

Postscript to the Tudor Rose Theory

To begin, we regret the omission of the names of Dr. Paul Nelson and Mrs. Isabel Holden who discovered the De Vere Geneva Bible. They should have received honor in each and every discussion but it has seldom been done. John Michel will include them in any future editions of *Who Wrote Shakespeare?*

The failure of the Tudor Rose theorists addressed in my recent monograph (ER, 6:1) to challenge one single point of fact speaks for itself. They knew long before the annual conference of the Shakespeare Oxford Society that it was to be shortly published in this journal.

However, having found a factual error and several typos (the author's responsibility), I would also like to expand on some useful research that was of necessity cut from the original copy:

P. 10, par. 1, line 16, for "known textual sources" read "existing printed sources."

P. 14, par. 1, lines 10-11, read "by many senior Stratfordians, perhaps most importantly J.W. Mackail in *Approach to Shakespeare* (1930, p. 114)." Every reader of this journal should consult the extensive documentation from the *Hackney Spectator* (London), September 5 and 12, 1924. Summaries appeared for the first and only time since in the Miller edition of *"Shakespeare" Identified* (1975), pp. 218-223 with much more. Hall, who tried to cultivate Oxford's patronage as early as 1579, had a ready guide to any manuscripts left at King's Place in the person of his cousin and vicious fellow spy, Oxford's former secretary, Anthony Munday.

In the best interests of accurate Elizabethan scholarship, the entire run of inaccessible Shakespeare Fellowship proceedings (*Hackney Spectator*, 1922-1928, *Shakespeare Pictorial*, Stratford-on-Avon, 1929-1937) should be assembled in one volume as quickly as possible. If the Ogburns had had them in the early days we would all have been spared the embarrassment of the Tudor Rose theory.

P. 25, par. 1, lines 18-19, read "Looney's lengthy endorsement of Barrell (April 1944) preceded Mrs. Ogburn's appearance on the scene by a mere eight months. It is incredible that the Ogburns never knew of it."

P. 30, par. 3, line 28, "Oxford's *preference* for the Greek Orthodox Rite." This information and much else comes from the interrogation of Oxford's former page Angelo by the Italian Inquisition. The predominantly neo-Oxfordian Internet bulletin board, Phaethon, distributes a comprehensive translation; but monitor Nina Green struck a blow against

sound scholarship with her astonishing claim that this, at latest, seventh century rite was "much closer to the Protestant in the sixteenth century."

P. 33, par. 1, line 8, read Dr. Eric *Dingwall*.

P. 34, par. 1, line 8, Anthony Bacon's highly evidential passport is now catalogued in the British Library and has recently been moved to King's Cross.

P. 36, par. 1, line 18-22, Strike any quotation marks from A. E. Waite's magic words. This almost quote is an in-joke for two or three genuine Tarot specialists in the event they should happen on them here or there.

P. 41, par. 1, line 13, The gracious and exuberant Sophie Jacobs held literary court on *Golder's Green*. She also had some important things (via the Dowdens) to say about Shakespearean Sonnet 121 which Percy Allen missed, but I am very far from my references.

Some additional thoughts: the strictures against the neo-Oxfordians were directed only against those who knew or, unless blinded by passion, should have known that they were dealing in historical claptrap. If, say, better evidence exists in Dorothy Ogburn's manuscript at Emory University or in the missing Allen pamphlet, to go no further, they must be dealt with fairly in their turn; but I informed several prominent neo-Oxfordians of the existence of those papers in 1993. Charlton Ogburn Jr. told me that he held a poor carbon of his of his mother's manuscript. The fact that no one adduced it indicates that it did not clarify the confusions of the first book.

Any theoretician who attempts to yet again bring back the Tudor Rose on a more satisfactory basis must first admit that a) the entire structure, metaphors included, was lifted in total from previous neo-Baconian texts, b) that in lifting that structure the originally viable historical correlations were completely destroyed, c) that any attempt to find a satisfactory alternative birth date for an illogically postulated Oxford-Elizabeth heir will widen the age gap with the Southampton heir. All told, neo-Oxfordians would be better served by becoming neo-Baconians, if the now affable and long socially acclimated neo-Baconians have any use for such wild men.

P. 24-26 and notes 47-51. We finally obtained the Ward-Allen *An Enquiry*: 1) The title page may be undated but the noted on page 5 clearly gives the publication as Spring-Summer 1936; yet despite this, the Ogburns, who never read the pamphlet accurately, and their supporters, who never read it at all, continued for fifty years to portray their founder, Captain Ward, *filis*, as a late convert to his own theory.

2) It likewise develops that while the Ogburns took over Ward's now impossible chronology, they worsened the situation by turning Ward-Allen's conception date into the delivery date.

3) By 1936, Ward and Allen had so far declined as historians that they

believe Anne Vavsour was named Frances. So much for their pioneering work of 1931 (pp 14-15).

4) It is Allen's teenaged son John who discovered the plausible correlations between *Wilobie His Avis* and Chapman's *An Humorous Day's Mirth*, which are ignored by the Ogburns. Regrettably, the name Avis is not mentioned in the Chapman text, as an oral report led me to believe.

The only way to save the Ogburns' integrity as critics in the light of these further examples of historical misuse—and there can be no question of the integrity—is to move the date of their "discovery" of the Tudor Rose theory from 1945-46 to late 1949-50 and their discovery that they had been preceded by Ward and Allen, actually eighteen years earlier, to 1950-51 very late into their third and final draft. They quickly forgot or never bothered to assimilate the three 1944-46 texts that should have informed them of their situation. It was only at the end that they got around to briefly borrowing the 1936 pamphlet and perhaps spending an hour transcribing the misleading documentation it contained. The quotes from the second, still-missing Allen pamphlet of 1943 are second-hand from a correspondent (probably Allen himself) and *Talks With Elizabethans* was assimilated at some unknown period between 1952 and 1967 when Dorothy quoted it with buoyancy.

Most of the faults of *This Star of England* are simply examples too much, too soon; in the case of the Tudor Rose theory, it was too little, too late.

P. 34, note 5, Peter Moore preceded us on Adon in an almost unobtainable issue of the *SOS Newsletter* from the late 1980s, which reference we currently lack. He proceeds from Mrs. Stopes (MLR, 1921) and the basic text and, on this basis, remains uncertain as to the original identification. He is apparently unaware of Barrell (as I was unaware of Moore), does not discuss the original Dowden article, and, of course, does not know of the Schine-Hester Dowden exchange, or Mrs. Stopes radical shift of position (*Third Earl of Southampton*, p. 61) where she identifies Southampton as Adon, followed and tellingly elaborated by Alden Brooks (*Will Shakspeare and the Dyer's Hand*, pp. 109-110). On the basis of the additional information, I have no hesitation in positively identifying Oxford as, in Edwards opinion, the author of *Venus and Adonis*, and Southampton as Narcissus but certainly not the author. As Mr. Moore is one of the most able of anti-Stratfordians, his criticism will be welcome. This, to our knowledge, is a complete list of Adon commentaries to date.

The ultimate source for the Queen making love to the Earl of Oxford, who would not fall in, is Christopher Marlowe's fellow counterfeiter, John Poole, the younger, of whom a good account is given in Charles Nichols' *A Cup of News* (1984, pp. 194-96). Poole was hardly in a position to know, but this lately

revived (1587) scandal of the early 1570's would further identify Oxford as Adon to contemporary readers.

P. 35, note 9, lines 7-8, Attorney and historian Patrick Devinney writes me from New York that Dr. Orville Owen did receive a *carte blanche* charter from the Occultist and still influential French Lodge of Memphis and Mizraim. This is the same lodge to which I previously referred. Was Dr. Prescott, Owen's financial sponsor, ignorant of the ultimate source of both his and Owen's inspiration? In this case, we would have a parallel to the Dodd situation; Prescott would have been very impressed with two sources thousands of miles apart (but readily identical) coming up with similar cryptological techniques.

P. 43, note 58, Another expert Mason, Roderick Eagle, exposed the non-existent Kay cipher as described in my article. He also identified the source of the chaos as one Clifton (a close colleague of Dr. Wescott) who has, probably, even more for which to answer than the Woodward brothers.

Appendix II - Ms. Hughes, whom we criticized somewhat stringently, has withdrawn her claim that Robert Greene never existed as did her mentor, Parker Woodward, in *Baconiana*, Spring 1916. Mr. Woodward, however, went on to prove the non-existence of Parliament member John Lyly and Thomas Watson, since so well documented by Mark Eccles. In all fairness, Ms. Hughes now openly rejects the Tudor Rose theory.

Her answer to our query, "Is Edmund Spenser and the impersonations of Edward de Vere to follow shortly?" is a resounding yes. We appreciate such prompt responses from our readers. The source, this time, is E.G. Harmon (1914 and 1924), a genuine intellectual and isolated maverick. Unless 75 years of additional scholarship are brought into play, *caveat emptor*.

P. 30. The Du Bartas-De Vere connection is rendered highly dubious by Derran Charlton and Andrew Hannas's independent discoveries that the *Dictionary of National Biography* attributes the disputed poem to Edward Lapworth, a well known academic of Oxford. Be that as it may, Charlton's communication, dated March 15, 1998, was neither printed nor acknowledged by the SOS editors. If Andrew Hannas, who made translations from the Latin for the original article, had not intervened, the SOS readership would never have learned of the alternative and, as of now, official point of view. Similar, but by no means unique, examples are cited on pp. 10 and 37. Under these ever declining standards, is it any wonder that the current President recently announced that six members are leaving for every five novices entering the Society.

Roger Nyle Parisious