SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY

NEWSLETTERS

1977

The Shakespeare Oxford Society NEWSLETTER
SPRINC, 1977

110 Glen Argyle Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21212

EDITOR'S NOTE

There is a typographical correction to be made in the Winter 1976-77 issue of the Newsletter, page 5, column 2, line 20. The title of Ovid's famous work should read Metamorphoses.

Responses continue to come in to the ads that S.O.S. Trustee Russell des Cognets placed in The Shakespeare Newsletter, Harvard Magazine, and Saturday Review (described in our last issue). Mr. des Cognets states that the Saturday Review ad, in his opinion, accounts for the majority of responses. The communications to the Society request the free information about our Society and the Oxfordian theory which the ad offers. (We have recently added a fifth flyer to the material described in our previous issue: a list of arguments against the Stratford man's authorial credentials. Previous respondents will receive this addition in a separate mailing.

Some of the respondents to these advertisements have already become members of the Shakespeare Oxford Society, and, although space forbids a listing of them, we offer these new adherents a hearty welcome.

Gordon Cyr, Editor

"SHAKESPEARE": A MISSING AUTHOR
by J. Thomas Looney

The Newsletter is pleased to present to its readers a condensed version of this article, written by the Founding Father of the Oxfordian theory of Shakespearean authorship and first published in the News-letter of The Shakespeare Fellowship (American Branch), Vol. II, No. 2 (February 1941). The original essay was published in two parts (the second appeared in the following April issue). Mr. Looney's arguments here deal only with the negative evidence, and his presentation should have an appeal to all doubters of the Stratford myth, especially since the author's logic is impeccable and his arguments persuasive. (We reprint here only the first of the two installments.)

Although mankind has certainly to face in these days graver and more pressing problems than that of the authorship of the Shakespeare plays, this question has a claim, if only a secondary one amongst the serious interests of life, and deals with matters that are destined to endure when the special problems of today will have passed out of mind. Centuries hence, when the entire world will have changed, socially, politically and religiously, the works will be read with wonder, and the personality behind them command the admiration and even the affections of readers.

Truly great dramatic literature can only come from ... writers who are accustomed to look closely into their own souls and make free use of their secret

experiences; and it may be doubted whether a single line of living literature ever came from pure imagination or mere dramatic poss...

As, then, the Shakespeare plays hold first place in the world's dramatic literature, an acquaintance with the personality behind it — a prime factor in its right understanding — must be a matter of some concern to those who regard these great creations of the human spirit seriously. Works so rich in thought and knowledge, and so varied in passion, could only come from an intense and manysided genius; and all the elaborate developments of Stratford-on-Avon are a sufficient answer to the contention that the person of the writer matters nothing...

The consciousness that there was a distinctive personal element running through the dramas, one quite out of harmony with the records and traditions of William Shakspere of Stratford, was one of the principal results of the discriminating admiration with which, in the nineteenth century, the works came to be studied. With penetrating sagacity Emerson remarked "I cannot marry (him) to his verse." ...

However decisive such a sense of discord may be to the person who feels it instinctively, it does not supply the kind of material that can be easily pressed into service as evidence in an argument. On the other hand, experience has proved that scholars, equally equipped, can wrangle endlessly respecting the classical knowledge shown in the plays; whilst lawyers and pseudo-lawyers argue inconclusively respecting their legal contents. Something more palpable and measurable is needed to settle the issues raised by these psychological, classical and legal difficulties; and it is to evidence of this concrete practical nature, such as can be weighed without special scholastic preparation, that I shall try to confine myself.

At the outset I shall state ... what it is the special object of this essay to prove, namely: that the William Shakspere of Stratford-on-Avon, who died in that town in 1616, cannot have written the poems and plays attributed to him, but was used as a cover for some great poet-dramatist who did not wish his own name to appear on the published works; and that, therefore, the author of the plays is missing.

It is generally known that there are many converging lines of evidence pointing in this direction. To rest a case, however, on the cumulative effect of separate and varied lines of proof demands a weighing of complex probabilities, and becomes, to some extent, a matter for the experts. We shall, therefore, not attempt such a task of general survey and coordination, but shall confine ourselves within very restricted limits, and shall find, I believe, a case as cogent as it is simple.

We shall, moreover, discard altogether that vast mass of Shakespeare lore which passes current as authenticated fact, but which is in reality mere inference based upon the assumption that William... of Stratford wrote the plays; and we shall narrow the argument down to the bedrock of facts, taking as a general basis the aristocretic connections of the original publications.

The name Shakespeare made its first appearance in English literature as that, not of a dramatist but of a poet, when Venus and Adonis was published in the year 1593. The titlepage gave no author's name — in itself a significant beginning — but the dedication —to Henry Wriothesley, the 3rd Earl of Southampton, was signed: "William Shakespeare." The terms of this prefatory letter prove the poet to have been already on an intimate footing with the nobleman; and the English both of the dedication and the text of the poem reveals a natural mastery of the cultured speech peculiar to the highest social circles. This, of course, clearly establishes the writer's

free aesociation with the arietocrecy some yeers prior to 1593.

Not till 1598 did the name "Shakespeare" become known as that of a dramatist,when it wae attached to an edition of Love'e Labo:r's Lost. Here, egain, aristocratic connections are stressed. Thc work wae publiahed "ee it wae presented before her Highnee"...end thc drama iteelf ie exclueively one of court life, full of interior portraiture and having ea ita baeia thc distinctive manners, etiquette and intercourse of people in familiar touch with royalty.

After thia ceme a eucceesion of playe with the same general stamp. 2 Henry IV: "Ae it heth been...acted by the right honourable thc Lord Chamberlaine hia eeruants." (That is, the Qneen'e epecial company of playere.) The Merchent of Venice: "Aa it hath been...acted by the Lord Chamherlaine his eeruante," etc.... And eo with other publiahed playe from 1598 to 1609.

Thc year 1609 saw the publication of the ...Sonnete; and, whatever perplexing problems reepecting this work may have divided scholars, upon one peint ell ars agreed: namely, that many of the poems are addreesed to a young nobleman, with whom the poct is here eeen on terms of cloae intimacy and strong personal effection.

In the eame ycar an unauthorised edition of Troilus and Creesida appeared, with e bold assertion that the "grand peseesors" of the manuscript had been defied in the publication of the work. Who theae "grand poaeeeaore" may have been we cannot tell. Thc terms, however, clearly peint to erietocrats.

In 1623 the authentic publication of the Shakespeare plays culminated and closed with the iaaue of the famoue First Folio.

This work is dedicated to the two brothcra William and Philip Herbert, the Earle reepectively of Pembroke and Montgomery, who are there stated to have followed "the author living with much fevour"; end in the introductory poem contributed by Ben Jonson epecial emphasie is laid upon tha personal intarest both of Queen Elizabeth and King Jamea I.

From first to last, then, linka of a perfectly unique kind connect these playe and the pereon of their author with royalty and the aristocracy; and sc aurely are such intimacias implied, that it is usual to epeak of them aa eatabliehed facta... For no leas than thirty yeers (1593 - 1623) the published worka therefore declare him to have been acquainted with or honourably remembered by tha greatest pecple in the land; end, if we take into eccount the neceasary antecedenta of the 1593 debut, the period of aristocratic connection must be coneiderebly extended beyond the thirty yeare.

We must now see how these facte bear upon the person hitherto credited with the authorehip.

When Venue and Adonia was published William Shakspere of Stratford was a young man of twenty-nine. To have worked himeelf by that age into euch e eociety, and to have ecquired the literery and social culture ehown by the poem and its dedication — much of which could not have been laerned from booke — to have produced eo lengthy and elaborately finished a poem and carried through ita publicaion, he must have had his feet firmly planted on the social ladder in his early twenties, at thc latest. Ae, thema, he lived to the age of fifty-two, and the chief bueineee of his life would be to produce this literature end meet the social obligation which it would entail, we may say that the whole of that effective part of e man'e lifctime which fixee permanently hie place emongst hia fellows would be pessed in the open light of royal end aristocretic favor.

If, moreover, one with such commonplace beginnings es are ehown by the eerly Stratford recorda, had, merely by his acting

and playwriting, won for himself access to the foremost company of actors, without a trace of youthful apprenticeship or experience in an inferior troupe, and used the position so rapidly gained to place himself immediately into intimate relationships with the people round the throne, he must have possessed, not only extraordinary intellectual powers, but wonderful initiative, enterprise, ambition, personal address and social tact. His aims must have been settled early, and his efforts to realize them direct and resolute. This was not the kind of man to allow himself to be pushed into the background, and, following a public vocation, he could not easily have been hidden. However rapid the ascent it could only have been accomplished by stages and through the active interest of suitable intermediaries.

The question before us, then, is whether these published pretensions and necessary implications of his connection with the literature can be subjected to an effective test...

The Shakespeare question, on the side from which we are now viewing it, is therefore one which is specially open to the test of historical research; and no workers have been more thorough in their investigations, or more unsparing to themselves, than those who, during many years, have hunted for particulars relating to William Shakspere of Stratford. Additional details may yet come to light, but sufficient has already been made out to pronounce quite definitely upon the general result of all this research work.

The first fact which stands out boldly is the complete absence of even the slightest relevant link between William Shakspere's sordid beginnings at Stratford, traceable right up to the time when he was a married man with three children, and the exalted social and cultural intimacies of his early twenties implied in the publication of the first Shakespeare poems. In those days even scholars from the universities could, as writers, only penetrate the outer frings of that uppermost circle by means of aristocratic patronage, graciously bestowed, and paid for by public literary compliments. Shakespeare reaches its centre without academic send-off and by a single stride, without leaving traces of an upward struggle or of assistance from any aristocrat or other likely helper. The supposed achievement, under any circumstances, is highly improbable; without record of stages and means it may be confidently regarded as impossible.

What is true of his reaching these heights is even more emphatically true of his keeping them. The records for all the years which lie between Venus and Adonis (1593) and the latest date ever suggested for his final retirement to Stretford (1612) — the most eventful years in the history of the English drama — have been ruthlessly searched in the one supreme quest: to find out more about William Shakspere. With what result?

We now know that he sold some malt to one Philip Rogers, lent his customer two shillings, and afterwards prosecuted him for repayment; that when he died he left only his "second best bed" ... to the woman whom he married under unsavoury compulsion; and that, through years of affluence, he neglected to pay a shepherd a debt of two pounds incurred by his wife in days of poverty...

These, and other irrelevancies relating to houses, lands, tithes and false claims respecting his coat-of-arms, have, with infinite pains, been dug up, to teach the humblest of us how unfortunate it may prove to excite the curiosity of posterity; but in no single instance during the many years of his supposed fame do we find in his private records trace of a personal friendship with an aristocrat.

This is extraordinary from every point of view; for, even in the capacity of mask for another man, marks of such contacts might be looked for, since the person engaged for one purpose might very well have

been employed on other business. This is not an unlikely explanation of the fact that after the time of his final retirement to Stratford the Earl of Rutland's secretary coupled the name of "Shakespeare" with that of Burbage in respect to a quite irrelevant cash payment ... but not even a trifle like this has, directly or indirectly, connected him with an aristocrat during all the years of his reputed immersion in literature and high class friendshipe. If ever he lived in touch with such people the meetings must have been jealously guarded and their traces carefully covered.

During these years he was evidently kept generelly out of sight, in as yet undiscovered quarters. Brief glimpses of semiclandestine lodgment is all that we can catch of him in London; for there, even the tax gatherers, who wanted him, went wrong by a matter of years as to where he could be found — the very yeare during which, on orthodox assumptions, he was living in a blaze of royal favor. On the other hand, Thomas Greene, a lawyer, resided in his Stratford house, and along with Shakspere's brother Gilbert, seems to have attended to any important business there; so that no one, either in Stratford or elsewhere, ever received a note from his hand, and no business of his in town has left a specimen of his signature. Even his Stretford domiciliation, so much more traceable than anything found in London, is not without its strangely elusive phases.

As might have been foreseen, the lesson of the special researches directed towards him personally has been amply borne out by more recent enquiries directed from the other side: that is into the lives and correspondence of the aristocrats themselves, particularly those who, by name, were implicated in Shakespeare publications. Up to the present none of these labours has yielded the slightest fruit. Not a single document has shown any aristocrat at all interested in the person of William Shakspere. None wrote to him, received a letter from him, or so much as mentioned him in private correspondance. It is blank negation everywhere.

The distinctive way in which "Shakespeare" has selected the third Earl of Southampton for immortality, in connection with his great poems — and also, it is believed, in the Sonnets — has naturally focussed attention upon that nobleman; and what is probably an exhaustive investigation has been made into his life and correspondance. In Mrs. Stopes biography of him the materials collected fill two very substantial volumes; but, at the close of a long task ... the biographer has to admit failure so far as her main object was concerned. She has not discovered those traces of Shakspere that she hoped to find: which she undoubtedly would have found had Shakspere been the writer of all the "Shakespeare" poetry dedicated and addressed to Southampton.

A similar unrelieved failure has attended such enquiries as have been made into the affairs of the brother Earls of Pembroke and Montgomery ... Indications of a warm practical interest in other men of letters, like Ben Jonson, exist; but not a trece of lifetime contact with Shakspere has been found.

It cannot, of course, be claimed that all possible sources of information have now been exhausted; but the presumption against anything turning up to show us William Shakspere in the presence of an aristocrat amounts to a practical certainty. One delusion that modern researeh has positively shattered for all time is that he enjoyed frequent and easy access to the nobility and the undisguised favour of royalty, whilst living, as a popular journalist has claimed, "as well known in London as the Globe Theatre." Such a life and such publicity are however the necessary implications of the litereture.

We have therefore an irreconcilable conflict between the authorship pretensions and the findings of modern research: a proof that this man was the personal centre of a cunning scheme for deceiving peo-

ple reepecting the source of these great works. We speak of deception, of course, without implication of censure; for one way of concealing authorship seems as legitimate as another. The method in thie case has proved more affective than an avowed anonymity would have been; and,if the writer had decided definitely upon his own self-effacement, it ie certainly preferable that the works should have been preserved in thie way than lost to mankind forever. As, however, Shakepere wae not the author he must have been used aa a covar for someons else; and until that man is discovered and acknowledged, the works are anonymous, and the writer of tham ie still miesing.

THE SHAKESPEAREAN AUTHORSHIP SOCIETY

Many S.O.S. membere have directed inquiriee to us concerning their inability to get a response from the Englieh Shakespearean Authorship Society. There haa been apparently a considerabla change of offices in that organization (ae well aa a change in both name and style of their house orgsn — now called The Bard), and our attempts to establish rapport last summer during our trip to England yielded the name of one officer whoee sddress we published in our Fall 1976 Newsletter.

It eeems that some membere of our Society have even sent money (in the form of checke) to that addreee, and that evidence of receipt has appeared in the form of cancellations, but neither correspondence nor any issue of The Bard has been forthcoming.

The Shakespeare Oxford Society regrets the inconvenience its members have suffered due to this problem. The Newsletter editor is making every effort to follow through and to try to get to the botom of the difficulty. Any progress (or lack thereof) will be reported in future issuee.

C.C.C.

WAS "SHAK-SPEARE" A TYPO?

Our series of Rhoda Meesner'e rebuttal to Dr. Louie Marder has drawn the greatest amount of comment from members to date, most of it favorable. The individualism of Oxfordians is, in our opinion, one of the Society's snd the Oxfordian cause'e greatest strengtha, and the purpoee of the Newsletter ie to air a varisty of approachee to the authorship problem — a variety which existe even within the unity and ecientific eimplicity of the Oxfordian authorship theory. So, there are bound to be disagreementa with this or that argument or with ita particular importanca, and the Nawsletter staff in publishing the views of any member impliee nothing beyond a broad general agreement. In other worda, we have our own opinions aa well, ae resders of our Fall 1976 issue can gauge by the eopious footnotes we appended to the firet installment of tha Meeener-Marder exchange.

Due to the deadline pressure in getting out the Winter 1976-77 Newsletter (many members will remember it arrived just in time for the Vernal Equinox), we dispensed with the footnotee and decided to catch up on eny furthar comment in this isaue, eo here goea!

We eannot coneur with Mrs. Meesner's conceseion on page 4 that "the hyphen argument for tbe pseudonym Shake-epeare ie... euggestive but not very important." Indeed, we fael that Dr. Marder'e anewer on this point ie not only weak, but insccurate and mieleading ee well. He correctly states thet the hyphen is not constant in the published use of tha name "Shakespeare" on title pagee of the playe and poeme, but he neglecte to inform the reader that a hyphen waa then ae now only used in a peraon'e name to combine two or more proper namee, each of which was capitslized. The fact that "speare" is never capitalized in the printed form of "Shakespeare" constitutea a prima facie srgument for a pseudonymous connotation. Marder's citation — in supnort of his srgument —

of the various spellings of Elizabethan surnames is monumentally beside the point, unless he can produce some examples of "Ben Jon-son" or "John-son" or "Mar-low" or "Hey-wood," etc., atc. in use at that period.

But it is when Marder statas categorically that "the intermixture of all spellings, including the Shak (short a) and Shaks (long a) forms, with hyphenated and unhyphenated forms for the same works, completely disproves any theory based on it," that our breath is simply taken away!

It has long struck many anti-Stratfordians as extremely curious that Shakspere's six parelytic signatures without exception omit the "s" aftar the "k," and that the published plays and poems with only one excaption — to be discussed below — show "Shake" as the first syllable, whether the name is hyphenated or not. If the Stratford citizen were really tha author of "Shakespeare's" works, wouldn't ths form he consistently eigns himself meke at least some appearance in the publications?

As a matter of fact, the spelling "Shak-" does make one published appearance on a play during Shakspere's lifstime: on the First (or "Pied Bull") Quarto of King Lear, 1608. J.T. Looney was the first to note the irregularities of publication attendant upon the four "new" Shakespearean publications of 1608-1609 after a peculiar hiatus of three years following the death of Edward de Vere ("Shakespeare" Identified, pp. 351-357). But the one aspect under discussion seems generally to have escaped notica, or at least extended comment.

The title page of Lear's First Quarto reads: "M. William Shak-speare: HIS True Chronicle Historie of the lifs and death of King Lear and his three Daughters. With the unfortunate life of Edgar, sonne and heire to the Earle of Gloster, and his sullen and assumed humor of Tom of Bedlam: As it wae played vsually at the Gloabe on the Bancks-side." Under a printer's insignia is the further information that the edition has been printed for Nathaniel Butter, to be sold at his shop in Paul's Church-yard at ths sign of tha "Pide Bull," etc.

This solitary appearance of the name "Shak-speare" (which beare no resemblanca to either the other published forms of the author's name or to Shakspere's own signed form) appears to have been "corrected" by the Second Quarto title page, backdated to 1608 in an apparent effort to circumvant an order of around 1615 forbidding the publication of any of the plays of the King's Men "without their consent." This Second Quarto, actually printed in 1619 by one of the Jaggards, reeets the type on all of the information quoted above, but, unlike othar aimilarly beckdated quartos of Shakspeare plays printed in that year, preserves the information intact, even unto the spelling — except for the author's name, which has been altered to "M. VVilliam Shake-apeare." This suggests that in the publishing world, at least, the "Pied Bull" spelling of "Shakspeare" was regarded as an aberration.

On this interpretation, Louis Mardar's fancied "intermixture" of the spellings on Shakaspeara's published works disappears altogether.

ANY VOLUNTEERS?

The Shakaspeare Oxford Society needs you. Are you willing to halp in the work of the organization? Would you perhapa stand as candidate for offica in ths coming year?

As usual with a volunteer organization such as oure, the same few must bear the burden of work. That is why we ara making this appeal for new facas to share ths responsibility. Let us hear from you soon.

RHODA MESSNER ANSWERS DR. MARDER

(Part III)

In April 1963, Louis Marder, editor of The Shakespeare Newsletter, published in his journal a partial list of his answers to a challenge he had issued the previous November to anti-Stratfordians. Various doubters of the orthodox mythos answered, and Dr. Marder ultimately responded to seventeen questions put forward by G.M. Pares and Francis Carr of the Francis Bacon Society in England. Rhoda Messner, author of Absent Thee from Felicity, had corresponded with Dr. Marder, asking his permission to publish in our Newsletter his own responses along with her rebuttal. In the Fall 1976 and Winter 1976-77 issues of the Newsletter, Dr. Marder's answers and Mrs. Messner's comments for Questions #1 - 12 have been published. The series concludes in this issue with Questions #13, 16, and 17 (#14 and 15 are omitted because they apply only to the Baconian candidacy). As in Questions #1 - 8, the Newsletter editor's comments are given in footnotes. The Shakespeare Oxford Society wishes to thank Dr. Louis Marder for his consent to republish his material.

13. Q. How do you account for the fact that we have not a single line of praise written by Shakespeare's contemporaries as an obituary notice? There is no evidence that anyone thought that his death was worth commenting on.

L.H. That there is no eulogy may be accounted for by the fact that Shakespeare died suddenly — the state of his will indicates this — and was buried before any "literary" ceremonies could be arranged. When news reached London nothing more was done for him than for any other poet except Jonson. John Taylor mentioned Shakespeare among other poets as dead in 1620. Hugh Holland's lines prefixed to F1 with their talk of tears, coffin and grave may have been composed closer to 1616 than to 1623.[1] As with Jonson and Bacon, a book of eulogies is frequently organized by one minor figure. Would that Shakespeare had had such a friend![2]

R.M. Even if he died suddenly and was buried in Stratford, why would that prevent eulogies being written when the news reached London that the famous and beloved writer had died (assuming that Shakspere was that writer)? And when he left London to retire to Stratford, why were there no regrets voiced then? Mrs. Charlotte Stopes, the Shakespearean scholar and biographer of Southampton, blames this neglect of his death on his retirement, which brings us to the puzzling question of why he retired, a fact never satisfactorily answered. There is much evidence of his business energy and activity during his last years, but none of any dramatic or bookish interests. Why? People do act in inexplicable ways, I grant you, but surely someone would have some clue to his strange behavior. I can only add that which J.T. Looney has remarked: that Spenser, a lesser poet, was still writing to the bitter end, and Jonson, a lesser playwright, was writing and publishing until his death. Or, it is conjectured that he was bitter and disillusioned with the city and the life around him. Again, why? From a poor, obscure provincial he had become unbelievably successful, famous and affluent, according to the orthodox assumptions. If he indeed did have private reasons for

---

[1] "May have been...," therefore, it "was"? Besides, Holland's only significance in Jacobean letters seems to derive from this effusion. John Taylor could well speak of "Shakespeare" as dead in 1620, since the Earl of Oxford had died in 1604.

[2] It is curious that William Camden, the foremost chronicler of Elizabethan and Jacobean times, in describing important events of the year 1616 (in Annals), does not see fit to mention the passing of one he had previously praised as one of many "pregnant witts" (Remaines of a Greater Worke Concerning Britain, 1605).

disillusionment with London, would he not have continued his writing (if he was the poet Shakespeare) in peaceful little Stratford and have strived to make a cultural haven there?

16. Q. With regard to the Stratfordian's claim that the Dugdale sketch of the Shakespearean monument is inaccurate, we find that in 1730 Dr. Thomas, a Warwickshire man residing near Stratford, brought out a second edition of Dugdale's work which was revised, corrected and expanded. Yet we find that the representation of the original monument is from the same unaltered block which Dugdale himself used. The plate in Dugdale's Antiquities of Warwickshire (1656) is the first illustration we have of the original monument. The next is the one that appears in Rowe's biography of Shakespeare (1709) and this engraving very closely resembles Dugdale's. Both artists portray the figure as clasping a sack or bag. Observing that Sir William Dugdale was a noted antiquary and Garter-King-at-Arms, and that his own careful sketch (from which the engraving was made) is still extant, how do you account for this?

L.M. This argument too ought to be embalmed as a curiosity of criticism. There is superabundant evidence that Dugdale worked too quickly, misrepresented grossly, and accepted shoddy work from his engravers constantly. The Clopton monument and the Carew monument, both in Holy Trinity at Stratford, are hopelessly misrepresented and out of proportion.[3] ...The only conclusion is that for the engravings — to say nothing of the numerous errors pointed out by Thomas and other writers — Dugdale is in this case no reliable authority whatever![4]

R.M. Dugdale may have been quite careless and unreliable in his drawing of the Shakespeare monument and bust in 1656 (although the Thomas you cite does not seem to have caught this particular "error," inasmuch as he did not revise Dugdale's representation in his own edition!) but what possessed the man to portray the famous poet-playwright as a seedy-looking individual reaching out to clutch a well-filled grain-sack, if the bust really then showed him, smug and chubby, with his arms relaxed on a smooth cushion and holding a pen poised in his right hand? Was it malice, or a perverted sense of humor, or for some good reason of his own?

17. Q. Since the Shakespeare controversy began to receive a considerable airing in the press, not one person has come forward to demonstrate that the anti-Stratfordians are wrong. The attitude of complete silence from the authorities at Stratford-on-Avon is now making people in England think that the skeptics may be right after all. Mr. Fox, the Director of the

---

3Dr. Marder's citation of the Clopton-Carew monuments is not analagous, since the drawings were submitted by the families, thus the "misrepresentations" are not Dugdale's. To compare the differences in "many details and entire configuration" (M. Spielmann, letter published in The Pall Mall Gazette, Feb. 21, 1912) of the Clopton-Carew monuments with the truly substantial differences in the Shakespeare monument as it appears today with Dugdale's sketch is surely the language of exaggeration. The reader should go to Stratford and judge for himor herself.

4A Dr. Whitaker, cited by Sir George Greenwood (Is There a Shakespeare Problem? London, 1916, pp. 488-9), is one antiquarian who states that Dugdale's "scrupulous accuracy, united with stubborn integrity," has elevated his Antiquities of Warwickshire "to the rank of legal evidence." Greenwood in a footnote (loc. cit.) also quotes Anthony Wood: "What Dugdale hath done is prodigious. His memory ought to be venerated and had in everlasting remembrance."

Birthplace Trust, haa refueed to aee interviewers from the BBC and the preae. Is this, in your opinion, the conduct of e man who ie confident in the claime made by his own organization?

L.M. My opinion of Mr. Fox is that he ia eure of his position and knowe eo well that proper evidence is available that he doee not trouble himself to answer. It ia to teachere like myself to whom is relegated the taak of enlightening the uninformed and making the known truth more widely available.

R.M. I don't blame Mr. Fox for refuaing to aee the interviewers from the BBC and the preee. I am sure that he hae confidence and ie secure in his poaition. He would not want to get involved in the fray. It would be troublesome, undignified and unprofitable. I do detect in Mr. Fox, ae well aa in a great many other learned gentlemen a faint reaemblance to the ostrich. (Query: When doea a fox reaemble an ostrich?)[5]

[5]"Hide fox, and all after." Hamlet, Act IV, Scene ii, line 30.

IN OUR NEXT ISSUE

A report on the Cyr'e trip to England in June, 1976, including a visit to Tilbury Manor, ancestral home of Sir Horace Vere.

Sir Morace Vere'e will, procured for us by Mr. Harold Patience, Secretary of the S.O.S. English Branch.

Preaentation by Peter Michaels, Coneervator for the Maryland Historical Society and the Capitol of the U.S., at the Shakeapeare Oxford Society national conference in Baltimore September 25, 1976.

* * *

ARE YOU A MEMBER

OF THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY?

Join us in our research

and related activities.

Memberehip Duea

Student member	$2.00 per annum
Regular member	$10.00 per annum
Donating member	$25.00 per annum (or more)

Your Shakespeare Oxford Society

duea are tax-deductible.

Write to:

SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY

110 Glen Argyle Road

Baltimore, Maryland 21212

* * *

The Shakespeare Oxford Society NEWSLETTER
SUMMER, 1977

110 Glsn Argyle Roed, Baltimore, Maryland 21212

S.O.S. SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE 1977

The Second National Conferencs of ths Shakeapeare Oxford Society will be held October 14 - 16 st the Ramada Inn, Rosslyn, Virginia (suburban Washington, D.C.). A eeparate mailing will includs further details as to location, travel directions, room ratss, and agenda. For those who plan to arrive sarlier (or to stay beyond the Sunday edjournment), the new D.C. Metro subway line has recsntly opened its routs to Rosslyn, which operetes on weekdsys and is a great convenience for tourists to the capital. Rosslyn is aleo only tsn minutea from the National Airport.

A POST MORTEM ON THE MESSNER-MARDER EXCHANGE

Our publication in the lsst three issusa of Rhoda Henry Measner's rebuttal to Louis Mardsr's answers to anti-Stratfordiana' questions has revived interest among our members in ths quality of argumsnt displayed by the orthodox when facing skaptics. Dr. Mardsr shows himssIf to be one of our more courtsous adversariss, in thst hs solicited ths qusstions himself, made s game try at snswering them, and refrained from the usual sd hominem sttscks on hia opponents. Dr. Marder dessrves the grstitude of all anti-Stratfordisns for his ssrious and dignified approach to an issus which ought to bs, after all, ona in which reasonabls men can "disagrss without becoming dissgreeable."

Also, in fsirness to Dr. Marder, we should inform our rsaders that thsrs were two points which Mrs. Meesner had truncated, as her reply did not dspend on Marder's complets statement: Question 10 (ths hyphenation of "Shaks-speare") and Qusstion 16 (the Dugdale drawing of tha Stratford Shakespeare Monument). Dr. Marder documents hie anawers mors fully in each case, but with one exception (which will form a separate articls in e future Newslettsr), ths omiseions do not materially sffect the gist, nor Mrs. Meesner's snd our own rebuttal. (Dr. Marder's complete answers, plus the rebuttal of Mr. Francis Csrr of ths Francis Bacon Society of England, appear in ths Shakespearean Authorship Review #10, Autumn 1963, pp. 2 - 9.)

But with ell dus defsrsncs to Louis Marder's poaition in Shakespeerean studies, and allowing that certain of the questions are loaded onea, we find that the level of dsbate in which hs engages, sside from hia grsater courtssy, doss not rise above that of his profsssional colleagues on sny of the iseues raised. Dr. Mardsr had the snormoua advantege of having chosen his own ground snd thus had every opportunity to make ths strongest cass poaeibls. That he hae not dons so is prssumptivs evidencs that ths cause is a weak one. It ie rsvsaling that in hia introduction in ths original srticle (The Shskaspesrs Newsletter, April 1963), Dr. Mardsr, liks many othsr Shskespesrsan scholars, csnnot resist rsferring to his opponsnts ae "hsrstics," conceding to the world that ths "orthodoxy" of Stratfordianism is a revaaled religion, impervious to ressoned dieesnt!

Oxfordians and other disbelievers in ths Stratford dogma may sdopt Dr. Mardar's final statement in this introduction as their own. One of the purposes of his snswsrs, he ssys, is to "provide ths teechsr with aoms avidsnce to warn othsrs of specious arguments."

Below we propose to list some of the common logical fallacies and dubious debating techniques that Marder seems to share with many Stratfordians, over and above those addressed by Mrs. Messner or ourselves in the footnotes. Our concern here is not to answer the points Dr. Marder raises in his replies, since Mrs. Messner has performed a very able demolition job on those herself, but to criticize his argumentative methods and a frequent failure to observe a modicum of scholarly rigor. Nor do we intend to single out Marder in this connection and thus give the impression that we are repaying his courtesy with ingratitude. He has, after all, only adopted Academe's standard tactics, and Oxfordians have already seen most of these used — though less civilly to be sure, and with many more factual errors to their debit — in the various screeds of Evans, Levin, and Schoenbaum.

Our presentation does not necessarily follow the order in the exchange, but rather attempts to classify the various logical lacunae by type. Since the exchange was serialized over three consecutive issues, all citations will appear with the number of the question first, followed by a letter indicating the Newsletter issue (F = Fall 1976; W = Winter 1976/77; S = Spring 1977), and finally the page number in that issue (e.g. 1F6 = Question 1, Fall 1976 Newsletter, page 6).

The non sequitur. This is a frequent lapse in many of the exchange's answers, one of which we've already pointed out (4F7). Some others: "If the civic-minded John Shakespeare [sic] had no education, it would be all the more reason to think that he would have assured one to his son (2F6)." This might be true in our own age of compulsory universal education, but John Shakespere, by Marder's own admission (3F7) was illiterate, and one of the preconditions of admittance to school in those days was the learning of one's "accidence" — i.e., the ability to read and write. Dr. Marder does not answer the implied question of how William's father could have imparted such a skill.

"If the butcher tradition must be accepted, so must the schoolmaster [i.e., Aubrey's statement that young Shakspere had been a 'Schoolmaster in the Country'] (5 F7)." As Sir George Greenwood truly said, "This schoolmaster story is caught at by the Stratfordians as drowning men catch at a straw." (The Shakespeare Problem Restated, London, 1908, p. 105n.) We are more interested in the type of thinking which tries to assert the mutual dependence and equal veracity (or falsity) of each and every item in a demonstrably unreliable source. A good historian is always faced with decisions in the sifting out of improbabilities within any source. In this instance, in addition to our original arguments for believing the butcher portion of Aubrey's biography (with its independent confirmation), we can only repeat our reply to Evans and Levin on this same subject (Newsletter, Summer 1975, p. 15), "...the schoolmaster story must be dismissed as improbable —especially in the face of the deadly fact that no school has come forward to boast of Stratford Will's tenure as 'country pedagogue'."

"This and similar documents showing Shakespeare's share in the Globe theatre prove that Shakespeare was a so-fully integrated member of the company that it is utterly fantastic to think that he could have been at the same time an unknown or permanently concealed front for some other author (9W3)." The dearth of evidence for Shakspere's acting "career" belies the assertion that Shakspere was a "fully integrated member" of the King's Men. On the contrary, this lack of evidence is not at all inconsistent with the hypothesis that Shakspere's theatrical connections provided a perfect "cover" as front man for a concealed author.

Abuse of hyperbole. "Utterly fantastic (see above)," "analysis of this problem gives absolute and irrevocable avidance... (10W4)," "superabundant evidence that Dugdale worked too quickly, misrepresented

grosely, and accepted shoddy work from his engravere constantly (16S9)." Noteworthy in all these examples is the degree of adjectival overkill, as if the respondent wanted to shore up a weak cass with heavy words.

The ignoratio elenchi, or the fallacy of irrelevance, conaista of drawing a conclusion which doea not contradict the proposition the debater aeeks to refute. In an attempt to deny that the author of Shakespeare'a worke needed the specialized knowledge so many commentators have attributed to him, Dr. Marder concludes, "If we remember that Shakespeare did not live in a vecuum, that the playa reveal evidence of ecute powers of observation and understanding, then all things are possible and probeble — and so, aa the playe revaal (12W5)." Powers of observation and understanding are not inconsistent with laarning, and in fact are more often found among the educated than otherwise. The educated Renaissance man trained his ability to obeerve with hie wide reading in the ancient philosophers, many of whose treatisea had not been translated into English. The argument here ie also a form of

The vicious circle, in which a premise assumas the point et issue. Many Stratfordiane boil down the proposition stated above to thia syllogism: "Shakespeare did not need to be educated, because to a genius all things ere poasibls. And the proof that all things ere possible to en uneducated genius is to be found in the plays of Shakespeare."

Another example of this type of fallacy can be found in Dr. Marder's attempta to explain away tha interlineated bequests to "fellow actors" in Shaksper's will (11W4). The question in effect asked whether the occasional references to a "Shakespeare" (however spelled) as a "shareholder" or a "partner" in various theatrical entarprisss could have raferred to someone other than the Stretford man. One doaa not have to defend an affirmative enswar to see that the negative one Marder employs resta on very shaky ground. The first step in the argument is to cite the bequeste to Heminges, Condsll, and Burbage in Shaksper's will. But coneiderable suepicion attaches to these because they ere interlinaated, suggesting thet they could have beon added any time after the drafting of the will—could even be forgsries. Dr. Marder tacitly concedes this weakness, but then says that the entries are "borne out ...by their reference to him, and similar bequssta to him by other actors." But this last instance, refarring presumably to Augustine Phillips's 1605 will (which should make Marder's reference read "another actor") does not clearly indicate that William of Stratford is meant. Ae for Heminges's and Condell's remarks, along with "other references to Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon in the First Folio," the First Folio's avidentiary valua haa baan in question by the skeptics for more than a century! And one of the more questionable aspects lies in the so-called "testimony of Heminges and Condell." Ceorga Steevens, the well-known 18th Century Shakeapearean commantator, proved that Ben Jonson composed the prefaces to which these two gentlemen signed their namee, and the sincerity (not to mention the reliability) of Jonson's First Folio utterances is suspect on a number of points. Two types of contradictory evidence are hers juxtaposed: 1) where the reference to William of Strstford is not in doubt, but its reliability ia, and 2) where the evidence (or witneas, such as Augustine Phillips) is reliable, but the reference to Stratford is in doubt. The disingenuous statement that the "relationship" between all these dubious props is "mutual and reciprocal" cannot conceal the argument'e circularity.

The self-contradiction. "Moreovar analysis of thie problem [the hyphenated form of Shake-speere] givss absolute and irrevocable evidencs that Shakspere was Shakespeare (10W4)." In almost the next breath we find "the intermixture of all spellings, including the Shak (ehort a) and Shake (long a) forms, with hyphenated and unhyphenated forms for the same works

[an inaccurate statement as it turns out] completely disproves any theory based on it." "Any theory" must include the one previously put forward: that "Shakspere was Shakespeare."

The non-response. In answer to the question whether pseudonyms have ever become an open secret or a convention, readers are left hanging with the brief sentence "... this is not analagous to the Shakespears situation (8F8)." How is it not analagous? Why not? Details, please!

The ex cathedra pronouncement. "It is to teachers like myself to whom is relegated the task of enlightening the uninformed and making the known truth more widely available (10S10)." At the very least, this conveys the perhaps unintended tone of the priesthood concept surrounding the Stratfordian commentators, who generally (as we've seen above) adopt theological terms of debate in the authorship issue.

In the introduction to The Shakespeare Newsletter's original exchange, Dr. Marder states, "I do not see how exception can be taken to the answers unless opinion be offered by the heretics instead of facts..." The same facts (or rather paucity of facts) are available to both the believer and the doubter. What is at issue is the interpretation of those facts. For this, reason not opinion is needed, and the Stratfordians have shown that they enjoy no monopoly on such a desirable commodity.

NOTED STRATFORDIAN OBJECTS TO SHAKESPEARE'S "IMAGINARY LIFE"

Louis Marder, in The Shakespeare Newsletter of May 1977, is rightly critical of those responsible for the six-part "life of Shakespeare" soon to be visited on British and American television audiences. Dr. Marder, whose refreshingly untypical good will toward anti-Stratfordiana we have had occasion to praise in the preceding articles, complains with considerable justification of the Associated TV (of London) script that "facts are changed," relationships are "invented" and "conceived," and he demurs from scriptwriter John Mortimer's statement in the Sunday Times last year: "You can write the life of Shakespeare on a post card and have room for the stamp." Marder concludes "...from what I have read of this series, the audience can only come away with a distorted view of Shakespeare's life. In his writing about the series Mortimer makes it clear that his plays are almost pure fiction rather than documentaries. I hope it will be made as sufficiently clear before each segment is presented to the public."

While we have no hesitation in associating ourselves with Louis Marder's views in this instance and deplore along with him such a cavalier treatment of facts — especially when it is considered that this topsy-turvy know job will be disseminated before a large public — a part of our sympathies must go to the perpetrators of this outrage. The biographical evidence for Shakspera of Stratford is, as Mortimer points out, pretty meagre. Although the metaphoric post card may be an exaggeration, if we are to speak of those few references that point clearly to the Stratford man, rather than of that cornucopia of two centuries' worth of constructions that currently passes for "Shakespearean scholarship," these could certainly be contained on a single side of one 8½ X 11" sheet of paper.

More to the point is the quality of these references. Stratfordians of every shape, size and gender have come to grief trying to bring the personality revealed in the plays and sonnets and this paltry Stratfordian curriculum vitae, in the words of W.H. Furness, "within planetary space of each other." In this vain attempt, many scholars have made themselves ridiculous by miereading of evidence and unwarranted inferences, which are then elevated to the rank of premises, which form the basis for ever further unwarranted inference, and

so on, in exponential fashion. Why should not a scriptwriter for TV — charged with ths job of coming up with a ehow that will not turn viewers off — be allowed to have a crack at it, especlally after five minutes' acquaintance with such a mare's nest? It is merely one step further from the Stratfordian loose interpretation of facts to the attitude that if these facta don't square with the popular notion of what is approprlate to s writer's life, well then, a fig for ths facts!

Dr. Marder mentions that one of the "concsived" relationships in the series is that of the Dark Lady, who is made into the "wife of a judge, too busy to note ths liaisons with Shakespeare and the Earl of Southampton." Marder compares this with William Gibson'a similarly fictionalized drama, A Cry of Players, in which Anne Shaksspesre is imagined as the Dark Lady, "who has an affair with Hamnet Sadler" — the latter being a real-life fellow townaman of Shaksper.

But are these fancies any more absurd than the numerous other Dark Ladies put forth, perfectly seriously, by many Stratfordian echolars, with no more evidence in their favor? Who can possibly justify tha ahopworn candidacy of Mary Fitton, for whom any data supporting a connection with Shakspers of Stratford (or aven a cosmetological basis for the nickname) ars conspicuously lacking? Or A.L. Rowse's even more far-fetched Emilla Lanier, whose sole qusifications for the "honor" seem to lis in a monumental misreading of the adjective "brave" for "braun" (i.e., "brown"!)? The Associated TV series, atrocious as it no doubt will be (both in Dr. Marder's view and our own), is but a foreseeable consequence of the frustration the average person feels when he or sha confronts the dismal facts of "Shakespeare's biography": the bequest of the "second-bsst bed," the bookleas last testamsnt, the petty maltster who sued his fellow townspeopls for small sums, hoarded corn in times of famine, and moved to have the common lands snclosed.

Could this, by eny stretch of the imagination, be ths same man who gave us Hamlet, The Tempest, end tha Sonnets? Small wonder, then, that John Mortimer (and before him, Frank Harris in The Man Shakespeare) would wieh to change these facta — feeling, perhaps, that fiction in this case is more in accord with reality (at least paychological reality) than the "truth" as Stratford eess it.

IN MEMORIAM

It is with great regret that we announce the dsath of RALPH TWEEDALE, author of Wasn't Shakespeare Someone Else?, in an automobile accident on July 13 (Detroit Free Press). Tweedale, 73, was an Oxfordian of long standing, having been one of the Shakespeare Oxford Society's many distinguished lawyer-membera. In addition to a law degrae from George Waahington University, he held an engineering dsgree from Cornell. These two areas of expertise converged in his book (published by Verity Prese in 1971), in which hs put forward an ingenious but controveraial cryptogram theory for the 1609 edition of Shake-speare'a Sonnets. The Shakespeare Oxford Society extends ite profound sympathy to Mr. Tweedale's family.

OVERPAINTING ON THE "ASHBOURNE" PORTRAIT: A CONSERVATOR'S VIEW

Advice ae to what reaearchers could or could not do to detect evidence of overpainting and discover details of the original painted surfacs undernesth wae given at the Shakespeare Oxford Society's annual meeting in Baltimore, Maryland on September 25 last year. Peter Michaels, Departmsnt of Fine Arts at Coucher College, Maryland, who ie also conservator for the Maryland Historical Society, The Capitol of the U.S., the Cummer Gallery

of Art, Florida, and other institutions, aa well as Conservator Emeritua of the Waltera Art Gallery, Baltimors, was the expert on hand — to talk about currant techniques and answer questione from members.

Mr. Michaels opened his remarke with a eummary of Charles Wisner Barrell'e work in the 1930's — work which, incidentally led to a court suit involving a staff member of the Folger Shakeepeare Library in Washington, D.C. We were remindad of Mr. Barrell's photographs, x-rays, and infrared photography of the much-dieputed "Ashbourne" portrait, now hanging in the Folger Library, which was once reputed to be an authentic representation of "Shakeepeare." Barrell, as many will recall, was a photographic expert who worked for Western Electric and who waa invited by tha "Ashbourne" portrait's ownar — at that time (1929) Euetace Conway — to study and appraise the painting. Of course, Barrell's later photographic findings are generally well-known to Oxfordians, for he estabiiahed that there was indeed overpainting on certain areas of the portrait, that the forehead and ruff had been changed, that the data had been altered — the original having been scraped or gouged out of the canvas eurface—and that in various parte of the original painting, thsre ware obscured figures, one at least euggesting the allianca of the de Vere and Trentham familiee (Oxford's second wife waa Elizabeth Trentham). By tha way, Barrell had also made photographic examinations of the Hampton Court and the "Janssen" portraite with aimilar provocative findings.

Before proceeding with his remarks, Peter Michaels reviewed the definitions of techniques, euch as x-ray photography (photo made on a photosensitive negative by tranemission of x-ray radiation through an object) and infrared photography (employing longer wave lengths of the spectrum that can penstrate dark varnish and certain colors effectivaly).

From a conservator's viewpoint, Michaels felt that if the most eignificant changes on the painting, such ae tha forehead and ruff, could easily be saen on x-ray, then one could proceed with other examination tools that could be used to study the original paint underneath the surface. Aa far as establishing tha data of overpainting ie concerned, the only way is to find a pigment which waa not known at the time the original work was dona. For example, if any of the following painte ehowed up on the portrait's overpainted areae, estimatee of dates could be made: artificial ultramarine (not invented until 1826), cobalt blue (also 1826), cobalt blue with alumina (1802), or Prueaian blue (1704), and eo on. There are numerous methods to determine what the pigmente are within a layer of a paint etructure.

Michaels than outlined the investigative msthoda available today which fall into two major categoriee — non-deetructive tasting and "destructive" testing. The former includes x-ray, ultraviolst illumination, infrared photography, x-rey fluoreecent spectroscopy, neutron activation, and electron microprobe. Ultraviolet rays are at the other end of the spectrum (short wave) from infrared, and like infrared are not visible to the naked eye. Ultraviolet shows which area of a painting ia not part of tha original paint surface because the media which bind the pigmenta togsther are not identical and do not age in tha aame way and therefora fluoresce diffarantly whan viewed under ultraviolet light. An experienced eye can aasily aee the differencaa. Michaels wae frankly eurprised that this techniqua had not been ueed by Barrell. Its only disadvantage is that it doesn't penetrate old, dark reainent varnish well. But this problem, of course, does not apply to the "Ashbourne" portrait because it was newly cleaned and varniahed in 1936 after purchaee, and Barrell's study was made in 1937 and thereafter.

Infrared, on the other hand, cuts through varniah. Probably the most vital and sophisticated method for the Shakespaare Oxford Society'e researchers would be x-ray fluorescent spectroscopy. The objct to

be studied is placed in a stream of x-rays and a spectographic plate is mada from the rays emitted from the x-radiographed, excited aurface. Uaing this method, en expert can detsrmine through his or her knowledge of the structure of cartain pigments what is on the portrait's surface. Neutron activation, on the other hand, ie not aplicable to our case becauae the painting would be radioactive for ssvsral months, snd most museum directors or curatore would be nervous about letting euch a method be spplied to an important work, evan though it is not a dsstructive procedure. The last techniqus named, elactron microprobe, ie so complicated and svailability of equipmant so unliksly, that we should not seriously consider it.

The so-called "deetructive" methode ara not really damaging to the objects studied but are given this name becauee miniacule samples of the painted surface, sometimes the size of s grain of sslt, are involved. Thsse includs tha eetting-reein/crose-ssction method, tha laser beam microprobe, and microchamical analysis. In ths firstmentioned procedura, the tiny sample of paint (from the forehead or ruff area of the "Ashbourne" portrait, for example) would be embedded in a setting of resin. When the resin becomes hard with the paint fragment deeply embedded within, the hard reein can be shaved down until a cross section is visible. The different strata of paints csn sasily be seen — where ons bagins and another ends, whsre varnish was applied, where grime accumulated, and so on. This method alao permits possible micrcecopic x-rsy flourssccnt epectographic analyaie.

In the lasar beam microproba (only Boston might have the nseded equipmsnt), s laser is focueed through a microscope on s painted surfece and the energy projected through the microscope to a particular depth. This procedure is highly specialized and may not even be availabls at this time. The third method of "deatructive" testing is most resdily available — microchemical analysis of the paint itself. A little scraping is put under an ordinary microscope, and a skilled chemist, using acids and alkalies, i.s., wet chemical means, can determine what chemicals were actually involved in the painting.

Michaels summed up with ths thought that in our caee it is highly unlikaly that we would run into any pigmente that were not known from antiquity. Consequently, it is unlikely that we will be able to dete ths overpainting with any degree of accuracy unless it were done sfter 1911, which is, of course, not tha casa with the "Aehbourne" portreit. There ie an orenge-colored inacription in the upper laft, however, end thsse reddish pigments might provide some information. The cross-section technique would be important in any inveatigstion of thie type.

Michaele concluded with some spacific recommendations for the Shakeepeare Oxford Society. 1) Hs felt that all x-rays, infrared photos and panchromatic photoe thet have been mads should be gotten together in ths prasenca of ths painting end with the eid of a trained conservator should ba examined in good illumination side by side with the painting to saa what corrsapondencss there are. A small rsproduction ie not adequate for this purposs. 2) The report probably mada by the Fogg Musaum when that institution etudied, claaned, snd restored the portrait for the Folgsr Library should be availsble and should be considered along with the other svidsnce. The Fogg Mueeum would be likely to have a copy, snd certainly the Folger Library would hava received one along with the newly restored painting. 3) Becsuse nsw, improved x-ray film and x-ray techniques have been daveloped, it may be desirabla to redo the x-ray and infrsred photographs, particularly if tha old onee have not bsen etored properly over tha years or prove not to have sufficisntly high contrast for study. 4) Once it is eetablished thst changes have been made, it would be desireble to use x-ray fluorescent spectroscopy to determine ths nature of the pigmente in thoee aections and through cross-eection analysis exactly what they sre. 5) Anothsr report exiets — that which took placa under the auspices of the Folger Librsry in the 1940's — snd ehould be studied st <u>one time</u> along with sny

of the other photographic or written documents available, as indicated above.

After Mr. Michaels's address, membsrs asked numerous qusstions which elicited additional information. It is difficult at this time to give a cost estimate of tha various methods described. However, it can be said that x-rey photography is vary reasonable. Probably $25 per plate would be a good estimats. Of course, one must add the time of the technician, and of ths conservator who would study ths completed work. The standard techniques are ganarally available at several good laboratories in the Eastern United Statss. Michaels highly recommended ths Smithsonian Conservation Technical Analytical Department as having the most sophisticated analytical equipment in the country. The new conservation department at the Wintsrthur Museum in Delawara haa good equipment and outstanding sciantists on the staff. Dr. Robert Fsller at the Mellon Institute in Pittsburgh haa just established his own private lab at the Institute. Tha National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. would be the most desirable agency for our work, but might not want to becoms involved in an historical controvery euch as thia. The Inatitute of Fine Arts Conservation Csnter (Profesaor Lawrence Majeaki) at Naw York Univsrsity, on the other hand, has a fine technical est-up and is interested in controvereial problems. Of courae, costs would be higher with this lab because of the diatance involved.

Petsr Michaels himself admitted he would be happy to eerva in his capacity aa conservator to help in the analysis of the laboratory work performed by one of ths institutions cited above. He also answered an inquiry concsrning a method for determination whether a portreit was cut or torn (avidance ahows that the "Ashbourna" portrait was torn or cut at the bottom). Such evidance would be easy to obtain. Whara a canvas painting has baan pulled over the original stretcher and tacks hammered in, thsra will be pull marks in the fibera of tha canvas (scallops). An x-rey would easily show such evidence.

In a aubsequent ssssion at the Shakespeare Oxford Society's 1976 Confsrence, members agreed that the Society should puraus a cooperetive project with the Folgsr Librery of the sort described by Pstsr Michasls in ths next year or two.

S.O.S. CHAPTERS TAKE HOLD

For many yeara Los Angeles, California has been one region of tha U.S. where Shakespeare Oxford Sociaty members get togethsr regularly to share viaws and enjoy programs. Now there are stirrings alsewhere.

On Saturday August 20 in San Francisco, a few membsrs of ths northern California region met undar the laaderehip of Society trustss Michael Stsinbach at ths instigation of officars Helsn and Gordon Cyr who were on vacation in that area. This first sassion was dsvoted to getting acquainted, considering what was faasible for a chapte to do, discusaing mattars that tha group felt should recaive further ressarch effort and listening to a report on computsr techniquas for detsrmining authorship aa presented by tha Cyrs.

Discuaaion was enhanced by the thoughtful contributions mads by the highly qualified group pressnt, which included a psychiatrist, a retired librarian from Stanford University, and two staff members from tha Physics Departmant at tha University of California, Berkaley. Tha Society was urged to inveatigata the naw collocation approach to statistical analysis of authorship. Apparsntly, it is less time-consuming than othar methods, but is remarkably sffective for the study of authorship. Tha group was adamant in its concern that tha Shakespeare Oxford Socisty move faster and dsvota much mora time to research than in the past, particularly along lines that can be supported with scientific means.

On the other side of the continent, trustae E. Jimmea Stein of New York City raports t Ruth Loyd Millar, Shakespeare Oxford Sociaty

trustee and author/editor of various reissues in the Shakeepearean suthorship field, will ba guest speaksr at the Sept. 15 meeting of MENSA INTERNATIONAL in New York City at ths Williams Club on E. 39th St. Our Society's office has furniehed Me. Stsin with appropriate literature for distribution, and it ie hoped that some prospective members may be found in the audience. Thsre are now enough membere in the Nsw York area and adjacent New Jersey to form a working chapter.

Meanwhile, plans are going ahead for the firet get-togsther of those members who reside in Maryland, Washington, D.C. or northern Virginia. Ths meeting place will be ths Chsvy Chase Public Library; the dete and tims: Saturday, Sept. 17, 10 A.M. to 12 noon. President Charlton Ogburn, noted author, will be on hand to discues a recent controversy over the Washington Post'a article concerning a local eocial event given by an official of the Folger Shakespeare Library at which Samuel Schoenbaum made some derogetory remarks about anti-Stretfordians. Also, Ruth Loyd Miller, fresh from her New York lecture promiees to make an appearance to discuse her lateet reaearch.

And now full circle back to Los Angeles end the news that the lively southern California membere had another dinner meeting on last April 19 at ths U.C.L.A. Faculty Club at which the ubiquitoue Ruth Miller and her hueband Judge Minoe Miller met with members and Ruth gave a slide lecture on her researches in England. The Los Angeles group is inspired to action by S.O.S. Vice-President S. Colum Gilfillan.

Interested in a chapter in your area? Write ths Shaksspeare Oxford Society office so that the Society trustee closeat to you can be alerted into action on your behalf.

ACTIVITIES IN ENGLAND

England seems to be bristling with activitiee that relate to our cause these days. For example, the aminsnt British politician, Enoch Powell, M.P., a long-time student of the Oxfordian theory, not only appeared on a television broadcast (fall 1976) about ths tombs of the de Vere family at Earls Colne, but gave tha case for Edward de Vere a boost when he concluded his remarke by eaying, "There are those who believe —and thsre are grounds for thsir belief — impsssivs grounds — that Edward, seventeenth Earl of Oxford, was the man behind the works of William Shakeapeare. Psrhaps I ahouldn't have said that."

In May of this yeer, a play about Edward de Vere, Nothing Truer than Truth, opened at the Ovsrground Theetre, Kingston-upon-Themse. Author Darrol Blake assembled tha evidencs about Edward's lifs to support his thssis thet the Earl was the man behind the Shakeepeare authorship. Tha opening received good publicity in London papers, including The Times.

Then our English chapter's sscretary, Harold Patience, reports about his own racent sppeerance on BBC Televieion. "I managed to get myeslf on televiaion recently (BBC East Norwich). I was interviewed at Castle Hedingham. Ths whole thing lasted only about four minutss, but was good publicity. They ehowed old housas in the village and asksd only three qusstione. Then wa saw the portrait of Lord Oxford at ags 25 end (with appropriate commenta from ths interviewer) the 'Ashbourna'! (Thay borrowed my copies of the Looney re-iaeued booke.) Thres further questions were eeked (tape-recorded) for BBC Radio, but I didn't hear this myself. Am famous locally!"

Mr. Patience also dsscribes his entertaining of American visitors to England this ysar: Dr. and Mrs. Bronson Feldman of Pennsylvania (American members) and Mr. and Mrs. Leland Cooper of North Carolina, new mambers as of this week. It appears that Patience has taken so many people over to Castle Hedingham and environs by now that he ought to be in the tour business. After all, if Stratford can do it, Castle Hedingham can too!

****

SIR HORACE VERE'S WILL

While on the subject of our English chapter's secretary, Harold Patience also has forwarded to our office a copy of the will of Sir Horace Vere, cousin to the 17th Earl of Oxford, obtained from the will collection of Esaex Testatore 1558 - 1603 now maintained by ths Friends of Historic Essex. Becausa of dslays in transcribing this document, the article about it promised in the Spring 1977 Newslstter will be postponed to a future iasue.

SHAKESPEARE COUNTRY: REAL AND IMAGINED

by

Gordon C. Cyr

Our trip to England last summer formed principally a Shakeepeare odyssey — a visit to the aites frequented either by the true Shaksapeare, in our view, the 17th Earl of Oxford, or by his more famoue front, William of Stratford.

Mrs. Cyr and I began in London (which all ars agreed was Shakespeare's primary locus), whsre we had tea with Gwynneth Bowen and Ruth Wainewright (the two mainatays of the Shakespearean Authorship Society up through the earlier years of this decade). We hoped to re-cement relatione with our parent organization and to catch up onthe news of what had been happening in our respective aocieties eince we had lost contact with each other about three years ago. (For recent news about membership in the English socisty, aee the srticle immediately following.)

Two days later we were off to the "bookleea neighborhood" of Stratford (to borrow Halliwell-Phillippe's term) to visit the bogue monument and "Birthplace." In the house adjoining the eite of New Place — Shakspere's fine rseidence of his later years — we found many artifscte exhibited which had nothing to do with "Shakespeare," and, of courss, no books — ths only samplss of this latter "luxury" that we ran across were some of the medical journals of Dr. Hall at his house, Hall's Croft. (Dr. Hall, you will remember, treated Michasl Drayton — whom he describes as an "excellent poet," but could only say of the "immortal Bard,""My father-in-law died last Thursday"!)

Aside from tha rampant commercialism in Stratford (as exemplified not only in the misrepresentation of "Ths Birthplacs," but in the vending of post cards with a photo of "Ths Birth Room"!), we were struck by the physical placement of the "Shakespesre" monumsnt in Holy Trinity Church in relation to Shaksper's grave. Commentators often describe the monument as being placed above ths gravs. It is only "above" in the sense of being at a higher levsl. Ths grave ie removed from the wall by several feet, anothsr grave lying to the left of Shaksper's and adjoining the wall, snd other of Shaksper's family interred to the right. The inference we drew from sll this wae that the monument was an afterthought, snd that ths wall eome distancs away was tha closest the monument could be placed to the remains. Commercialism wes rife in this hallowed place as well, alas. However, ths fins performance of Romeo and Juliet by the Royal Shakespeare Company that we saw that evening helped to dispel these initial negative impressions.

The next day we were off to Braintree to meet with Englieh S.O.S. members. That evening we were introduced by our British chapter'e secretary, Mr. Harold W. Patiencs, to two mambers of the local press, Stanley Hayes, now rstired from ths Braintree and Witham Times and a great frisnd of the Oxfordian cause, and a Mr. Edge, a young reporter for the East Anglia Times (daily), to whom Mr. Hayea had introduced the eubject. An interview of Mre. Cyr and myeelf took place in which our views were cited in each of the two papere the following week.

The next morning Mr. Patience was to intrc duce ue to a new S.O.S. member, Mrs. Paget,

who had a car to teke us on a tour of the Essex countryside. We were et Mr. Patience's house on what must have been the hottest dey of the year, when the ebullient Mrs. Peget errived, full of good spirits and snthusiasm for ths dey's egenda! We took off first for Cestle Hedingham (the town that ie, not the cestle itself, which was closed on Frideye), where we were all snapped by a newepeper photogrepher for the East Anglia Times (like typicel Americsns we were dressed for the heat, whereas our English friende were more formal). During lunch we discovered that "Mrs. Peget" was, in reelity, the author Verily Anderson, one of whose many books had been made into a movie for British television. After lunch, she had arrenged for ue to vieit Tilbury Manor, the encestral home of Sir Horace Vere, cousin to the 17th Earl of Oxford. Tilbury Manor is now occupied by Ms. Anderson'e cousin, Mrs. Weller. The two ladies' hospitality included e tour of the manor and of the library. (No, we did not find there the manuscript of Hamlet in cousin Edward's hologreph!)

Aftsr dinner, Mrs. Cyr end I were invited to the home of Col. Ian Keelan, the Vice-President of ths English chepter. He and hia fine family live in e handsome 17th Century houee in Little Dunmow -- ebout twenty-five milee outside of Braintree.

Beck to London the next day where we mst Louis E.M. Alexis, e member best known to our readers for his brilliant end scholarly eolution of the "dram of eale" problem in Hamlet (Newsletter, Summer, 1975). Mr. Alexis met us et our hotel (appropriately, the De Vere) and we went to dinner, eeceping the blistering heet in an eir-conditioned restaurant. Alexia is soon to retire from hie teaching position at the Sevenoake School in Kent end will devote his time to Oxfordian research. Judging by the quality of his work on Nero which he had recently published, the Society may expect great things on its behelf from Mr. Alexis.

A whirlwind week of meetings with our British friends had to come to an end with our return home the next dsy. But it was all very stimulating, and, despite our travel-weariness, we were eorry to leave the Sceptered Isle!

MEMBERSHIP IN THE SHAKESPEAREAN AUTHORSHIP SOCIETY

Dr. D.W.T. Vessey, Hon. Secretary of the Shakespesrean Authorship Society, has written to our own Shaksspeere Oxford Sociaty's Secretary, English cheptsr, Herold Petience, concerning problems with new memberehips from the U.S. Apparently Americen members will pay the"current equivalent to the eubscription" (to The Bard)"in sterling (at present L3) plus a eurcherge of 10% to cover bank chargee if U.S. currency cheques are used. This worke out et epproximately $8.50."

If any S.O.S. members are among thoae who sent checks to England without ever receiving The Bard subscription, pleeee communicate with John Silberred, 11 Old Square, Lincoln'e Inn, London WC2, ENGLAND.

Ba sure to pay the difference if your check was below the amount indicated by Dr. Vessey. Also, notify Helen Cyr, Secretery-Treasurer, et our Beltimore, Marylend address eo that she may eend to Dr. Vessey a liet of names of those who heve thue far had difficulties with memberships.

MORE ON RUTH MILLER

An interview with Edwerd H. Clark (son of Eve Turner Clark) in the June 29 San Frsncisco Examiner gives good publicity to the Oxfordian theory and to Ruth Miller'e editions of Mr. Clark'a mother'e booke. Mrs. Miller also eppeared July 10 on e Louisiena televieion progrem, "Convsreetione," in which ehe diecuseed her Oxfordian work.

****

ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY?

Join us in our research and related activities.

Membership Dues

Student member	$2.00 per annum
Regular member	$10.00 per annum
Donating member	$25.00 per annum (or more)

Your Shakespeare Oxford Society dues are tax-deductible.

Write to:

SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY

110 Glen Argyle Road

Baltimore, Maryland 21212

* * * * * *

The Shakespeare Oxford Society NEWSLETTER
FALL, 1977

110 Glen Argyle Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21212

EDITOR'S NOTE

The delay in getting out this issue of the Newsletter was caused by preparations for our October national conference (see story on page 2), end-of semester duties, a virulent flu, and negotiations for performance of new musical works in 1978. The Winter 1977/78 issue will follow shortly.

Gordon C. Cyr, Editor

DETENTE WITH THE ORTHODOX STRATFORDIANS; POSSIBILITY OR IMPOSSIBILITY?

by Helen Cyr

Since the Newsletter will be mailed from now on to a selected list of college professors of English literature with a specialization in the writing of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the front page seems a fitting place to extend greetings, avow the Society's good will and best intentions for detente with Academe, as well as discuss the problems of working in harmony with established scholars, also the subject of a scheduled session with the same title as this article at the recent annual conference in Rosslyn, Virginia.

Of course, gloom settles over our members whenever Shakespearean scholars' lack of intellectual interest in reexamining the "facts" of Shakespeare's life and work comes up for discussion. However, that dark mood can be dispelled somewhat with a closer-than-usual look at the realities of the situation. What many of us do not recognize is that few professors presently teaching Shakespeare courses in colleges are Shakespearean scholars in the strict sense. More likely their expertise is in related subjects of the same period, e.g., Marlowe, Jonson, Greene, et al. It is possible, then, that our complaints about the "Shakespeare industry" --the fiscal and career investments that block the academic community involved in Shakespearean studies from the kind of open-mindedness and scientific zeal so common to other disciplines -- might be more justifiably directed to the few overcommitted Shakespearean specialists and to the Stratford tourist business in general. Perhaps the remainder of English literature pedagogues are more amenable to a fresh look at the authorship case than we actually give them credit for. Recent experiences of the Shakespeare Oxford Society staff with a few professors during the Rosslyn conference attest at least to the outwardly friendly attitudes of those who apparently have no "ax to grind." (Perhaps they even have doubts about A.L. Rowse and Leslie Hotson!)

Lately, the Folger Library has also provided welcome surprises. For example, the Exhibition Hall, the one that displays a number of "Shakespeare" portraits of extremely dubious pedigree -- one of which having been shown by our own late Charles Wisner Barrell to be probably an overpainting of the 17th Earl of Oxford -- now contains a small printed sign acknowledging his work. Also, in the same hall are displayed the heraldic banners

of several prominant Elizabethans, including thosa of the Earl of Oxford and Sir Francis Bacon.

What all this means for us is that the future efforts of the Shakespeare Oxford Society should be based on a realistic appraisal of the true nature of Stratfordianism, that we ought to engage in dialogue with those scholars who are willing to talk to us, and that we must demand high standards of scholarehip from the other side as well as from ourselvee. Accordingly, we should attempt to involve scholars connected with major eeats of learning in some of our activities. The planned distribution of tha Society'a Nswaletter is a worthwhila experiment along that line. Even the proposed computer-assisted study of Shakeepeare's and Oxford's lexical patterne, described in an account of tha conference proceedings elsewhere, will need to have an advisory panel of experts representing both sidea if it is to have any significance for the academic world and the general public.

SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The Shakespeare Oxford Society Second National Conference was held October 14-16 at tha Ramada Inn in Rosslyn, Virginia—a suburb of Washington, D.C. Prasiding over the conferenca were Gordon Cyr, editor of tha Neweletter and acting president at the request last may of Preeident Charlton Ogburn, Jr., and Helen Cyr, Secretary and Treasurer. Aleo attending the conferance were President Ogburn, Craig Huston, Warren Hope, Dr. A. Bronson Feldman (the last three from the Philadalphia area), Dr. Michaal Steinbach, Palo Alto, California; Ruasell dee Cognets, Lexington, Kentucky; Morse Johnaon, Cincinnati; Rhoda Henry Messner, Cleveland; John Kloepfer, Buffalo; Betty Taylor, District of Columbia; new members: Morris Kaplan, New York City; and Mrs. Leland Cooper, Boone, No. Carolina. In addition, the conference was visited by husbands and wivee of Dr. Feldman, Mrs. Meeener, Mrs. Cooper, and President Ogburn. Other vieitore includ- Mr. Carl Pfuntner and a Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Ryan of the Rosslyn Advertiser, a local weekly. Unfortunately, some of thoee who attanded the Firat National Conference in Baltimora last year were unabla to attend thia year: Judge Minoa and Ruth Miller of Jenninge, Louiaiana, who had raeervations for a carrel at the Huntington Library in California, where they planned to do extenaive research; E. Jimmee Stein, a recant Ph.D. in English literatura who is currently revising for futura publication har doctoral dieeertation on Shakespearean connections in the New World; Walter Grotyohan of New York City; W.P. Fowler of North Hampton, New Hampshire who graced our last conference with a sonnet he had compoaed to Edward de Vere.

Tha Second National Conference began Friday evening, but waa dalayed in coming to ordar by very bad rains, which slowed down the normally precarious-at-beat traffic conditions of the District. A brief progresa report and agenda announcemente were made by Gordon Cyr, who also read portions of a statement of graetinga by Dr. O.B. Hardison, Jr., Director of the Folger Shakaapeare Library (the complete statement waa read Sunday morning).

Saturday morning, Helen Cyr presided over the beginning of the business mesting, which dealt mostly with the election of officers and ratification of the draft of By-lawe proposed by John Kloepfer (appointed chairman of a committee for that purpose at the First National Conference). Some amendments to Mr. Kloepfer's draft were propoeed and adopted: the creation of an Honorary Prsaident and an Executive Vica-President, the latter to have the management of the Society'a busineas; the creation of local chaptere to be formed in coneultation with and the approval of the Board of Trusteea. (The ceremonial offic

of First end Second Vice-Presidents were retained.) Aftsr approval of the By-laws ee amended, Charlton Ogburn wae slscted Honorary Prssidsnt; Gordon Cyr, Executive Vice-Prasident (also retaining the chair of the Publications Committee end continuing es Editor of the S.O.S. Newslettar); and Helen Cyr wae rstained as Secretary/Treaeurer. First and Second Vice-Presidencies were retained by Dr. S. Colum Gillillan of Los Angeles, California and Dr. Francis G. Horne of Hempton, Virginia reepectively. There were two offers of resignation: Dr. Michael Steinbach from the Research Committee and Warren Hope from the Public Reletions Committee. Dr. Cyr accepted theee reeignations and, in his newly empowered office, appointed Dr. A. Bronson Faldman and Morse Johnson respectively ae replacaments. The By-lawe Committee was dissolved automaticelly with the Board's ratification of the amended draft.

At 11 A.M., Society members were treated to e report by our guest speakar, Joseph Engliah, head of the Forensic Science Laboratory of Waehington, D.C. and lecturer in law at Georgetown University. Mr. English is one of the top forensic specialists in the Baltimore-Washington area and is often ueed es en expert witnese in court casea. He waa commiesioned by the Shakespeare Oxford Society in September to anelyza the five most legible of the six canonical signaturea of William Shakspere end to report on theee at our conference. Although restricted to half-tone reproductions of thess handwriting specimene (all that is available on this side of the Atlantic) and told nothing of ths authorship controversy baforshand, Mr. English's conclusions were ao etartling as to obligs us to dalay a detailed announcement of them until a futura Newsletter. Honorsry Preeident Ogburn thanked Mr. English for his report and filled him in on some of the important implications of his findings. Adjournment for luncheon followed.

At the afternoon session, Helen Cyr made two presentations, the first of which was a "collocstion study" of pross samplee of the writings of Edward ds Vsre and of Shakespeare (sevsrel lettsrs of the former and ths dedicatione of Venue and Adonia and Ths Rape of Lucrece, plus speeches in As You Like It and Hemlst). This was primarily a demonstration of Andrew Morton's method of "word collocation" -- i.e., conjunctiona of two-or-more word patterns, ae oppoaed to the more familiar (but considerably lesa reliable) method of studying single word ueege between two authore -- which he had recently epplied to the worka of Bacon and Marlowe, tharaby eliminating thsee two writere ae candidates for Shakeepeerean authorship honore. Mrs. Cyr streesed ths fact thet her atudy was for damonstration purpoees only, and that with euch a amall sampling no eignificant concluaiona could be drawn. But ehe did say that har limitsd examination waa encouraging to Oxfordians. For example, aa a "control" Mrs. Cyr ueed also a ehort dedication by Thomas Naah. A comparieon of collocation patterns of the three authors showed a greater resemblance, superficially et least, bstween the styles of de Vere and Shakeepeare than between the style of either end that of Nash. Because ths procesa is so laborious and time-consuming, a much larger sampling from both principal authore being needed, time on a computer will be neceesary in order to epply the collocation method effectively. Dr. Cyr then interjected with the good newe that as e faculty member in a Maryland stete university (Towson Stete) he could get access to a computer with no cherge (unlese the project were funded from outeide and with the proviso that ell publiehed research results give credit to the Maryland Center for Institutional Research). Since the conference, Dr. Cyr's application hae been approved, end he plans to enlist tha aid of Dr. James Hill of the English Department at Toweon Stete University to assist in the input to the computer.

The second of Mrs. Cyr's reports was en-

titled "Ths Stetus of the 'Ashbourne' Project: The Fogg Museum Report and the Latest Findings Re the 'Ashbourne' Pedigree." Reeders will recall that Mr. Peter Michaels, the expert curetor who was guest speaker at last year's conference and rsported on ths latest techniquea of investigating overpainting, had mentioned e statement of C. W. Barrell's that the "Ashbourne" had gone to the Fogg Mussum in Cambridge, Maseachussetts to be cleaned and restored when the Folger Library had acquired it. Mr. Michaels had noted that no mention was made in the Miller edition of Looney's "Shakespeare" Identified--where Barrell's statement appears--of a Treatment Report the Fogg Museum must have mads of ths painting and of their work on it. Mr. Michaels said that this report would be of inestimable value should any new investigetive work be done on this painting. When Dr. Cyr contacted Dr. O. B. Herdison, Jr. of the Folger Library to request e copy of thie report, the latter could find no record of it. A voluminous triangular correspondence betwesn Mrs. Cyr, Dr. Hardison, and the Fogg Museum could located no such report, nor evidence that the "Ashbourne" portrait had even been to the Fogg Museum! It is a pity that Mr. Barrell didn't live to tie up this end a few other loose snde surrounding his valuable x-ray and infrared sxaminations of the "Ashbourne" and other "Shakespeare" portraits. Mrs. Cyr suggested that for these reasons and because of the nswer techniques of overpainting analyeis described by Mr. Michaels, a fresh investigation of these portraits was justified, under modern controlled conditions.

The remainder of Mrs. Cyr's report dealt with the work Gwynneth M. Bowen of the Shakespearean Authorehip Society in England had besn doing constructing a "conjectural pedigree" for the "Ashbourne" and "Janssen" portraits. Mrs. Cyr was restricted to synthesizing the already published views of Miss Bowen in various iesues of the Shakespearean Authorship Review (#7 Spring 1962 and #17 Spring 1967) Miss Bowen's "conjectural pedigree" poses the intsresting coincidence thet associations of thsse two portraite with two large estates in England is paralleled by the eerly poseeesion of these two estates by the Cockayne family, related to the Earl of Oxford through his eecond marriage to Elizabeth Trentham. Mrs. Cyr eaid that Miss Bowen's csse for the association of the "Janssen" portrait with Pooley Hall was a very good one, since the reproduction of this painting made its first public appearance es en illustration in an edition of King Lear by Charles Jennens (the well-known librettist of Handel's The Messiah and other of that compoeer's works). Sir Aston Cockeyne had sold Pooley Hall to Sir Humphrey Jennens, and Mies Bowen opined that the "Janseen" portrait may have gone elong with the sale of the property. This same Cockayne also sold Ashbourne Hell to the Boothby family at about the same time (late 17th century) as the Pooley Hall transfer. However, Mrs. Cyr pointed out that the "Ashbourne" portrait cannot be traced to Ashbourne Grammar School (part of the Aehbourne property) before its eale to the Rev. C. U. Kingston--who was Second Master at that school--in 1847. According to Kingston, he had acquired the painting "in e London ehop," had it appraised and restored, after which he hung it at the Ashbourne Grammar School, whence the painting derives its name. Mrs. Cyr noted that C. W. Barrell in his January 1940 Scientific American article had stated a rumor that the painting had once belonged to an old "country" family. Miss Bowen had said that the last of the Boothby family (certeinly a "county" family) had died out with the 8th Baronet's passing in 1846, the year before Kingston's alleged London purchase! Unfortunately, the source for Barrell's statement cannot be traced (except possibly in James Friswell's hopelessly unreliable 1864 book), despite Mrs. Cyr's combing through all available published material on the por-

traits of "Shakeepeare." Therefore, if Mise Bowen'a hypothesia is correct, either Kingston wae not quite truthful about his so-called London purchase, or we are presented with a puzzling coincidence: that Kingston found "in a London shop" a portrait of Shakespeare that had formerly bssn in the poasession of the owners of the vsry school where hs happened to work! Mrs. Cyr left ths matter atanding there as an intriguing sidelight on ths whole vexed question of "Shakespearean" portraiture.

After a dinner adjournment, the conference resumed with a presentation by Dr. A. Bronaon Fsldman on the Induction to Ths Taming of the Shrew, in which he amplified on his essay "Kit Sly and the Unknown Lord" in Secrets of Shakespeare (see revisw in Wintsr 1976-77 Nswsletter, pp. 7-8). Dr. Feldman in his conferencs talk argued that various characters and place names in the Induction did indeed refer, as Stratfordiane have maintained, to persons and placss familiar to ths Warwickshire citizen, William Shaksper. But far from arguing this as evidencs of Shakaper's authorship of The Taming of the Shrsw (to which, Feldman ably dsmonstrates, this Induction was later addsd), Feldman infers thst the mocking references to Mary Ardsn as "the fat als-wifs of Wincot," as hs supposes the "Marian Hackett" character to be (Shaksper's mother was from Wilmecote), could never have been composed by a son, unless he wers an undutiful monster of some kind.

Sunday morning brought the final report of the conference by Gordon Cyr, which concerned the possibility of "dstente" with the orthodox Stratfordians (sse lsad article on pags 1). Dr. Cyr began by reading the complete statsment of O.B. Hsrdison, Jr., Director of ths Folgsr Shakespeare Library, in which the latter "laid out the welcoms mat," so to spesk, to members of ths Shakespeare Oxford Society, offering to meet with small groups of us in ths Foundere' Room at Folger-sponsored "teas" or "coffee breaks." Dr. Hardison regretted his inability to ettend our conference, but said he would welcome invitationa to future chapter msetings or confsrences in the area. Even bettsr news in Dr. Hardison's statemsnt were his announcementa of the updating the portrait dsacriptions in the Exhibition Hall and the displsy of Oxford'a heraldic banner deecribed on pags 1 of thia issue. Dr. Hsrdiaon's statement also rsiterated a point that yst csusss some confusion to skeptics of ths Stratfordian faith: the Folger Library reading facilities are indeed open to sll serious studenta of Shakespesre, upon e minimal showing of eligibility, and that the library haa many holdings of anti-Stratfordian matarials.

After some further buainesa iteme wers discussed and a unanimous decieion to send a Reaolution of Appreciation to Sol Feinstone of Wsshington Crossing, Psnnsylvania for his recent generosity to the Society (sss following two srticlea), Honorary Preaidsnt Ogburn dslivered eome closing remarks snd the Shakespeare Oxford Society Second Netional Conference concluded.

A SEPTEMBER "MINI-CONFERENCE" OF S.O.S. MEMBERS AT CHEVY CHASE LIBRARY

An sttempt to form s chapter of S.O.S. members in the Baltimore-Washington aree on September 17 turned out to be something quits diffsrsnt, but equally rswarding. An announcement of the meeting was sent to arsa msmbera in August, to be held on ths date msntioned at the Chevy Chase Public Library in southsrn Maryland. Msanwhile a phone convsrsstion with Judge Minos Miller and his wife Ruth (editor of eeveral invaluable re-issuss of Oxfordian "claesics" reviewed in previous issues of the Newsletter) about the October national confsrence revealed the fact that they would be unable to attsnd, but that thsy could attend the meeting at

Chevy Chase, on their way home to Louisiana from New York City.

On tha day of the appointed "chapter" meeting, a bare handful of local members put in sn appearance (somewhat like the situation in San Francisco in Auguat — described in the Summer 1977 Newsletter): Dr. and Mrs. Cyr, Preaident Charlton Ogburn (accompanied by his wife Vera) new member Chalmers Sweeney, new membsr Mary Brown and her husband, and Robert Meyer. However, this scanty showing of locals was more than made up for by the attendance of the Millers, along with that of Dr. and Mrs. A. Bronson Feldman of Philadelphia, who roda down with the Millers.

Dr. Cyr opened the mesting with an announcament of the October national conference (sea preceding articla). President Charlton Ogburn gava a progresa report of hia correspondenca with various staff members of The Washington Post, following their recent article about a party given by a membsr of the Folger Shakespears Library staff, Diane DeVers, at which the guest of honor was Prof. Samuel Schoenbaum (author of Shakespeare's Lives, Oxford, 1970). The articls, written by Henry Mitchell of the Post, drew readers' attention to ths Oxfordian theory by way of the similarity of surnames between the Earl of Oxford and the Folger hoatess, only to make an ad hominem attsck on doubters of the Stratford myth. Mr. Ogburn and the Newsletter editor each wrote letters of protest to the Post, neither of which was printed. Subaequantly, Mr. Ogburn received a ten-page, triple-spaced letter from Mr. Mitchell, which only demonstrated once more the average layman's invincible incomprehension about the authorship isaue.

Mrs. Miller then gave a report on her latest activitiea, the most important of which included an award of $750 she had established through the Southern Writers Conference for the best talevision documentary on the Earl of Oxford as Shakespeare, and a grant by Sol Feinstone of $10,000 to the Shakeapeare Oxford Society for the purpose of resesrch in England on the Earl of Oxford and the Oxfordian theory of Shakspearean authorship. This gsnerous gift, to be known as the "Sol Feinstone Research Fund," included in its apecifications that ths money was to be put in a savings account to draw interest, and waa to be drawn upon by Ruth Loyd Miller through the Society to pay for research in England. None of the funds sre to be used by Society members for travel, nor to send anyone to England, but to pay actual duplication costs of documents, manuscripts, etc. and fees for personal services in English libraries, archives, and MS. collections. This instrument was then initialedby Ruth Loyd Miller, Craig Huston, and Sol Feinstone. Mrs. Cyr thsn at the meeting received the check from Mrs. Miller and made arrangements for its re-transfar in accordance with Dr. Fsinstone's wishas. It was also agreed at the meeting that future Newsletters would carry a "Sol Feinstone column," giving a progress report on tha funded resaarch (see following article).

Mrs. Millar also announced that in pursuing the theme of "the First Folio as a family affair" -- developed as the first part of Oxfordian Vistas (the second volume of her edition of J.T. Looney's epochal work) — she had discovered that Henry de Vere, 18th Earl of Oxford, had given Ben Jonson three volumes of translstions of Plato's works. As tha date of publication in these gifts is 1578, it is a reasonable assumption that these were part of the 17th earl's library. Mrs. Millsr said she was also working on finding evidenca for a hypothesis she was tentatively developing (and inferring from several letters already found betwaen saveral members of the Cecil, Vere, and Pembroke families and King James I), that the First Folio's publication may have been speeded up as a means of persuading the King to releaae the 18th earl from the Tower, whare he was imprisoned upon the Earl of Bucking-

ham's accusation of treaaon.

During the meeting, Mrs. Millar also suggested that membars doing research on Oxford contact her, in order to avoid duplication of efforts, since she has copies of moet of the important documents in the Public Record Office.

The meeting then adjourned a little after the noon hour.

SOL FEINSTONE MAKES GENEROUS GIFT TO THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY

As announced in preceding articles in this isaue, Dr. Sol Feinstone had in September bestowed upon the Shakespeara Oxford Society the magnificent sum of ten thouaand dollars for research in England. Also mentioned earlier was the reaolution adopted at our national conferencs at Rosslyn to express our appreciation collectively for this gift. Accordingly, Dr. and Mrs. Cyr arranged with Sol Feinatone to visit him at his home, along with Honorary President Charlton Ogburn and Craig Huston, a member of and legal conaultant to our Society (also author of The Shakespeare Authorship Question, Dorrance, 1971) on Friday, December 2 to preaent Dr. Feinstone this reaolution.

Sol Feinstone, despite his wealth, lives a rather Spartan existence with his wife Roae on a Pennaylvania farm close by the Dalaware river whare Georgs Washington crossed at Christmas tima in 1776 and subsequsntly defaated the Hessians. Large portions of the area have been mada into a national park. To S.O.S. members, Sol Feinstone may be best known for his endowment of several libraries, including the one at St. Lawrence University, where a host of "Sol Feinstone Rooms" contain collections of volumes devoted to the Oxfordian theory. He has also created the David Librsry of the American Revolution, located on his farm, which housea historical treatiaes, biographiss, and holographic documents of important peraonagss in the American Revolution. While enjoying the Feinstonas' hoapitality, we wsre alao treated to s fine luncheon in a historic inn nearby and to a viait afterward to the Sol Feinstone Elementary School whoae library is yet another of thia faacinating man's humane endowments.

Near the end of our visit, we presented Sol Feinstone ths Rasolution of Appreciation (text below) and recsived from him in return several books of his authorship on topics of American history, of which he is an eminent authority. We then signed the resolution in his presence.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION TO SOL FEINSTONE

On October 15, 1977, the members of the Board of Trustees of the Shakespeare Oxford Society learned of Sol Feinstons's gensrous resaarch grant to the Socisty, and,

Whereas, the Board hers aasembled in Arlington, Virginia, for its annual meeting wishes to express formally its appreciation to Sol Fainstone for his contribution to the Shakespeare Oxford Society, and,

Whsreas, the Board wishes to recogniza Sol Feinstone's gensrous support of resaarch to be conducted in England which will aid the study of Edward de Vera, 17th Earl of Oxford, as the true author of the Shakeepearean playa and poeme, and,

Whereas, the Board wishss to salute Sol Feinatona, not only for this recent evidance of his dedication to the Earl of Oxford's causa, but also for his yaars of devotion to that cause,

Now, therefore, be it reaolved, that this

expression to Sol Feinstone of Washington'e Crossing, Pennsylvania, be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and be made a permanent record of the Shakespeare Oxford Society and that s copy of this resolution be sent to Sol Feinstone with the thanks and beet wishes of the Board of Trusteea and the members of the Shakespeare Oxford Society. (Date October 15, 1977 and Society's seal.) (Signed)Charlton Ogburn, Jr., Honorary President; Gordon C. Cyr, Executive Vice-President.

...AND WHILE WE ARE AT IT!

The Shakeepeare Oxford Society acknowledges the generosity of members Rhoda Henry Mesener (who continues to forward $3.00 gifts to the Society for each copy sold of her novel Absent Thee From Felicity), Dr. S. Colum Gilfillan of Los Angeles, California, and Morse Johnson of Cincinnati, Ohio.

We express our gratitude to Vice-President Gilfillan and to Trustees Messner snd Johnson for their contributions to research.

SHAKESPEARE AND COLCHESTER

by Harold W. Patience
Secretary, English Chapter
Shakespeare Oxford Society

Situated fifteen miles from my home town of Braintree, Esaex, is Colchester--Britain's oldest recorded town--where Roman earthworks and walla still exist and where csn be seen, of course, the famous Roman/Norman Castle. The town takes its name from "chester" (Roman camp on the River Colne). It was besieged by General Fairfax during the Civil War of Cromwell.

Strange coincidences link Colchester not only with Edward de Vere, ths 17th Earl of Oxford, but with the Shakespeare works.

1. The modern by-pass is named "Cymbeline Way" after an ancient British king who ruled from Colchester--Cunobelinus, otherwise known as Cymbeline. This, of course, is the title of a Shakespeare play, considered by some to be an early work of the

great playwright.

2. In 1573 (whsn he had been married to Anne Cscil for two years) Lord Oxford's country eeat was the manor of Wivenhoe, a village situated only four milee from Colchester at the mouth of the River Colne. Confirmation comes from the earl'e introductory letter to Thomae Bedingfield with which he prefaces hie 1573 publication of Bedingfisld's translation of Cardanus' Comforte. The letter bears a concluding sentence: "From my nsw Country Muees of Wivenhoe".

3. In Dr. Broneon Feldman's excellent monograph Hamlet Himself there is a refsrence to Hamlet's reply when Queen Gertrude invitee him to eit by her: "No, good mother, here'a metal more attractive". Dr. Feldman writes:

> "The Earl of Oxford etands out among Englieh thinkers by the glow of his cordial interest in the advances of ecience, in particular of the chemistry of Paracelsue. Hamlet'e joke on the magnetism of Ophelia plainly alluded to a book that came out in 1581, The New Attractive, containing a ehort diecourse of the Magnes or Lodestone...now first found out by Robert Norman, Hydrographer. De Vere'e interest in the eubjact endured to his daath. Four years before that grievoue event Dr. William Cilbert of Colchester, Eesex, published his classic work De Magnete, where tha word 'electricity' first appeared."

4. Also, in Hamlst Himself we read the following:

> "In the same month (September 1583) Oxford sold to Roger Harlackenden, a former steward, the manor and park of Earle Colne, which embraced the burial building of the Earle of Oxford. While executing thie break with tradition, he aerved on a commiesion in Colchester to snrol recruita in the srmy".

One ie instantly reminded of Act 3, Scsne 2, of King Henry IV, Part 2, where Falstaff recruite eoldiere in Gloucestershire. The word commission is actually used by Shakeepeare:

> Shallow: No. Sir John, it is my cousin Silence, in commission with me...
>
> Falstaff: Fie! thie is hot weather. Gentlsmen, have you provided me here with half dozen aufficient men?

5. On the facade of Colchester'e Town Hall we eee a near-life-size statue of Samuel Harsnstt, Archibiahop of York. Son of a Colchester baker, Harenett was born in the parieh of St. Botolph, Colchestsr, and baptized on 20th June 1561.

In 1586 Harenett was appointed Master of the Free School at Colchester, but finding "the painful trade of teachying" little to hie taste, he resigned the post in the fall of 1588 and returned to Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, in order to apply himself more cloeely to the study of divinity. In 1592 he wae elected Junior University Proctor of Pembroke College. Five yeare later he received institution to the vicarage of Chigwell, Eeeex.

In 1602 Harenett was collated to the Archdeaconry of Eesex. In 1605 he resigned hie vicarage of Chigwell to become, on May 16th 1606, vicar of Hutton, Eesex. In 1609 we find him vicar of Stisted, a village near Braintree, situated only three milee from

whers I writs. In 1628 he reached the apex of his career when he was elected Archbishop of York.

In 1603 Harsnett had published by order of the Privy Council a vigorous exposure of Popish designes entitled A Declaration of Egrsgious Popiah Imposturss, to withdrsw ths harts of her Maiestiss Subjects from their Allsgeance. Many Shakespearean scholars believe that it wae from the Declaration that tha playwright took the names of ths spirits that Edgar mentione during his pretended madness in King Lear. In Hackney, Harsnett, and tha Dsvils in King Lear Miss Gwynnsth Bowsn quotes Professor Alexander on the dating of Lear ss follows:

> "King Lear in the form found in tha Quarto of 1608 (the first edition of Shakespeare's play) cannot be earlier than Harsnett's Declaretion (1608)".

Miss Bowen goes on to say: "This, even if true, would not of course rule out the possibility of Oxford'a authorship, for he had still another year to live. But is it true? The answer to that quastion must depend upon the answers to certain other questions. In the first placa, can we be surs that Harsnett did not borrow from King Lear; could he perhapa have read the play in manuscript? Secondly, is it possible thst both writers borrowed from a common source? "It is no doubt assumed thst Harsnett could not have borrowed from Shakeepeare becausa his book is not a work of fiction. On the other hand, it is well known that from 1597 to 1604, as Chaplain to the Bishop of London, Harsnett had the job of censoring playa for the preaa, so hs certainly could havs sssn King Lear in manuscript, if such a manuscript existed before hie own book was published --which ie ths very point at issue".

Miss Bowen then pointa out that Harsnett not only had a aourcs, "but named it; quoted from it at some lsngth; and gave his page references. In his prsface he writes: 'And that this dsclaration might be frea from the carpe and cavill of ill-affacted or discompoaed spirits, I hsve alledged nothing for materiall, or authenticall heerein, but the expresse words ayther of some part of the Miracle booke, penned by the priasts, and filed upon Record, whare it is publique to be sssn...' ".

Miaa Bowan concludes that "as a friend and neighbor of Lord and Lady Vaux, the chances that Lord Oxford ssw the book of Mirecles long before it was 'filed upon Record' are very high indeed, and he may well have seen it before April 1594, when Philip Henslowe, owner of the Rose Theater, rscorded in his famous Diary two performances of a play called King Leare. Was this, as generally believed, the sams play ae the anonymous King Leir, published in 1605 and still extant; or waa it, ss Profsaaor Alexander suggests, sn early version of Shakespeare's play; or was it, perhaps, King Lear, as we know it, devils and all?"

Archbishop Harsnstt bequeathed his Library to the Corporation of Colcheeter, "in trust for the clergy of the town and neighborhood" on condition of a euitable room being provided for the reception of his books. The library i e, to this day, still housed in a ssparate room--at the Colchester Public Library. The Catalogue of the books is dated 1888 and, not unexpectedly, we find that the majority of volumes comprise "heavy" Latin theological works, together with nearly a score of Bibles. There are, however, several books snd authors, listed aa being in the collection, which Shakespeare must have studied: Sophocles, The Greek Poets, Plutarch, Polybiue, Vergilius (Polydorus), Sturmiue (Oxford sctually visited him in Germany!), Homer, Hesiod, Cardano (Girolamo), Basle, 1599 (another coincidence). Most significant of all is the listing of Saxo Grammaticu ("Danica Historia, Libris XVI..Frsnkfurt, 1576") It is generally agreed that the author of Hamlet took the basics of his plot from Saxo. Perhaps Lord Oxford borrowed Harsnett's copy of Saxo and made notes in the margin. I plan to pursue this point in the future.