

SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY
NEWSLETTERS

1981

Newsletter *Shakespeare Oxford Society*

Verò Nihil Verius

WINTER-SPRING, 1981

Vol. 17, Nos. 1 & 2

If Winter Comes Can Vere Be Far Behind?

This variation on Shelley's observation came to mind when I realized that more than enough manuscripts had accumulated to warrant publication of this double-issue of the Newsletter. Considering the variety and quality of these manuscripts reminded me of a source of legitimate pride for Oxfordians: the remarkable quantity and quality of scholarship which has been produced by Oxfordians. This achievement is not only a source of pride but also an exceedingly strong argument for the soundness of our position.

There are, of course, other sound arguments. J. Thomas Looney's brilliant and readable attempt to do for Shakespeare what Ralph Waldo Emerson said he could not do for William Shakspeare of Stratford, that is, "marry the man to the work," remains the dominant argument for the Oxfordian position. (That argument remains readily available thanks to Ruth Loyd Miller's enriched two-volume edition of Looney's book, Shakespeare Identified, issued by the Minos Publishing Co., P. O. Drawer 1309, Jennings, LA 70546.) In fact, most of the articles in this issue represent efforts to deepen or extend the two primary furrows first plowed by Looney: they either seek to illuminate Shakespeare's work with the light cast by Oxford's authorship or to undermine the traditional attribution of Shakespeare's work to William Shakspeare.

Another argument for our position is the argument based on authority. It is extremely helpful, I think, to be able to point to such writers as Emerson, Hawthorne, Whitman, Henry James, Twain, and Freud as at least hospitable to doubts and debates concerning the Stratford legend. If, when the Shakespeare authorship question arose, these writers had been outspoken defenders of the legend, their words would no doubt be hailed and echoed in traditional Shakespearean literature. Instead, we witness the spectacle of seeing

these authors gagged, or ridiculed, or misrepresented. One such instance recently came to my attention.

Max Perkins, for years a leading editor at Scribner's and arguably the man more than any other responsible for determining the dominant fashion in American literature "between the wars," was a convinced anti-Stratfordian. A. Scott Berg, in his popular life of Perkins, Max Perkins: Editor of Genius, gives us a good portrait of this New Englander who operated behind the scenes of the publishing business as the editor of F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, Thomas Wolfe, S. S. Van Dine (pen name of Willard Huntington Wright), Taylor Caldwell (another pen name), and others. But Berg feels compelled to slight and ridicule his subject when he takes up Perkins's anti-Stratfordian views and his determination to publish Alden Brooks's Will Shakspeare and the Dyer's Hand.

Scribner's published that book because of Perkins's support of it. Editorial conferences rejected Brooks's book time and again. Perkins brought it up again and again until the book was accepted for publication. Berg thought Perkins's method and persistence admirable when they gained a hearing for Scott Fitzgerald. Berg found the same method and persistence evidence of a fondness for "crackpot" ideas in Perkins when they gained a hearing for an anti-Stratfordian.

It is not necessary to share Berg's view. Maxwell Perkins knew writers and writing. His opposition to the Stratford legend should carry weight, the authority of a distinguished bookman. I like to think Perkins would have enjoyed the articles in this issue of the Newsletter. I certainly hope that you will.

W.H.

Announcement: The Summer issue of the Newsletter will feature a new and lengthy article by Ruth Loyd Miller: THE STRATFORD CONNECTION.

Part I: The Cloning of William Shakespeare

Part II: The Earl of Oxford's "Stratford"

Love's Fine Wit: Oxfordian Puns in
Sonnets 76 and 105

by
Elisabeth Sears

O, learn to read what silent love hath writ!
To hear with eyes belongs to love's fine wit.

Sonnet 23

Shakespeare-Oxford supporters have long been aware of Edward de Vere's penchant for making quibbles on his own name. One example of this, cited by Bernard M. Ward in his biography of the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, is the Latin inscription on the flyleaf of a Bible sent to his wife, Anne, by the Earl when he received news of the birth of a daughter while he was travelling on the Continent in 1575. The interplay of "vera," "veritas," and "Vere" runs throughout the dedication, but the last few lines (as translated by Ward) will serve to demonstrate:

...may thy mind always glow with the
truth and may thy true motto be ever
lover of the truth. ...thou a Vere,
mayst be called the true glory of thy
husband.

The same propensity for punning on his name and title is often found in the "Shake-speare" plays and Sonnets. Prime examples of this are found in Sonnets 76 and 105, both of which are addressed to his beloved son. [Editor's note: This identification is not, of course, firmly established, but rather a matter for research and scholarly debate: opinions on the identification range very widely.]

In Sonnet 76, the first line initiates the word-play with the fourth word, "verse." Not only is there a visual resemblance, but reading this with the "brogue" of an Elizabethan pronunciation, the sound is also similar to "Vere." Again, in line two, "variation" has an echo of Vere.

Line five is curious, for it includes a Southampton motto (All For One and One For All) condensed to "All one," as well as Queen Elizabeth's motto (Always the Same), with the word, "ever" (E.Ver) substituted for

"Always." Thus, it reads:

Why write I still all one, ever the
same,

Line six: "And keep invention in a noted weed," refers to the canker rose, the wild or briar rose that grows like a weed; a flower image which appears a number of times in the Sonnets. (See Sonnets 54, 67, 69, 70, 95, 109.)

Line seven: "That every (E.Ver-y) word doth almost tell my name," is patently evident to anyone who believes in the Oxford authorship of the "Shake-speare" canon; it scarcely needs mention.

Line eight: "Showing their birth, and where they did proceed," completes the thought of line seven, with the emphasis on "birth," which of course means "high" birth.

Line nine begins with an "O," which stands alone without an attendant "h" (Oh), thus making it a clear signature for Oxford. Also, he addresses his son as "sweet love" in this line, as he does again in Sonnet 105:

O, know, sweet love, I always write
of you,

The next notable pun is in the final couplet where he uses the "sun-son" interchange to liken the constancy of the sun's diurnal progress to the author's own constancy in the praise and adoration of his son, who is the sun or center of his universe. There is an echo, too, of Oxford's identify as Phoebus Apollo, as well as a reminder of the sun-son images in Sonnets 7 and 33.

Sonnet 76 reads in full:

Why is my verse so barren of new pride?
 So far from variation or quick change?
 Why, with the time, do I not glance
 aside
 To new-found methods and to compounds
 strange?
 Why write I still all one, ever the
 same,
 That every word doth almost tell my
 name,
 Showing their birth, and where they
 did proceed?
 O, know, sweet love, I always write of
 you,
 And you and love are still my argument:
 So all my best is dressing old words
 new,
 Spending again what is already spent;
 For as the sun is daily new and old,
 So is my love still telling what is
 told.

Turning to Sonnet 105, we find the same theme of praise for his son, this time compounded with a trio of puns.

In line four: "To one, of one, still such, and ever so," we find a repeated reference to the same two mottos noted in line five of Sonnet 76. As before, "ever" is a replacement for "always."

In line five: "Kind is my love today, tomorrow kind," he addresses his son again as "my love." He also puns on "kind" as "kine," an archaic term for cattle, which here may specify "Oxen," or Oxford.

Line seven contains the poet's name again in the word "verse":

Therefore my verse to constancy confined

In line nine, the triple pun appears, and then is quickly repeated in line ten for emphasis. "Fair" stands for Vere, "kind" again means "Ox," and "true," as usual, represents Vere through the Latin word for truth: ver, veritas. Line ten, while restating the multiple quibble, also adds one more play on the name Vere with the word varying. [Editor's note: Elisabeth Sears's identification of this triple-threat pun caused Dr. Bronson Feldman to suggest that "fair, kind, and true" re-

presents Oxford's punning notation for Plato's the beautiful, the good, and the true.]

Line twelve, by referring to "Three themes in one" offers a suggestion of the Christian Trinity and echoes the original denial of idolatry in lines one and two.

The final couplet repeats the trinity of quibbles and re-emphasizes the "three in one" concept, almost as though the poet is deifying his glorious son-sun. Also the son can be viewed as the combined essence of his parents; therefore he is himself and his parents, all three in one individual.

One other word that nearly escapes notice is "affords" at the end of line twelve. Since quibbling is so pronounced in this particular Sonnet, it is not beyond reason to suppose that Oxford intended to pun on the last syllable of his title, "ford."

The sonnet in its entirety reads:

Let not my love be call'd idolatry
 Nor my beloved as an idol show,
 Since all alike my songs and
 praises be
 To one, of one, still such, and
 ever so.
 Kind is my love today, tomorrow
 kind,
 Still constant in a wonderful
 excellence:
 Therefore my verse, to constancy
 confin'd
 One thing expressing leaves out
 difference.
 "Fair, kind, and true," is all my
 argument,
 "Fair, kind, and true," varying to
 other words;
 And in this change is my invention
 spent,
 Three themes in one, which wondrous
 scope affords.
 Fair, kind, and true have
 often liv'd alone,
 Which three till now never
 kept seat in one.

Notes on Two Noteworthy Books

by
Rhoda Messner

I have here two books which I have owned for some time: The Annotator, by Alan Keen & Roger Lubbock, published in 1954, and The Case for Shakespeare's Authorship of the "Famous Victories," published in 1961 by Seymour Pitcher. I had previously looked through both books and read them casually but now, suddenly, they have assumed a new and startling importance.

The latter book puts up a very good case for Shakespeare's authorship of the Famous Victories. Happily it includes a complete text of this anonymous play. Here are the main highlights of the author's argument:

1. In its span of events the play fairly covers the Shakespeare trilogy, Henry IV, Parts 1 & 2 and Henry V.
2. Tagged as a source for Shakespeare's work, there has still been uneasiness about it. Dover Wilson wrote, "Without any doubt whatever a very intimate connection of some kind exists between Shakespeare's three plays and this old text, though what the connection is has never been established."
3. None of Shakespeare's early plays can be described as inexperienced writing and this play could begin to fill the gap. Crude as it seems to us, in its own time it must have had considerable effect.
4. The Famous Victories is immature but in spite of its "gusty slapstick and buffoonery," at its best it has poignancy in characterization and language. "How else could we expect Shakespeare to have begun?" the author plaintively asks.
5. Since the play is called unpretentious and inferior, it has never been thoroughly scrutinized. It seems impossible to believe it to be a mere source.

Plainly Shakespeare used it in his Trilogy, but he used it instinctively, as if it were his own; he knew it by heart, by total assimilation. Perhaps it served as his first draft.

6. Beginning with the Gad's Hill robbery episode, it emphasizes the wildness of the young Prince. The chroniclers before Shakespeare disagreed about Prince Henry; several believed in his misspent youth but they all glorified him as the Hero King of England. Edward Halle, the chief source for the anonymous dramatist, and for Shakespeare, knew few details of his wanton riotousness and considered his reformation a sudden miracle. John Stow's 1580 chronicle calls the Prince's dubious companions "young lords and gentlemen" and glosses over this episode as a youthful prank. The Famous Victories was the first work to mention Gad's Hill or to show the Prince engaging in a criminal enterprise or associating with thieves and buffoons. (If the Famous Victories was written earlier, before Stow, this episode must have its source in Oxford's well-known escapade at Gad's Hill. It may have been written in 1573-4 as Oxford's apologia to the Queen for running away to the Low Countries without her permission, instead of in 1586, as Mr. Pitcher believes, "as a kind of apology for his shortcomings," assuming it to be Will Shakspeare's poaching adventure and his father's embarrassment because of it! An Oxford, be it noted, is prominently featured in this play, as he is not in Halle's Chronicle or in Shakespeare's Henry IV & V.)
7. Derick in the play is only a partial realization of Shakespeare's Falstaff, but he is the center of attention in

every scene in which he appears. And the author notes the Shakespearean manner of giving painstaking and loving attention to minor characters which the anonymous playwright displays: John Cobbler, Robin Pewterer, Lawrence Costermonger and the Vintner's Boy.

8. Richard Tarleton: The author stated that Shakespeare was early acquainted with Richard Tarleton, the chief comedian of the Queen's Company and "it happens that it is possible to assert with assurance that Tarleton performed in the Famous Victories," with the role of Derick seemingly created just for him. (We know that Tarleton knew Oxford and was active at Court for more than a decade before the author's proposed 1586 date for this play.)

Now for Keen and Lubbock's Annotator:

The authors, two English antiquarian booksellers, obtained in June 1940 an authentic copy of Halle's Chronicles 1550 edition, with annotations in the margins which they believed might have been made by Shakespeare. Perhaps they were. They make a good case for it. (But surely not annotations made by Will of Stratford.)

The ink of the annotations was said by a British Museum expert to be contemporary with the old book itself. A handwriting expert could not prove that the annotations were by Will Shakspeare, with only his six signatures to compare them with, but said there were some resemblances.

The (probable) first owner's signature, "Richard Newport," was in the book, dated April 1565 in quite different handwriting from the annotations. Then, amongst the annotations, appears the name "EDWARD," inserted the authors say, "apparently by an Elizabethan schoolboy or child, once in ink and once pricked out with a pen." (my italics --they made nothing of course of this startling, to me, addition, but went on to describe the 18th and 19th century owners by what they had done to the book's physical condition.)

This "EDWARD" annotation is noted by Keen and Lubbock on p. 129 Appendix II and p. 211 Appendix X.

Then the authors proceeded to trace a long, thin, farfetched trail of Will Shakspeare's activities as a play actor, with his name changed to "Shakeshaft," through Lancashire and finally to the Lord Chamberlain's Company in London. (I had heard this Shakeshaft or Shankshaft theory before, but even Mr. Pitcher above "cannot accept it as convincing.")

The only spark of interest it produced in me was finding the name Robert Nowell somewhere along this Lancashire trail, that tried to trace the book from first owner Richard Newport of High Ercoll, Shropshire to Will Shakspeare. This Robert Nowell was a brother of the Earl of Oxford's Cecil House tutor, Lawrence Nowell, and he, Robert, according to this book's chart, died at Gray's Inn in 1569, when Oxford was there! Could he have given this copy of Halle's Chronicles to Edward de Vere there? Or, perhaps, given it to his brother Lawrence some years before?

I looked up the reproductions of Oxford's letters that Ruth Miller sent to the 1979 SOS Conference and had a court handwriting analyst that I knew compare the letters with the Halle annotations illustrated in Keen and Lubbock's book. I was disappointed with her opinion that they were definitely not by the same hand and I could not quite accept this as final. After all, she did not have the Halle 1550 book itself to work on. And, I thought, if not Oxford's hand, could it possibly be John Lyly's or Anthony Munday's, from when they were working for Oxford as his secretaries?

Keen and Lubbock's book-find, the 1550 Halle, must still be in their possession, or some buyer's, or even in the British Museum. Could a further test be made? Perhaps this is all Much Ado About Nothing, but it seems to me worth following up.

SOS Bulletin Board

- * Celeste Ashley has opened a depository for Oxfordian materials in the Theatre Collection of the Stanford University Libraries by donating back issues of the Newsletter to the University. Members interested in contributing to this collection which could become an invaluable resource for future researchers should write:

Mr. Richard Phillips
Division of Special Collections
Stanford University Libraries
Palo Alto, California 94306

- * Bronson Feldman has published what amounts to a full-scale critical study of the life and work of Christopher Marlowe in the current issue of The Bard (the journal of the Shakespearean Authorship Society of England) under the title, "The Marlowe Mystery." This monograph-long analysis should be considered required reading for all students of the Elizabethan period in general and the Shakespeare authorship question in particular. Copies are available from:

The Bard
10 Uphill Grove, Mill Hill
London, England NW7 4NJ

We hope an advocate of the Marlowe theory of Shakespearean authorship will take up this hefty gauntlet thrown down by an Oxfordian scholar-champion by reviewing the work for a future issue of the Newsletter.

- * Ruth Loyd Miller, Louisiana-based Oxfordian activist, has scored successes on the lecture circuit. Through the auspices of Oxfordians John and Barbara Crowley (Barbara Crowley is the daughter of S.O.S. Vice President Colum Gilfilan), Mrs. Miller gave the PALAC (Pasadena Area Liberal Arts Club) lecture at the Shakespeare Club of Pasadena, California. Her talk stirred so much interest that Barbara Crowley was invited to give a follow-up presentation to the Shakespeare Club. Elizabeth Wrigley, Director of the Bacon Library at Claremont College, demonstrated anti-Stratfordian goodwill and hospitality

by attending the talk and entertaining the Millers at her library. Mrs. Miller celebrated the conjectured birthday of the conjectured bard by speaking on "The Shakespeare Who Done It" to two hundred honors students and their faculty advisors at the University of Southwestern Louisiana at Lafayette.

- * Harold Patience, our man in De Vere--Shakespeare country--Essex, England--informs us that the BBC announced the airing of a TV program on the Shakespeare authorship question, "Will the Real Shakespeare?" at 8 p.m., April 23, the supposed birthdate of the supposed playwright. We hope Mr. Patience will provide us with a report on the show and reactions to it for a future issue of the Newsletter.

- * Warren Hope, current editor of the Newsletter, wishes to announce that he looks forward to receiving articles for the Newsletter, letters to the editor, and notes, queries, or corrections to be posted on future versions of the S O S Bulletin Board at his current address:

812 Goshen Road, C-22
West Chester, PA 19380

He also wishes to express his own and the Society's gratitude to the former editor of the Newsletter, Charlton Ogburn.

* * * SOS Wants You * * *

If the Shakespeare Oxford Society is a stranger to you, please treat it in the way Hamlet suggests:

"And therefore as a stranger give it welcome."

Tax-deductible Dues:

Student Member	\$ 2.00 per year
Regular Member	\$10.00 per year
Donating Member	\$25.00 or more per year

The Shakespeare Oxford Society
P.O. Box 16254
Baltimore, Maryland 21210

The Mystery of the Dugdale Engraving
by
H.W. Patience

The Shakespeare Monument, on the wall of the parish church at Stratford-upon-Avon, is the "lynchpin" of orthodox faith as regards the authorship of the immortal works; without it there would be nothing whatsoever to give the town the slightest authentic link with Shakespeare. The register of birth, the so-called Birthplace, William's gravestone, the remains of New Place, Anne Hathaway's Cottage--all these can be disregarded in a search for truth: they offer no vestige of evidence concerning William's authorship. The monument is different; it is definitely a monument to "Shakespeare." But as in so many matters concerning the dramatist it offers us nothing but mystery.

I have given some thought to the problem presented by the Dugdale engraving of the monument as it (apparently) appeared in 1656. No definite conclusions have emerged; the matter is raised only in the hope that other members may perhaps be inspired to study the problems raised by that enigmatic-al engraving.

The Dugdale engraving is mentioned in several books on Shakespeare--books mainly anti-Stratfordian in approach, I may add. Here are just two examples:

William Dugdale, the antiquarian, when collecting interesting items for his book on Warwickshire, in 1656, drew a monument which differs very considerably from the present erection...

Who Was Shakespeare? (Hilda Amphlett, 1955)

...the hands of the bust in 1656 were resting on a sack, probably a sack of wool, instead of holding, as at present, a pen and paper...

The Shakespeare Mystery (George Connes, first English edition, 1927)

Baconians usually equate the "sack of wool" (as seen in the engraving) with a representation of Francis Bacon's symbol of office--the woolsack!

In his book The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated (1908) Sir George Greenwood (a Baconian) wrote concerning the monument as follows:

No, we have no portrait of Shakespeare, unless we fall back upon Dugdale's picture of the bust as it was when he saw it about 1636... Look for a moment at the frontispiece to the Sylva Sylvarum showing Francis Bacon in 1626. Note those hollow cheeks, that short beard, that drooping moustache...compare it even to the row of buttons running down the centre, with Dugdale's engraving. And the bust was executed by a London man! The stone carted from London! Good heavens!...

(Judging from the notes in his diary, Dugdale seems to have prepared his work in the neighborhood of Stratford-upon-Avon about 1636, though publication was delayed by the civil wars for twenty years.)

I must take issue with Sir George Greenwood. Firstly, it is very unlikely that a monument to Shakespeare (whoever he may have been) would have been erected during the man's lifetime. Sir George obviously overlooked the fact that whilst Bacon died in 1626, the monument is mentioned in the prefatory matter to the First Folio (1623):

...when that stone is rent,
And Time dissolves thy Stratford
Moniment...
(Leonard Digges)

There is also, of course, a clear statement of Shakespeare's death in the actual monumental inscription.

Sir George could, of course, retort that the monumental bust could have been altered at some time during the years 1626-1636. (But altered from...what?)

Any attempt to unravel the mystery of the monument must, of course, be influenced by the individual attitude to the Dugdale engraving: do we accept it or reject it?

My own personal theory is as set out below, but it should be noted that all dates (years of reconstruction, painting of the bust, etc.) are factual.

1601 Death of John Shaksper, father of William. For two reasons it is decided to erect a monument in his memory:

1. He held a position of some importance in the town: perhaps today we would describe him as an alderman.
2. He had married into the historic Arden family. (For this reason his son was to later obtain a family coat-of-arms.)

The bust presented him as clutching a sack of wool (a symbol of his trade). This bust was drawn as such in 1636 and engraved in 1656.

1616 Death of William Shaksper. For the sole reason that he is a holder of tithes (and not because he is a great writer) he is buried in the chancel. Had William been "Shakespeare," surely the monument and the grave would have been combined?

1616- At some time during these years the
1623 monument is transformed into a tribute to "Shakespeare" by the addition of (or alteration of) an inscription. Note that Digges uses the word "Moniment," as distinct from monument, implying inscription. Time, says Digges, will "dissolve" the inscription--because it is false.

1636 Dugdale sees a man with a drooping moustache, clutching a sack. But, in his engraving, he also shows the inscription!

1709 Rowe, in his first edition of Shakespeare's works, includes a representation of the bust which agrees in detail with Dugdale.

1746 From a letter in the Stratford archives we learn of a proposal to repair "the curious original monument and bust of that incomparable poet." On 9th September there would be a special performance of Othello, "the receipts arising from which are to be solely appropriated to the repairing of the original monument aforesaid." Query: Was the monument described as "curious" because its appearance at that time tallied with Dugdale's engraving?

1748 Bickering over responsibility and finances had delayed the project for two years. On November 30th a meeting was held at the Falcon Inn, Stratford, at which it was agreed that "Mr. John Hall, Limner, shall repair and beautify... the original monument of Shakespeare." I suggest that this was the year in which the monument was transformed from its appearance as Dugdale engraved it into what we see today. A quill pen and paper took the place of the "sack of wool." However, to confound anyone who may have remembered the sack, a cushion was installed. (Ridiculous, of course: a cushion presents a most unsatisfactory writing desk....)

1793 The bust is painted white.

1835 On 23rd April the following announcement was made:

The Shakespearean Club of Stratford-upon-Avon have long beheld with regret, the disfigurement of the Bust and Monument of Shakespeare, and the neglected condition of the interior of the Chancel which contains that monument and his grave.

"The cost of restoring Shakespeare's Monument and the Chancel" was £1,210. 12 shillings--a hefty sum which suggests extensive alterations. A Bazaar was held for further repairs to the church in 1839; other subscriptions came in, and the whole amount expended amounted to £5,000.

1861 The bust has its colours restored.

I have stated that in my opinion the present quill pen and sheet of paper were installed in 1748. However, in view of the expenditure incurred in the year 1835 it is quite possible that this was the year in which the significant transformation of the bust occurred.

Bunk and the Bust
by
Bronson Feldman

There is one lonesome fact which connects the works of William Shakespeare--to be exact, thirty-six of his plays--with the money-lender, maltdealer, and land speculator William Shakspeare of Stratford on Avon. In the first folio collection of the master dramatist's works, printed in 1623, a scholar named Leonard Digges contributed a poem "To the Memorie of the deceased Author," opening thus:

Shake-speare, at length thy pious fellows
give
The world thy Workes: thy Workes, by
which, outlive
Thy Tombe, thy name must: when that
stone is rent,
And Time dissolves thy Stratford Moni-
ment,
Here we alive shall view thee still.

Digges's document is the only reference that would not be laughed out of a court of justice, indicating that readers were to view the tomb of William Shakspeare and the monument erected on the wall nearby as somehow memorial for the writer of the plays, whom

Digges addressed as "Shake-speare." The Stratford fellow never used this signature. Nor did he or his family erect the monument above his grave which proclaims in Latin that the "judgment of Nestor, genius of Socrates, art of Vergil" were buried in this earth. Below the Latin an unknown rimer set the following lines:

Stay Passenger, why goest thou by
so fast?
Read if thou canst, whom envious
Death hath plast,
With in this monument Shakspeare:
with whome,
Quick nature dide: whose name doth
deck Ys tombe,
Far more then cost: sieh all, Yt
He hath writt,
Leaves living art, but page, to
serve his witt.

The wit-work over the contrast of nature and art induces me to believe that Ben Jonson wrote these lines, whose main idea resounds in the lyric Jonson preluded the folio with. No matter who made this joke about nature dying with "Shakspeare," it is questionable whether the verses were carved when Gerard Johnson, the Dutch chiseler in London, sculptured the bust of Shakspeare for Holy Trinity Church. For that bust was never meant to honor an English Socrates or Vergil.

Gerard Johnson must have made the bust about the same time that he shaped the effigy for the tomb of John Combe in Trinity Church. Combe had been a comrade of William Shakspeare in business deals; both were notorious in their hometown for sharpness in usury. The former left 60 pounds in his will for erection of his tomb: he died in 1614 and his will was legally approved late in 1615. By April 1616, when Shakspeare perished, the art admirers of Stratford would have enjoyed the pious statue Johnson cut for Combe. Shakspeare had not left a farthing for the decoration of his grave. His daughter Susannah, wife of Dr. John Hall, who profited most

from his will, getting all his real-estate, probably arranged for erection of the bust, cheaper than an effigy.

We know what the bust originally looked like, from Sir William Dugdale's engraving of it made for his Antiquities of Warwickshire (1656). His picture has not been often reproduced. You can see a copy on page 557 of The Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare, edited by Campbell and Quinn (1966). It shows a dismal-faced lean old man whose hands rest upon, if they are not caressing, a big bag or sack of some commodity, usually believed to be wool. Campbell & Quinn were of course well aware that the engraving of 1656, which turned up again in Nicholas Rowe's edition of Shakespeare's works (1709), "differs radically from the monument as we know it." Today the bust bears a round bland face, staring at nothing in particular, with one hand holding a sheet of paper and the other a pen, apparently writing on a cushion! "Either Dugdale's illustration is inaccurate," babble the professors, "or the monument has been overhauled since the 17th century." Campbell & Quinn wrote this knowing well enough that the bust--and only the bust--had been deliberately transformed by the clergy and commercial masters of Stratford.

Joseph Greene, schoolmaster of Stratford grammar learners, discovered the will of William Shakspeare under official dust in 1747. He has been suspected of attempting to improve the document by writing between the lines the donation to the dying man's wife of his second-best bed, because there was no mention of poor Anne anywhere in the will as first drawn. Another interlineation, that is almost never noted to be such, gives "To my fellows, John Hemynge, Richard Burbage, and Henry Condell, twenty-six shillings eightpence apiece, to buy them rings." Without this afterthought, there would be nothing in the will to indicate that Shakspeare had an interest in theatrics. The words between the lines connected him with the fellow-actors who were alleged to be the sponsors of the first folio. No erudition is needed to identify the writer of the folio state-

ment signed by Heminge and Condell; it bristles with Ben Jonson's trademarks of style. There can be no doubt that he was put in editorial charge of the volume by the brothers Herbert, Earls of Pembroke and Montgomery, to whom the folio was dedicated. They and their wives, Elizabeth de Vere and Susan de Vere, two of the daughters of the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, in my judgment, ordained the Latin and poetic monument that so grotesquely accompanied the sad sack above.

Two years after Joseph Greene announced his finding of William's will, he seems to have persuaded his colleagues and employers of the town of Stratford to undertake alterations of the dilapidated "monument." Instead of the old economic alabaster used for its entablatures, marble was introduced. Parts of fingers that had broken off were restored, and "the pen which had been between the fingers," according to J. Parker Norris, in The Portraits of Shakespeare (1885). The burgeses of Stratford were quite delighted by the labors performed to carry out their order to "repair and beautify" the bust. This job of 1749 paved the way for the Stratford "Jubilee" of 1769, when for three days in September the educated of all continents became conscious that the town contained a shrine of world culture. The actor David Garrick organised a festival of parades, masking balls, music and fireworks, amid which his literary friend James Boswell tried to forget his suffering from a meretricious malady by striving to make his countrymen aware of the struggle of Corsica for liberty from the empire of France. The Jubilee must have amused Boswell immensely, for he knew how false the boasts of Stratford were, having assisted Edmund Malone in his monumental edition of the works of Shakespeare, published in 1821. Documents collected by Malone for his biography of the dramatist were destroyed and lost by Shakespeare experts, notably John Payne Collier the forger. Not a single line from Shakespeare's plays or poems was recited or publicly read during the three-days farce. Even tho the babes of nobility and the burgess class were already getting accustomed to hearing their mentors quote from the pennypinching wisdom of Polonius, "Neither a borrower nor a lender be," and the sublime advice of Iago, "Put money in thy purse," "Make money."

Newsletter *Shakespeare Oxford Society*

Verò Nihil Verius

SUMMER, 1981

Vol. 17, No. 3

The Fruits of Error

At least two errors appeared in the last issue of the Newsletter (Winter-Spring, 1981). I am responsible for both these errors and do hereby humbly apologize for them. At the same time, since "to err is human," as the poet says, I cannot promise to produce only error-free pages in the future. I can and do promise, however, to acknowledge and correct promptly all errors which are drawn to my attention and with as much additional information as I receive.

Since errors cannot be completely avoided--even though we conscientiously struggle against them--we must make the most of them by making them fruitful, by learning from them. It pleases and reassures me that readers of the Newsletter not only caught my errors and wrote me correcting them, but did so in a way which adds to our store of Oxfordian knowledge.

The first error appeared in my introduction to the Newsletter. Dr. Bronson Feldman noticed that I had unintentionally misled readers and wrote me:

On page I we are told that the lordly Looney "first plowed" the furrow of research "to undermine the traditional attribution of Shakespeare's work to William Shakspeare." The first plower of that furrow was an amateur of boats named Joseph C. Hart. In The Romance of Yachting (New York: Harper Brothers, 1848) he blasted the Stratford idol as "a fraud upon the world," and appealed for inquiry, "who were the able literary men who wrote the dramas imputed to him?" Hart was unable to believe that the major plays were indeed written by one hand and mind. (Pages 208-243, between accounts of a voyage to Spain.)

The second error, for which I doubly apologize, was a misstatement of fact which I introduced into Dr. Feldman's article, Bunk and The Bust. While splicing two versions of that article, with an eye to the length of the page, I left William Stanley, Earl of Derby, on the cutting room floor, and wrongly married his wife, Elizabeth de Vere, to William Herbert. As Feldman rightly wrote me:

On page 10 your aged and industrious servant was made, by mischief of excessive condensation, to say that Ben Jonson was put in editorial charge of the 1623 Folio by the brothers Herbert, Earls of Pembroke and Montgomery, and their "wives," Elizabeth and Susan de Vere. Now, even better than I know a hawk from a hansaw, I know that Elizabeth de Vere married William Stanley, Earl of Derby, who has been nominated as worthy of the workmanship of Shakespeare. William Herbert, of Pembroke, was considered as a potential husband for Bridget de Vere for some months. His brother Philip of Montgomery married Susan de Vere, and lived happily ever after. Her sisters were not so fortunate. It was her magnificent mother-in-law, "Sidney's sister, Pembroke's mother," who, I think, conceived the collection of Shakespeare's plays in the beautiful folio. She died in 1621, incapable of the deceit that her sons proceeded to practice on the gullible, folly-gulleting world, in order to redeem the noble name of Vere from disgrace which could have stripped it of the earldom of Oxford and fouled up many a marriage.

Dr. Feldman was not the only reader to notice the foul-up I foisted on him. Celeste Ashley wrote immediately from Palo Alto,

California, to supply fuller, accurate information on the marriages of the Pembroke brothers and the Vere sisters from Frances B. Young's Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke (London: David Nutt, 1912), as follows:

William Herbert, 3rd Earl of Pembroke, married Mary Talbot, daughter of the Earl of Shrewsbury, on November 4, 1604.

Philip Herbert was clandestinely betrothed to Lady Susan Vere and their marriage was celebrated in the chapel of Whitehall on December 27, 1604, with the King giving the bride away. Philip succeeded to the title of Earl of Pembroke in 1630 upon the death of his brother William. Until then, he was Earl of Montgomery.

Elizabeth de Vere was the Countess of Derby--she married William Stanley on January 26, 1595. He succeeded to the title of the 6th Earl of Derby upon the sudden death of his brother, Ferdinando.

Bridget de Vere was Lady Norris.

Celeste Ashley regretted that her source did not give the date of Bridget de Vere's marriage to Francis, Lord Norris, later Earl of Berkshire. Ruth Loyd Miller, on page 34 of the second volume of her edition of J. Thomas Looney's "Shakespeare" Identified, states that that wedding took place in 1599.

As you read the following pages, please be aware that errors may be lurking in them. But I hope you will agree with me that it is well worth running the risk of error if it can cause our eagle-eyed and learned readers to produce such abundant fruit as these.

W.H.

The Opening of Twelfth Night

by
Owen Feldman

The well loved and well known passage which opens Twelfth Night seems not to have met any critical vision. No one has pointed

out that its meaning bears no resemblance to what it says. The Duke Orsino (whose name = bear) is wrapt in langorous passion--how can such a thing be?--for the Lady Olivia (= olive). (The bear has a taste for olives; later he settles for a musical instrument, a viola.) When listening to his court lutenists and flutists, he declares

If music be the food of love, play on,
Let me have excess of it that, surfeiting,
The appetite may sicken & so die.

Directly stated, the lines might bear this idea: if love feeds on music, let me have so much that the appetite may sicken and die of overeating. But love does not feed on music. His love may or her love may grow to music. The sense here is: if love is fed by music, my love may die when stuffed with too much tunefulness. The absurdity stems from the Bear's wish that his "appetite" for Olive could be "surfeited" and then his love would die. Few people would believe that he hoped to sicken of music (the play shows he remains rather fond of songs) although he does call "enough! no more" right after.

Lord Oxford's Son-in-Law
by
Harold W. Patience

Prompted by a recent short TV debate on the Authorship Mystery, when one of the proposed "candidates" was William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby, I have asked myself: Is there a possibility that Oxford's son-in-law was connected with the Shakespeare Works in some way? Oxford and Derby, in their lives and in their troubles, had quite an astonishing number of similarities and common experiences. Both were scholars and linguists; both had studied law and traveled widely on the Continent. Connected with theater groups, both men were beset with financial troubles, and had fought duels in which each had been wounded.

I must make it clear from the outset that even if it were to be proved that several pens had a hand in the "Shakespeare" works, my "true" Shakespeare would be the man who wrote Hamlet, Othello, Lear and the Sonnets (at least) - and that this man was the Earl of Oxford I am personally convinced.

When considering Derby's possible connection with Shakespeare, I propose to formulate the questions and theories into three parts: Could Derby have been Oxford's "secretary"? Could he have collaborated with Oxford? Could he have written plays which have, or have not, come down to us outside the Shakespeare canon?

1. Derby as "secretary"

Some time ago I heard of a tradition existing in the village of Hedingham to the effect that Shakespeare wrote some of his plays in the Castle. I had also heard that at some time in his career the Earl of Derby lived in a cottage or gatehouse in the Park adjacent to the Castle. (It is appropriate to note here that Oxfordians seem to be in agreement that we have no evidence that Lord Oxford ever returned to his ancestral home after leaving it, at the age of twelve, in 1562).

In the State Papers, Domestic, for 1598-1601, we find that a political agent and Catholic spy, George Fenner, had been checking up on the activities of Lord Derby who was regarded by the Catholics as a possible candidate for the throne. On 30th June 1599 Fenner reported to Balthazar Gybels at Antwerp: "The Earl of Derby is busied only in penning comedies for the common players," and again, in another letter of the same date to an Italian correspondent at Venice: "Our Earl of Derby is busy in penning comedies for the common players."

"Penning" is an annoyingly ambiguous description of Derby's activities. Was he actually writing plays, or merely making fair copies for the players? Where exactly was Derby in 1599? Contemporary records give only partial clarification, as follows:

In January 1599 Lady Oxford was being entertained by the Derbys at Thistleworth...a letter from Lord Derby to Sir Robert Cecil states he intends to accompany the Countess of Oxford back to her home (at Hackney) when she returns.

...(Derby) wrote to Sir Robert Cecil, his wife's uncle, "from Hackney" on the 28th, when he was staying with his father-in-law...in November, 1599, he and his wife once more were staying at King's Place with the Oxfords...

In his book The Shakespeare Mystery (first English edition, 1927) Georges Connes wrote:

"In May 1599 we know that Derby sought seclusion in a little house in Heningham Park..."

"Heningham" is one of many Elizabethan spelling variants of Hedingham. It is highly possible that Derby spent the greater part of 1599 in seclusion at Hedingham. Is it possible that (as per a possible arrangement made at Hackney in January) he was engaged in copying out Oxford's plays?

Had Heminge and Condell been in possession of Shakespeare's original drafts, the remark in the prefatory matter of the First Folio to the effect that

"And what he thought, he uttered with that easinesse that we have scarce received from him a blot in his papers..."

would have made little sense, surely, for "blot" must be read in the sense of "alteration" or "revision." If, however, we assume that the Heminge and Condell copies had been prepared by a copyist or scrivener we are not surprised to find that their special quality should have caused comment.

2. Derby as collaborator

Like his father-in-law, Lord Oxford, Derby was fond of the theater and ran his own company of actors. Several writers have

confidently proclaimed that Derby must have been the author of Love's Labour's Lost, pointing out the fact that he spent some time at the Court of Navarre, actually meeting the historical counterparts of "King of Navarre," "Longaville," "Berowne" and "Dumain."

The Stanley family take an important place in the Shakespeare plays--in Henry VI, Parts 2 and 3, and Richard III, in particular. It should be noted that several Shakespearean scholars have failed to find the hand of the Master in Henry VI, Parts 1 and 2. As regards Part 3, however, the special glorification of the 13th Earl of Oxford here inclines me personally to the belief that the 17th Earl wrote this Part, which is easily the superior of the trilogy.

In January 1595 Derby married Elizabeth de Vere. Could he, I wonder, have collaborated with Oxford in writing A Midsummer Night's Dream--the very play presented at Court to mark this happy occasion? Alternatively, could he have revised A Pastoral of Phillida & Choryn (Phillida and Corin) which, acted on December 26th, 1584, was most probably either The Dream as we know it, or an early version of it written by Oxford? In any event, it should be noted that Oxford was 34 years old in 1584, when William of Stratford was only 20 and probably in Stratford.

3. Derby as playwright

Convinced as I am that several "Shakespeare" plays were drafted in the 1580s, I consider that Lord Derby, born in 1561, came on the scene too late for consideration as the author of the entire Shakespeare canon.

Authorship of some of the plays in the so-called "Shakespeare Apocrypha," however, could perhaps be considered with Derby in mind. It is generally agreed, for example, that the Master had no hand in the following plays:

Lochrine 1595 "By W.S."

The Widow of Watling Street 1606

"By W.S."

A Yorkshire Tragedy 1608 "By W.S."

The "W.S." is perhaps a "sales gimmick." The possibility remains however that Derby

could have playfully signed these works with his initials of William Stanley knowing full well that the assumed author would be the mysterious "William Shakespeare."

In 1589 Lord Lumley*, in The Arte of English Poesie mentioned

"...Noble men and Gentlemen of her Majestie's own servants, who have written excellently well as it would appear if their doings could be found out and made public with the rest, of which number is first that noble Gentleman, Edward Earl of Oxford..."

Oxfordians, taking note that de Vere comes "first," curiously overlook the plural: other "Gentlemen" (of the Court) have written well. Just who were they?

The cryptic epigram to Shakespeare by John Davies (1611) gives further food for thought:

To our English Terence, Mr. Will.
Shakespeare

Some say, good Will, which I in
sport do sing,
Had'st thou not play'd some kingly
part in sport,
Thou had'st been a companion for a
king,
And been a king among the meaner
sort...

The supporters of the Earl of Derby for the crown of "Shakespeare" naturally claim that we have here a reference to the earl's very real claim to the English throne. There has, however, been a belief throughout the centuries that certain great men wrote under the name of Terence, the Carthaginian slave of 185-159 B.C. Was Davies in this epigram voicing his own belief that the name of "Shakespeare" concealed at least two men?

1587 is the year in which by tradition William Shakspeare is supposed to have left Stratford-upon-Avon. It is therefore remarkable to find that in July of that year the Earl of Leicester's troupe of actors came directly to Lathom House

* This attribution remains a matter for debate and research: academics attribute the work to Puttenham; Charles Wisner Barrell thought Edmund Spenser could be the author.--W.H.

[seat of the Earl of Derby) from Stratford. It is tempting to imagine William joining the actors in Stratford in a minor capacity and later meeting Derby at Lathom. Did the earl there and then decide that the commoner's name would provide an ideal "cover" or "mask" for his own playwriting activities and those of his kinsman (Lord Oxford)? Was the name of William Shakespeare to eventually evolve from William Stanley plus Oxford's crest of a lion shaking a broken spear?

"O what a dusty answer gets the soul,
When hot for certainties in this our
life"

John Davies's Sonnets for the
Marriage of Elizabeth Vere
and William Stanley

by
Warren Hope

Oxfordians have for long been aware of a connection between Edward de Vere, seventeenth Earl of Oxford, alias Shakespeare, and John Davies, eventually Sir John Davies, the Elizabethan poet and courtier, best known for his poem, Orchestra. Charles Wisner Barrell, that prolific and entertaining Oxfordian scholar, provided the best and fullest description of the connection between these two Elizabethan poets in what I take to be his masterpiece, a veritable tour de force of literary detective work, his analysis of the Epistle Dedicatorie to Thomas Nash's "Strange News" (1593). (Barrell first published his Key to Nash's Epistle Dedicatorie in The Shakespeare Fellowship Quarterly for October, 1944. Ruth Loyd Miller reprinted the analysis in her edition of Eva Turner Clark's Hidden Allusions in Shakespeare's Plays published by the Minos Publishing Company, Jennings, Louisiana, in 1974.)

Barrell's main aim and most triumphant achievement in that work was to identify the recipient of the Epistle Dedicatorie--a man Nash addressed as "Gentle M(aster) William"--with Edward de Vere, thus showing that De Vere was known as "William" to contemporaries. But what matters here is Barrell's discussion of Davies and De Vere, a

discussion which sprang from this passage in Nash's Epistle:

By whatsoever thy visage holdeth
most precious I beseech thee, by
John Davies's soul and the blue Boar
in the Spittle I conjure thee to draw
out thy purse, and give me nothing
for the dedication of my pamphlet.

Barrell wrote of this passage, in part:

"That John Davies's poem, Of The Soul of Man (the second part of Nosce Teipsum) was considered "precious" by the Earl of Oxford in 1592 is plausible enough. Davies had high connections and later was knighted and appointed Attorney-General for Ireland. He married Eleanor, daughter of George, Baron Audley. His wife was sister-in-law of the daughter of Ferdinando Stanley, Fifth Earl of Derby, a patron of "Shakespeare's players." There is also excellent evidence that Davies' Soul was in existence when Nash wrote The Epistle. For in 1697, when Nahum Tate, then Poet Laureate of England, republished the poem, he included a dedication of the work to Queen Elizabeth, signed by Davies and dated "July 11, 1592." This indicates that Tate had access to a manuscript copy which had been presented to the Queen (very possibly by Oxford) long before Davies' complete work was entered for publication on April 10, 1599.

"John Davies is one of the most important contemporary witnesses against the Stratford claimant and in favor of the Earl of Oxford as the real Bard. But his evidence is much too interesting to include in these brief notes. Born in 1569, by the age of twenty Davies had made himself persona grata to the same literary set in London that Oxford favored. He appears to have written at least one of the anti-Martin Marprelate tracts. (Sir Martin Marpeople, his Collar of Esses... offered to sale upon great necessity by John Davies, 1590.)

"The Davies-Shakespeare association has long been discussed as the result of the discovery in the Stationer's Register of the entry of a license granted to a bookseller named Eleazer Edgar, under date of January 3, 1600, for the publica-

tion of A Booke Called Amours by J.D., with certain other Sonnetes by W.S. Previous to this, the rather scandalous Epigrams of John Davies had appeared in a joint volume with Christopher Marlowe's translation of Ovid's licentious Amores. Only the initials of Marlowe and Davies--"C.M." and "J.D."--had been printed on the title-page of this under-the-counter edition. But when the book was suppressed in 1599, the Bishops named both writers.

"The combined work of "J.D." and "W.S." entered by Edgar in 1600 represented an obvious effort by the publisher to cash in on Davies' recent notoriety by coupling his (now rare) love Sonnets with the Sonnets of Shakespeare, some of which were evidently obtainable through Davies or the same person who had turned Davies' poems over to Edgar. The year previous William Jaggard had included two of the Bard's authentic Sonnets in a piratical compilation of pilferings from various other poets, all boldly issued by Jaggard under the misleading title of "The Passionate Pilgrim by W. Shakespeare."

"In 1600 the reading public could be lured by only one set of "W.S." initials, and those represented "William Shakespeare." Likewise, the success of John Davies's serious works such as Soul and Orchestra, as well as the more humid Epigrams, lent unquestionable commercial value to the initials "J.D." But Edgar appears to have been halted in his publication plans, for no book containing verses of Davies and Shakespeare has ever turned up. Somebody of authority evidently stayed his hand.

"Later on, Edgar became the publisher of the 1609 Funeral Poem Upon the Death of the Most Worthie and True Soldier, Sir Francis Vere, Knight. Sir Francis, it will be remembered, was Lord Oxford's admired cousin, to whose care the Earl entrusted the early military training of his illegitimate son by the Dark Lady of the Sonnets, Sir Edward Vere. Thus, Eleazar Edgar provides a logical connection between the Vere family, Oxford-Shakespeare and John Davies, whose Soul Nash says was "most precious" to Oxford in 1593."

Barrell never turned again to this subject or, if he did, he never published the results of his research. However, the most recent

editor of John Davies's poetry, Robert Krueger, has added to our knowledge of the connection between Oxford-Shakespeare and Davies by publishing Davies's Epithalamion for the wedding of Elizabeth Vere and William Stanley, Sixth Earl of Derby, made up of ten Shakespearean sonnets.

Krueger first published these poems in a scholarly journal as early as 1962. He has now included them in what is recognized as the standard text of Davies's poems, The Poems of Sir John Davies published by Oxford University at the Clarendon Press in 1975. Krueger, ignoring the connections between Davies and Oxford established by Barrell and others, and avoiding the Shakespeare authorship question entirely, nonetheless neatly established that these Sonnets were in fact written for the wedding of Oxford's eldest daughter:

"The conveniently inscribed date ('Finis 95 Ian:') gives the first clue to the marriage being celebrated in the Epithalamion. The second occurs in the poem, where Melpomene mentions the bride's cousin:

Your most victorious cosin warlike
Vere,
The glory of your glorious familie....

"This is the same Francis Vere (1560-1609) whose valour Davies celebrated in his 40th Epigram, 'In Afrum,' written about the same time:

He tells how Gronigen is taken in
By the brave conduct of illustrious
Vere....

"Davies gives a third clue in a speech by Calliope, who says she will witness 'an earls daughter married to an Erle'. This evidence points unerringly to a famous marriage of the time: Elizabeth Vere, daughter of Edward Vere, Earl of Oxford, to William Stanley, Earl of Derby, on 26 January 1594/95."

There is neither space enough nor time here to explore yet more fully the relationship between Oxford and Davies or to present the evidence I have gathered which suggests that Davies's most famous

poem, Orchestra, was also originally written as a court entertainment for the wedding of Elizabeth Vere and William Stanley. For now it will be enough to merely present to Oxfordians the sonnets John Davies wrote for that highly literary wedding, that wedding at which John Davies caused the Muses to sing Oxfordian puns in Shakespearean stanzas:

Love not that Love that is a child and
blynde,
But that Heroicke, honorable Love
Which first the fightinge Elements
combinde,
And taught the world in harmony to move:
That God of Love, whose sweet attractive
power
First founded cityes, and societyes,
Which linkes trewe frendes, and to each
paramor
That virtewe loves, a virtewous Love
affies.
This Love hath causd the Muses to record
Their sweetest tuens, and most celesti-
all,
To you sweet Lady, and to you great
Lorde,
In honor of your joyfull nuptiall.
And to their tuens this prayer they
still applye,
That with your dayes your joyes maye
multiplie.

Clio.

Illustrious Lord, heire of that happy
race
Which with great Lordshipps doth great
Love inherit,
Rayseed by the heavens unto that glorious
place,
Which your great grawnseirs did by vir-
tewe merit:
And you sweete Lady, virtewes noble
fayre,
Whom when I name your grandsier, father,
mother,
Of all whose excellencies you are heire,
I then extoll, and prayse above all
other:
Your famous Auncestors eternall names
My diamond pen in adamant shall write,
And I will spread your owne younge Loving
fames,
As far as Phoebus spreades his glorious
Light.

Still with my tuens importuninge the
skye,
That with your dayes your Joyes maye
multiplie.

Thalia.

And I the merry Muse of Comedyes,
That with a marriage ever end my playe,
Will into mirth, and greatest joye
arise,
While I applawd this blessed marriage
daye.
Yet will I sadly praye my Father Jove,
That as crosse chaunce fought not
agaynst your will
In the fayre course of your most happy
Love,
So with out crosse ye maye continewe
still.
That as the voyce and Echo doe agree,
So maye you both, both doe, and saye
thesame,
And as your eyes beinge two, but one
thinge see,
So maye ye to one end your actions
frame.
So shall your Lyves be a sweet harmonye,
And with your dayes your Joyes shall
multiplie.

Melpomene.

And I which sownd the tragicke tuens of
warr,
Have Layd my harsh and fearfull Trumpe
aside,
Wherwith I usd to rende the ayre a farr,
In service of your cosin, bewtious bride.
Your most victorious cosin, warlike Vere,
The glory of your glorious familye;
A braver spirit the earth did never
beare,
Since first the fyre of lyfe came from
the skye:
This fyery starre of Mars my trumpett
tooke,
And put a warblinge lute betwene my
handes,
And with a joyfull voyce and joyfull
looke,
Sent me to blesse these sacred marriage
bandes,
And to commend his vows to Jove on hie,
That with your dayes your joyes maye
multiplie.

Euterpe.

And I betwine whose lipps the ayre doth
playe,
Chaunginge her wanton forme ten thou-
sand wayes,
Will not distingwish one halfe note
this daye,
Which shall not sownd both to your joye
and prayse;
For even your marriage doth sweete
music make,
Like two sweete notes matcht in an uni-
sone,
Where each from other doth full sweet-
nesse take,
Where one could make no harmony aloane.
Longe maye you Joye such sympathye of
Loves
As doth betwine the Elme and Vine re-
mayne,
Or betwine palme trees, twinns, and
turtle doves,
Wher in one Lyfe doth live the Lives
of twayne.
Longe live you in each other mutually,
That with your dayes your Joyes maye
multiplie.

Terpsicore.

And I whose cunninge feete with mea-
surd motion
Expresse the musicke which my Sisters
singe,
Will nowe in songes expresse my trewe
devotion,
To you which to my Arte most honor
bringe;
For who can dawnce with better skill
and grace,
Then you great bridgroume, or then
you fayr bride?
Whether a solleme measure ye doe pase,
Or els with swifter tuens more swiftly
slide.
Still maye you dawnce, and keepe that
measure still
In all your lyfe which you in dawncinge
shewe,
Where both the man and woman have one
will,
And both at once the selfe same paces
goe.
So shall you never drawe your yoke awry,
But with your dayes your joyes shall
multiplie.

Erato.

And I the waytinge mayde of bewtyes
Queene,
Which oft am wonte to singe of wanton
Love,
Since I these sacred nuptials have
seene,
An other godhead in my brest doth move;
For nowe I singe of bewty of the minde,
Which bewtifies the fayrest outward
bewty,
And of a passion which is never blinde,
But waytes on virtewe with respectfull
duty.
O sacred Love, wher one loves only one,
Where each to other is a mirror fayre
Wherein them selves are each to other
shone:
Such is your sacred love, illustrious
payre,
Whose fyer like Vestas flame shall
never dye,
But with your dayes your joyes shall
multiplie.

Polyhimnia.

And I which with my gesture seeme to
speake,
Will speake indeede, in honor of this
daye,
And with my sweetest tuens the ayre
will breake,
Which shall to Jove passe through the
milkey waye.
Even to the eares of Jove my tuens
shall come,
And be for you (sweete bride) a zelous
praier,
That as a cherye graft uppon a plumme,
You maye be fruitfull in your issues
fayre.
Or that you and your Love be like two
streames,
Which meetinge after many windes and
crookes,
Doe spread their mingled waves through
many realmes,
And from them selves dirive a thou-
sande brookes.
And though the lesser loose her name
therby,
Yet with her dayes her Joyes shall
multiplie.

Calliope.

And I which singe th'eroicke Love of
 Kinges,
 Must use like notes whiles I your names
 rehearse,
 For he which your great names in number
 singes,
 With names of Princes doth adorne his
 verse.
 And princly is your match as gold and
 Pearle,
 Both bewtifull, each other bewtifie;
 So an earls daughter married to an
 Erle,
 Gives and receaves like honor mutually.
 And as the purest cullors which alone,
 Sett by themselves, imperfect bewty
 make,
 Wher they are mingled and cojoynd in
 one,
 One from an other lyfe and lustre take.
 So you beinge matcht, each other glori-
 fie,
 That with your dayes your Joyes maye
 multiplie.

Urania.

But I the Muse of Heaven, to heaven will
 rayse (you,)
 And your fayre names in starry letters
 write,
 That they which dwell under both poles
 maye prayse you
 And in rehearsall of your names delight.
 And you fayre bride, shall like fayre
 Cynthia sh(ine,)
 Which beinge in conjunction with the
 Sunne,
 Doth seeme her beames and glory to re-
 signe,
 But hath indeede more light and virtewe
 wonne.
 Longe shall you shine on earth, like
 Lampes of heaven,
 Which when you Leave, I will you stell-
 fie;
 To you sweet bride, shall Hebes place be
 given,
 But your Lord shall his Ganimedes roome
 supplye.
 Till when I will invoke each dyetye,
That with your Dayes your joyes maye
multipl(ye.)

SOS Annual Conference Set

This year's conference of the Shakespeare Oxford Society will be held in Philadelphia at The Barclay Hotel on Rittenhouse Square on Friday evening, October 16, and on Saturday, October 17. Room reservations may be obtained directly from the hotel. Autumn is a lovely time of year in Philadelphia. Please plan to attend and derive strength from true Oxfordian fellowship.

Hilda Amphlett: An Obituary

It is sad to have to report the death of Hilda Amphlett at Egham, Surrey, in England. She was 84 years old.

Author, painter, and naturalist, Miss Amphlett became a convinced Oxfordian and embodied her conviction in a book, Who Was Shakespeare?, published in 1955 by Heinemann, with an introduction by another leading English Oxfordian, Christmas Humphreys. The book has since been reissued by AMS. Miss Amphlett was an active member of the English branch of the Shakespeare Oxford Society until her death. Her diary, covering the period from 1920 to the present, and running to 60 volumes, is to be presented to the British Museum.

Perhaps something of Hilda Amphlett's spirit and dedication can best be conveyed by the words of one of her two surviving sisters, M.H. Robins, addressed to Harold Patience in a letter dated July 24, 1981: "Her interest in the Oxford Cause never failed, and she was still talking of the future of Hedingham Castle to the last." Such spirit and dedication will be missed.

Dorothy Stevens Ogburn (1890-1981)

To regret the death of one who had been condemned by the weakness of advanced age to bedridden helplessness, who had been unable for years to read and had heard only with difficulty, would be inhumane. The end that came for Dorothy S. Ogburn on May 7th was a release she had been longing for, with a mind unimpaired to the finish; she lacked a month and a day of her ninety-first birthday. Yet those who remember her as the vital spirit she had been, her capacity for gaiety, her love of humor and her wit, the warmth of response she engendered in others, and finally her productive absorption in the case for Oxford as Shakespeare will be deeply saddened by this further instance of the insatiability of Time.

Born in Atlanta, Georgia, Dorothy Stevens was married in 1910 to Charlton Ogburn, a lawyer and fellow Georgian. It was to prove a rich relationship. In 1919 the couple moved to New York, which was to become their permanent home. Dorothy turned to writing in the 1920's and produced three popular mystery novels. Then she and her husband were caught up in the greatest literary mystery of all. "This started the whole thing," she wrote some years later on a copy of the Saturday Review of Literature of May 1, 1937, which turned up in the considerable library of the Shakespeare authorship she left. The issue was that which contained the article entitled Elizabethan Mystery Man by Charles Wisner Barrell introducing to Americans the thesis--let us come right out and call it the discovery--announced in J. Thomas Looney's "'Shakespeare' Identified."

The Ogburns' lives, like so many others', were never to be the same again. The couple became active members of the Shakespeare Fellowship and Dorothy later a vice president of the Shakespearean Authorship Society of England. Charlton represented Mr. Barrell in his suit for libel against Giles E. Dawson of the Folger Library in 1949. Two years earlier he had written "The Renaissance Man of England," summarizing the case for Oxford in 37 pages. Though privately published, the booklet went through several

printings and was brought out in German by Origo-Verlag of Zurich. An expanded version by both Ogburns was brought out by Coward, McCann in 1955.

The Ogburns' major work, published by Coward, McCann in 1953, was the 1300-page "This Star of England," which Lincoln Schuster of Simon & Schuster called "a truly dazzling achievement." Before it sold out it had persuaded many others of the soundness of the Oxford case and its fascination. In 1961, with her husband having suffered a physical breakdown, Mrs. Ogburn wrote a much simpler work contrasting the evidence for Oxford and that for Shakspeare. This was "Shake-speare: The Man Behind the Name," published the next year by William Morrow & Co. shortly after Mr. Ogburn's death. Crane Brinton, the distinguished Harvard historian, called it a "fair-minded, balanced, and very well written treatment of a subject which has very rarely indeed been so treated" and said that it had "been successful in persuading me that the conventional attribution of the writings of 'Shakespeare' deserves at best the old Scots verdict of 'not proven.'" The book has continued to sell, a paperback edition having been exhausted some years ago. When she suffered the loss of her reading ability in 1973 Mrs. Ogburn had largely completed the manuscript of a book entitled "Elizabeth and Shakespeare."

Dorothy Stevens Ogburn had been the last living member of the first generation of American Oxfordians, who had numbered among them William McFee, Gelett Burgess, Louis P. Bénét, Charles W. Barrell and Eva Turner Clark. She is survived by a son, Charlton (a member of this Society), and three grandchildren.

SOS Bulletin Board

Russell des Cognets, Jr., our Kentucky-based missionary to the Stratfordians, announces that he has formulated yet another way to spread the Oxfordian word among believers in the dreary Shakspeare fairy tale. He is sponsoring an Oxfordian Essay Contest for students of Shakespeare. The contest was first announced in the February, 1981, issue of Louis Marder's The Shakespeare [sic] Newsletter, this way:

"Moved by the report that there were annual Shakespeare scholarship contests Russell des Cognets, Jr., (sponsor of SNL's columns on the Oxfordian authorship of Shakespeare) has offered to sponsor a third contest.

"To the American or Canadian student of Shakespeare who writes the best 1500 word typed, documented essay sponsoring the Earl of Oxford as author of the works of Shakespeare Mr. Des Cognets will offer a \$250 first prize and a \$150 2nd prize. To each of the professors sponsoring the winning students there will be \$50 prizes. The faculty of each institution will decide for itself which two essays it will submit. Judges will include the editor of the Oxford Society's Bulletin [sic], the President of The Shakespeare Oxford Society, Mr. Gordon C. Cyr, author of SNL's columns, Mr. Des Cognets, the Editor of SNL, and others. The winning essay may be published. The contest will end June, 1982. Write SNL for further details."

That Oxfordians will help promote this contest in local colleges and universities is a consummation devoutly to be wished. We also salute Russ des Cognets and Gordon Cyr for their efforts to bring enlightenment to the soi-disant World Shakespeare Conference in Stratford, England.

Rhoda Messner, author of that fine fictional study of the Oxford-was-Shakespeare issue, Absent Thee From Felicity, writes in response to our call for Notes and Queries: "You ask for 'Notes and Queries' and I find myself bursting with them. First, Elizabeth Sears' interesting article on Sonnets 76 and 105. Obviously, Sonnet 76

is a treasure-trove for all Oxfordians. I agree with 'Editor' that identification of the addressee is not firmly established and of course I lean toward Southampton for the honor. (Can she possibly believe that Southampton was Oxford's son?!) She notes the reference in the Sonnet to Southampton's motto, All for One & One for All, and if, as she believes, the 'noted weed' is the wild or briar rose, it could also refer to Southampton: his family name Wriothesley is sometimes (amidst much controversy and confusion) pronounced 'Rosely'....Oxford loved Southampton as a son (the sun-son pun) and hoped to have him as a son-in-law through the proposed marriage of his eldest daughter Elizabeth (who ended marrying the Earl of Derby). The first series of Sonnets urging marriage becomes much more reasonable as Oxford urging a marriage with his daughter than the Stratfordian explanation of the poems....Gerald Rendall (in "Shakespeare's Sonnets and Edward de Vere") thinks that "keeping invention in a noted weed" means only 'adhering to the stock form and conventions', but the rose interpretation is attractive. Rendall connects the 7th line "showing their birth and where they did proceed" to Oxford's ancestral village Ver, near Bayeux in Normandy; and Arnold Emch in his "Uncommon Letters To A Son" carries it further to where the Vere family "did proceed" in England. Mr. Emch is a member of SOS and has two memorable chapters in his book on the Shakespeare-Oxford authorship, one of them solely on Sonnet 76. This certainly doesn't exhaust all the gold in this Sonnet-verse, but I think I have used up my 'note and query' time.

Ruth Loyd Miller, bright lady of the Shakespeare-Oxford movement, found that the research she undertook to produce the article announced for this issue of the Newsletter has raised some questions which need answering before the article can be wrapped up. We look forward to its appearance in a future issue.

Charlton Ogburn, Jr., to whom we offer our sympathy, reports that Professor George Steiner of Churchill College, Cambridge, and a book-reviewer for The New Yorker, appeared on Bill Moyers' Journal, a program

telecast on May 22, 1981, and responded to the question: "What is your own conclusion about Shakespeare, was there one Shakespeare, was there..." this way: "I believe there was one Shakespeare. I believe he is the man of Stratford, but I refuse to dismiss one haunting problem which is this. We know through his will, we know through his very precise economic middle-class way of thinking about property, that he dies checking everything that belongs to him, and he does not mention sixteen major, gigantic plays not yet printed at his death in any form. Hence, if at all existing, on the floor of the theater, somewhere in London, in rough papers and rough actors' parts. And that psychological riddle, that a man would make no reference to that, I have no answer for, and I find it haunting." Charlton also reports a startling event in the academic world: the scholarly journal, Studies In Philology, published by the press of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, filled its Early Winter number (Vol. LXXVII, no. 5) with the poems of the Earls of Essex and Oxford, edited by Professor Steven W. May. The editor of Studies In Philology offers members of the Shakespeare Oxford Society a ten percent discount off the regular price of \$5.00 per copy for orders of 50 or more copies. Charlton Ogburn's review of this first academic edition of Oxford's poems will appear in the next issue of the Newsletter.

Harold Patience writes that the BBC telecast on the Shakespeare authorship question, Will the Real Shakespeare?, was short and disappointing. The program, however, did give Harold the opportunity to plug the Oxfordian case through a letter to the editor of the "Radio Times" which read in part: "A nobleman of the first rank, only Lord Oxford would have dared to address the Earl of Southampton as 'my lovely boy' and urge him into matrimony and procreation. As Fr Francis Edwards said, the works abound in incidents from Oxford's private life. Only Oxford could have dramatised such incidents for use on the public stages." Harold Patience has also published an outstanding article entitled "The 17th Earl of Oxford" in the East Anglian Magazine.

A Reminder: The Annual Conference of the Shakespeare Oxford Society will be held at The Barclay Hotel on Rittenhouse Square in Philadelphia on the evening of Friday, October 16 and all-day Saturday, October 17.

*** *** ***

JOIN SOS

If the Shakespeare Oxford Society is a stranger to you, please treat it in the way Hamlet suggests:

"And therefore as a stranger give it welcome."

Tax-deductible Dues:

Student Member	\$ 2.00 per year
Regular Member	\$10.00 per year
Donating Member	\$25.00 or more per year

The Shakespeare Oxford Society
P.O. Box 16254
Baltimore, Maryland 21210

WITH THIS ISSUE, we are mailing to all members of the Shakespeare Oxford Society a copy of the double issue (April 1981 and May 1981) of The Shakespeare Newsletter containing our full-page presentation, "The Case of the 'Alias Earl!'" This appears on p. 20 of the May issue (bound inside the April one). The article argues for de Vere's authorship of the Sonnets. Thanks once again to Russell des Cognets, this article was distributed to delegates and visitors to the World Shakespeare Congress at Stratford-on-Avon this summer! The Shakespeare Oxford Society is honored to have Russ des Cognets among its ranks. He is an entire "support system" in one person!

--Gordon C. Cyr
Exec. Vice-President