefranc's important article, "Les Eléments français de 'Peines d'Amour perdues' de Shakespeare" in *La Revue Historique* (Paris, 1936). Despite Lefranc's lucidity, his methods do not readily lend themselves to summary. See also his *Sous le Masque de 'William Shakespeare,'* (2 vols., Paris, 1918-9), 2:1-103. Another of his important books, never discussed by contemporary critics, is *Le Secret de William Stanley* (Bruxelles: L'Édition du 'Flambeaux', 1923).

⁹ There are genuine historical sources behind this wretched phantasmagoria. Briefly, Owen's mad wild and whirling words derive directly from an application of the same French sources which were held by Kenneth Mackenzie and later taken over by Wynn Wescott of the Societas Rosicruciana in Anglica. The existence of many manuscripts relating to this subject were revealed by the present writer to its ostensible librarian custodians for the first time. Prior to 1865, the information from the French Masonic groups went directly to Boston where Owen's later sponsor, William Prescott became aware of what was really going on. This information regarding Tarot cards and their relation to a Great Wheel, pre-computer style, also spread to Chicago, Cincinnati, and Detroit with varying forms of accuracy. Circa 1906, not 1909 as usually given, A. E. Waite, a genuine Hermetic scholar, essentially completed the now definitive Tarot pack. He worked on the basis of prior constructions by W. B. Yeats, G. R. S. Mead, Marcus Blackden, Florence Farr, and a black magical pack held by Frederick Holland, now in the SOC.ROS archives. In this system, the gyration of the Wheel through three successive turns is brought to a halt by crossing the Ace of Cups (Holy Grail) upon the Wheel of Fortune.

When Waite heard a crazy American had conjoined the Wheel of Fortune and a chess-move cipher to the Holy Grail, he hastened to the banks of the Wye to communicate with the Prescotts. Dr. Owen was that close to finding out the real secret of the Wheel, i.e., it is an *Ars Memoria* such as those which have recently been discussed by non-occultist Francis Yates. But Waite would have

found Owen beyond enlightenment.

Waite had already traced records to the first known French manuscript on Tarot, ca. 1750. This manuscript material gave the correlation to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, based on the Hebrew work Sepher Yetzirah. Waite left a privately issued elucidation of nineteen pages in the Masonic Library at Freemason's Hall, which was seen by the present writer in the 1980's but has since mysteriously disappeared. Now, to link this back to Shakespeare, we refer the reader to Charles Nicholl's *The Chemical Theatre* (London: Routledge Kegan Paul, 1980), pp. 144 and 151, where he will find a proto-image of Waite's Great Wheel specifically tied to *King Lear*. Nicholl seems unaware of Waite's work, but he should have known of New Critic Robert Heilman's *This Great Stage: image and structure in King Lear* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1948), which deals at length with the image of the Great Wheel in relation to the zodiacal cycle and the Fool of the Tarot pack, which is numbered "0." Some critics challenge the existence of Tarot cards in Elizabethan England, but if there was a Tarot pack in 1590's London, Shakespeare seems to have been turning a wicked pack of cards. We will bring the wheel to a halt with these magic words from A. E. Waite: "Personally, we think nearly everyone whose name is appended to the title page, even Shakespeare, wrote the works attributed to them, unless of course, they were occult writers, in which case there is no telling what devices they may have resorted to."

¹⁰ History does not record the reaction of Mrs. Besant's fellow free-thinker and former co-tenant, J. M. Robertson, to all of this.

¹¹ A. E. Waite, relates in *Shadows of Life and Thought* (London, 1937), pp. 109-12, how he spent futile years trying to persuade Baconians to stop their abuse of his pioneering works on the Rosicrucians. In the end, after fifty years of protest, Alfred Dodd still twisted Waite's material as badly as Constance Pott did at the beginning.

¹² Sorbonne educated, Mrs. Gallup took charge of Dr. Owen's wheel (1895) when he suffered a breakdown and retreated to Aspen, Colorado to rest, not to treasure-hunt in England, as reported in John Michel's otherwise fine account, *Who Wrote Shakespeare* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996), p. 147. When Mrs. Gallup, unaided by Owen, spun the Wheel of Fortune, it really sang, producing two plays, one about Bacon's "grandmother," Anne Boleyn, and great gobs of poetry from Homer's *Iliad*, a complete translation of which was promised within six months. (See J. E. Millet, a Harvard trained classicist and friend of James Phinney Baxter, *Baconiana* [April and October 1896, pp. 92-101 and 225-232] with an example and source material.) Shortly after, when Owen returned, Mrs. Gallup and her sister departed, along with a third, as yet unidentified, assistant. And the wheel was silent.

Mr. Mark Rylance, recently announced a production of one of Mrs. Gallup's plays as the work of Francis Bacon. She, or Bacon, deserves a chance

at a fine production from one of our best living actor-directors. But what do the editors of the *SOS Newsletter* (Fall 1996) deserve, who printed — without informed comment — the claim by Peter Dawkins [head of the Francis Bacon Research Trust in England] that *Anne Boleyn* “is not the only new Shakespeare/Bacon play. More than 10 others have also been unearthed.” Neo-Oxfordians are pitifully ignorant of the common ur-sources from which both their apocryphas recently derive.

¹³ Later works by Dodd give 1931 as date of first publication. But the 1931 edition contains two dedications, one for Easter 1930, the other Easter 1931. It was certainly available — and utilized by Ward *films* in his fatal conversation with Percy Allen (see pages 15-16).

¹⁴ We are dealing here with Baconian Royal Birth theory only in its irrational forms. These are the only ones which have had any social impact, and which alone exert a direct, controlling, and unacknowledged influence on neo-Oxfordian Royal Birth theory. It clarifies the disturbingly similar behavior patterns of the emotionally troubled and sometimes intellectually or financially dishonest people who have recently gravitated to the second, as they previously gravitated to the first. For a concise and reasonable presentation of genuine arguments for the Baconian Royal Birth Theory, see Pauline Holmes, “The Morgan Coleman Manuscript,” *Baconiana* (Jan. 1949). My old friend, an M. A. Wellesley, who kept Dr. Owen’s 400 lb. wheel on her front porch, never published her promised Baconian revisionism. Her trenchantly annotated Baconian library taught me much in my early days.

¹⁵ The first Oxfordian revisionist meetings are chronicled by an unidentified newspaper excerpt from 1930, filed in an envelope of clippings at the Stratford-on-Avon Shakespeare Library under the heading Shakespeare Authorship. They preceded Dodd’s original publication by a few months, but discussion of Dodd’s theories preceded them, and Dodd’s second edition is filled with scores of names in many countries to whom he sent his first edition.

¹⁶ As crypto-Oxfordian C.S. Lewis states it, “What man in the whole world, except a father, or a potential father-in-law, cares whether any other man gets married” (*English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, Oxford, 1954), p. 503.

¹⁷ Baconian Rendell Davies, in his deceptively modest *Notes upon Some of Shakespeare’s Sonnets* (London: Kensington, Cayme Press, 1927) provided a conservative Baconian antidote to Dodd before the fact (as E. W. Smithson had preceded Parker Woodward). But despite a favorable review in *The Times Literary Supplement*, and they seldom favorably reviewed Baconian offerings, he was ignored by all later Baconians, save the ever reliable Roderick Eagle.

¹⁸ Allen remarked of Looney on his death that “he [Looney] disliked controversy; and his disapproval of other men’s conclusions was always shown preferably by silence, rather than by counter-assertion in argument” (*English Fellowship News-Letter*, May 1944), p. 4.

¹⁹ Percy Allen, *Shakespeare Pictorial* (August 1931), p. 16.

²⁰ Percy Allen, *The Case for Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, as William*

Shakespeare (London: Cecil Palmer, 1930).

²¹ Most of the first, great, generation of Oxfordians passed in rapid succession during World War II, after which the press's attitude quickly altered from friendly-neutral to hostility and actual suppression.

²² Mrs. Bowen received a first edition of Alfred Dodd (1931); pagination documenting her acknowledgment differs in the nine later editions, the last of which is 1945. Though now little remembered, at least by American readers, Mrs. Bowen, otherwise Mrs. Gabrielle M. Long, was a truly distinguished author and deserves a revival. See *American News-Letter* (June 1943), p. 51. Crime aficionados still treasure her *The Lady and the Arsenic*, published under the pseudonym Joseph Shearing.

²³ *The Shakespeare Pictorial*, July 1935.

²⁴ In its crassest form, it is claimed that Oxford and Burghley deliberately attempted to mate Southampton to his half-sister for purposes of financial gain, and then had the nerve to sue him when the young man defaulted. A recent, even more obnoxious, revisionism holds that Elizabeth bore Oxford to Thomas Seymour before begetting Southampton on her eldest son. This semi-pornographic image has been promoted by a perpetual houseguest on the anti-Stratfordian lecture circuit. Our occult mole reveals that the unpublished sources of this theory include copies of Alfred Dodd with the names of Bacon and Leicester struck out, and Oxford and Seymour written in. What happened to the missing 11 years age difference remains a closely-guarded occult secret. This lecturer should acknowledge at least one of his onerous debts, but be that as it may, of one thing we can be certain. Dorothy Ogburn, who wrote that "the *Sonnets*, as Canon Rendall wisely observed, never contain a trace of erotic implication," by which she meant sexual deviation (*op. cit.*, p. 880) would be as grateful to these gentlemen as Elizabeth Wells Gallup was to Parker Woodward and Alfred Dodd.

²⁵ A knowledgeable British Oxfordian, from the 1940 period, long ago gave the present author a highly circumstantial account of later researchers writing to the widows of Col. and Capt. Ward, only to discover they were addressing the same woman. However, he cannot at present recollect the incidents. The death of the first (and perhaps only) Mrs. Col. Ward is recorded in the *American Shakespeare News-Letter* (June '42), p. 54. She apparently died near the end of '41, and it is odd that there was no English Oxfordian obituary. We intend to clarify this on our next visit to London.

²⁶ Allen, *Anne Cecil*. The *Midsummer Night's Dream* references are on pp. 69, 73, 75-107, 148, 188, 212, 234. I want to thank Dr. E. Jimmie Stein for the use of her copy of this scarce volume. Dr. Stein's extensive research on Shakespeare, Oxford, and Elizabethan colonization deserves publication.

²⁷ Lefranc, *À La Découverte de Shakespeare*, 1:419-518. Lefranc and Col. Ward alike are understandably ignored by neo-Oxfordians who are never at ease in the presence of any intelligence superior to their own.

²⁸ *The Shakespeare Pictorial* (July 1935).

²⁹ The complete title of this fifteen-page pamphlet is *An Enquiry Into the Relations Between Lord Oxford as 'Shakespeare,' Queen Elizabeth, and the Fair Youth of Shakespeare's Sonnets*, n.d. It is now available in the British Library after many years of misfiling, but not readily available for transcription purposes to a non-resident. Therefore we have not directly utilized it.

³⁰ Incredible as it may seem, Barrell never knew of Col. Ward's *père* seminal identification of Anne Vavasour, Tom Knyvet, and, by inference, the little changeling boy (*Shakespeare Pictorial*, August 1931). He attributes the discovery to Mrs. Eva Turner Clark in her 1933 book, *Shakespeare's Satirical Comedy 'Love's Labour's Lost'*, which started him off (*American News-Letter*, April 1942), p. 28.

³¹ *American Shakespeare Fellowship News-Letter* (February 1942), p. 16. Unfortunately, Barrell's book about Anne Vavasour and her son, which was slated for publication in 1946, never appeared. An extremely lucid prospectus appeared in *Tomorrow* (New York: Feb., March 1946). Barrell lived until nearly 1980, but without any further publication after the sudden closure of the *American Shakespeare Fellowship Quarterly* in 1948. His massive archives on the family of Edward de Vere, the x-rays of the Shakespeare portraits, and much else appear to be irrevocably lost due to immediate dispersal after his death (private communication from Dr. Ruth Loyd Miller, who was to have received them). The present writer attempted to trace the *Scientific American* archives concerning the three disputed Shakespeare portraits and discovered that they were transferred to a warehouse when the magazine changed hands in 1948 and were eventually, so far as can be ascertained, destroyed with the rest of the old files in the 50's. Barrell still believed they could be gotten from the magazine when I phoned him in 1966-67. Our thanks to Kenneth Rummell, a friend and former editor for *Scientific American*, on his extensive investigation which went far beyond the call of duty.

³² The eminent Hyder Edward Rollins vies with A. L. Rowse and Charles Hamilton as the Stratfordian crank of the century for implying in his *New Variorium* edition of the *Sonnets* (1944) that the second Edward de Vere never existed.

³³ Posthumously published, *The Shakespeare Fellowship Quarterly* (April, 1944), p. 23. Bear in mind that Looney praised Barrell for his general achievement in forging from many newly discovered records an extended series of successive historical links to what Looney and Canon Rendall regarded was an already largely predetermined *Sonnet* sequence provided by Thomas Thorpe. Looney could not have seen Barrell's still unpublished reassignments to specific recipients, i.e. forty-three sonnets to Anne Vavasour (*Fellowship Quarterly*, June 1942), p. 47, and fifty-three sonnets to the second Edward de Vere (*ibid.*, August 1942), p. 67, but considering Looney's conservative bent, he would not have endorsed such sweeping internal revisionism as

justified by the external facts yet available to the readers. But the thrust of Barrell's argument he considered "conclusive." When one neo-Oxfordian had the gall to state that Looney leaned toward the Tudor Rose theory at the end of his life, it is significant that every one of his fellow true-believers allowed this statement to stand unchallenged. Is this ignorance or deliberate deceit?

³⁴ *Op. cit.* (1st edition, New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1984), p. 569.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

³⁶ Judge Thomas McAllistair of the Michigan Federal Circuit (private conversation, Sligo, Ireland, August 1967) recalled meeting Looney at a soirée attended by T. S. Eliot in London during the late 1930's. Eliot was fine, but the jurist found Looney "the most memorable literary mind I ever met."

³⁷ We have been trying to find a copy since the early 1960's, and no one, including Dorothy Ogburn, has ever been able to produce it. It is not in any American catalogue, the British Library, nor in the respective Oxfordian collections held by L.L. Ware or Christopher Dams in England. Hopefully, some reader may supply one. Even if it should contain better material, such material, being unknown, is irrelevant to a contemporary Tudor Rose critique.

³⁸ The Ditchley portrait appears as a plate in *Talks with Elizabethans*; see also *This Star of England* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1952), p. 1,200. It shows a gigantic Queen Elizabeth towering across a map of England, with many towns beneath her feet. Allen and Dorothy Ogburn both thought she was standing between the towns of Oxford and Southampton. (Neither town appears to this observer to be strategically placed.) Allen and Dorothy also believed Elizabeth to be wearing a maternity dress, a theory on which I am not qualified to pass. Allegedly, Allen referred to this theory in the missing pamphlet. However, I remember a hilarious afternoon with Dorothy and my Baconian friend, Sylvia Spencer Ruggles, in which they discoursed at length – and at rapid fire speed – on how Elizabethan fashions allowed social mobility and concealment far into pregnancy. Hopefully, this went in Dorothy's unpublished volume, which is on deposit at Emery University. It is the kind of exuberant improvisation – royal birth theory aside, that made knowing Dorothy really worthwhile.

³⁹ Barclay's *Argenis* (see note 8) does give some genuine comfort to Baconians, but how can it help Southampton's case? He was under 6 years of age when Elizabeth's boy was allegedly cutting up in Navarre.

⁴⁰ The Wolfe and Knight information, not otherwise recorded, came to me from Mrs. Dowden's daughter. Wolfe, who wanted to trace his 18th century heritage for a never-finished novel, presumably communicated by letter from the United States. Her mother daily burned a potentially lucrative income in autographed correspondence to forestall charges that she might be building up files on her clients. All letters were shredded and went into the waste basket as soon as the appointments were booked. Her biography appeared in the early 50's, but as it was uniformly denounced as inaccurate and misleading by family and friends interviewed, I do not use it.

⁴¹ Dodd, *Immortal Master* (London: Rider & Co., n.d. [1943]). Dodd optimistically states that even considering the shortness of the session, it was evidential, and that, since they shook hands, they parted friends. But his own description of her “frigidity” and “silence,” as well as the fact that this ardent spiritualist never booked a second sitting, says otherwise.

⁴² W. B. Yeats’ “Ribh Considers Christian Love Insufficient” appeared in *Poetry* (Chicago, Dec., 1934) and also *The London Mercury* that same month. It was re-published in every subsequent edition of his works. Readers unversed in theology must understand that all orthodox Christian bodies accept the doctrine of the masculine Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the triune God. The Eastern Church, which built its greatest cathedral (Haiga Sophia at Constantinople) to Holy Mother Wisdom has often emphasized the Eternal Feminine, who, despite her sanctity, remains outside of, and subordinate to, the masculine Godhead. In Yeats’ poem, which Mrs. Dowden evidently knew, a pre-Roman Catholic hermit rages against the Latin doctrine of the Trinity and affirms the pagan Gnostic heresy that the Holy Spirit is feminine, Mother-Wife to the Father and the Son. Mrs. Dowden, who was a deep student of Greek neo-Platonism (personal information from her friend, Mrs. Sophie Jacobs of Goulders Green: interviews, 1970) provides Allen with an Oxford who is analogous to Creator-God, a Southampton who is Heir to his heavenly kingdom, the new creative dispensation, and Elizabeth, a ferocious Earth Mother and harlot, wife and Virgin Mother, who is, in the end redeemed, and who redeems them all by her quality of essential wisdom.

⁴³ *Talks*, p. 196.

⁴⁴ There is no printed treatment of this dominant Yeatsian theme. However, the reader can refer to Ron Heisler’s excellent and independent article “The Thirteenth Aeon” in *Yeats Annual* (New York: Macmillan, 1998). I have been lecturing on the subject for thirty years and will give a succinct account in my long-delayed *The Evidence of Things Unseen: W. B. Yeats and the Mystery of the Tarot Dance*.

⁴⁵ William W. Kennawell, *The Quest at Glastonbury* (New York: Helix Press, 1965), the only currently available life of Bligh Bond. Bond unwittingly gave Mrs. Dowden a great gift. While excavating Glastonbury Abbey (1907-1919) he became acquainted with a sometimes drunken medieval monk named Johannes, now doing penance as a psychic control. Seeking further aid in his genuinely important Glastonbury excavations, he approached Mrs. Dowden back in London. She had little to offer him, but much to his distress, Johannes took to modern urban life, abandoned him, and stayed on with Mrs. Dowden for the rest of her days. Much later, the three of them produced *The Book of Philip the Deacon* (London: Rider, 1932) to decent critical notices. Allen’s collaboration with Mrs. Dowden received a less favorable reception. See also Allen’s obituary of his friend in the *English News-Letter* (May, 1945), and Stephen Schwartz’ *The Secret Vaults of Time* (New York: Grosset and Dunlop,

1978), portrait of Bond, p. 2; self-portrait by Johannes, p. 35.

⁴⁶ *Talks*, pp. 41-2, 154, 157, 175.

⁴⁷ B. N. De Luna, *The Queen Declined* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970). In *The Unfortunate Traveler*. Thomas Nashe plainly indicates that Avisia really was a tavern slut. This almost ignored reference is worth returning to. Meanwhile, see Alden Brooks' *Will Shakspeare: Factotum and Agent*, (New York: Roundtable Press, 1937), pp. 36-9. In that case, Will Shakspeare could have known Southampton — in the role of his procurer. Ward and Allen's re-discovery of an Avisia in George Chapman's *An Humorous Day's Mirth (An Enquiry)*, p. 15) could yet prove the one good thing to come out of the Royal Birth mare's nest.

⁴⁸ Personal account from my old neighbor, Mrs. Lennox Robinson, née Dolly Travers-Smith, of Monkstown, County Dublin. Our first interview occurred in late December 1967, and in a lifetime of meeting remarkable people, I never heard more remarkable tales than on that night. John Michel received a rich and fascinating letter of reminiscences last year from an Allen relative, who is bitter toward Mrs. Dowden. However, Mr. Allen's relative was not a party to the transactions, and the unanimous testimony from the surviving witnesses directly involved is that Mrs. Dowden's tried her best and that was just not good enough to permanently salvage him.

⁴⁹ *This Star*, p. 927fn. This misstatement is expanded by William Plumer Fowler, *Shakespeare Revealed in Oxford's Letters* (Portsmouth, NH: P. E. Randall, 1986), p. 168. Mr. Fowler simply relied on the senior Ogburns' non-research without a first-hand check, and he has been followed by many neo-Oxfordians who have never checked his non-research either.

⁵⁰ I believe absolutely in my friends' integrity. But knowing their high morality, I can only assume that the Royal Birth theory was of little importance to them during most of the course of their comparatively brief but wide-ranging venture into Oxfordianism. This is confirmed by letters from Charlton Ogburn, Sr., which I still hold, dating from the early 50's. A British correspondent had sent me extracts from *The Shakespeare Pictorial* re: Capt. Ward and Allen's theory that Sir Walter Raleigh wrote *The Tempest*, a subject which is alluded to in three separate issues. Mr. Ogburn, Sr. wrote back (and how kind of him to maintain correspondence with a 12-year old farmboy) that he was unaware that Ward and Allen did hold to the theory. He also failed to identify my request for the sources embedded in the appendix to *Talks With Elizabethans* as the previously published and now missing Allen pamphlets. Dorothy was, of necessity, the research half of the team, and in addition to typing the entire manuscript three times, she was compelled to maintain a very active social schedule throughout, from which her research inevitably suffered.

⁵¹ Their friend Charles Wisner Barrell had been in correspondence with Allen while investigating the Ashbourne portrait (*American News-Letter*, February 1940), p. 3. And it is likely that Allen would have sent his fellow commentator a copy of his pamphlet, *An Enquiry*.

⁵² Secondary sources give this alternative title for the missing manuscript.

⁵³ Ogburn, Jr., *op cit.*, p. 148.

⁵⁴ The correct title is *George Gascoigne* [which is in fact a reproduction of an Elizabethan autograph] [*April 1562 to January 1, 1578 / or / EDWARD DE VERE / seventeenth Earl of Oxford / 1550-1604*. (Washington, D. C.: W. F. Roberts, 1930), pp. iii, 217. The Ogburns cite this under *George Gascoigne* without date or place of publication in the bibliography, yet another indication that the Royal Birth theory was elaborated with haste and too late for assimilation into the overall structure of a formerly better constructed book.

⁵⁵ The Ogburns rejected a lucrative offer from one of the best-known publishing houses in America rather than delete their Royal Birth conspiracy sections.

⁵⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 298.

⁵⁷ *Op cit.*, p. 295.

⁵⁸ Notably *Baconiana*, October 1945, p. 160; April 1947, pp. 99-105; October 1947, p. 225. On the Sonnets, the Woodwards and the non-existent "Kay" Cipher which set off Dodd, Allen, and indirectly, the Ogburns, see further *Baconiana*, July 1946, pp. 129-132; and above all, pp. 182-4, a controversial masterpiece which was inexcusably unknown to the Stratfordian Friedmans when they wrote their much clumsier and unreliable account *The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined* (Cambridge University Press, 1957), pp. 170-1, 224.

⁵⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 55-70.

⁶⁰ Woodward on Lyly, *op cit.*, pp. 107-9; Mrs. Pott, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-45.

⁶¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 20. For Oxford as Lyly, *op. cit.*, p. 25; for Oxford as Gascoigne, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

⁶² Noted by Looney (1st ed., 1920), p. 246. Looney listed his source as the *Calendared State Papers, Domestic* 1601-3, p. 56. Also noted by Kathleen LeRiche (*English News-Letter*, September 1953), p. 5, debating the Ogburns, but they both missed the link, supplied by Mrs. Dowden, to the earliest anti-Stratfordian identification yet found.