



**THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY**

**NEWSLETTERS**

**1990**



Morse Johnson, Editor  
105 West 4th Street, Suite #819, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

## VLADIMIR NABOKOV AND WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

By

Philip F. Howerton, Jr.

Vladimir Nabokov, the great Russian/American writer, was born on April 22, 1899, in St. Petersburg, Russia. In 1914 he published his first work, a small book of poems in a lilac folder. It carried an epigraph from *Romeo and Juliet*. At the time of his death in 1977, he left behind an enormous oeuvre which included, in the opinion of many, some of the finest novels in Russian and English written in this century. Alfred Appel, a Nabokovian scholar, has said that "although the problem has not yet been submitted to a composer, Shakespeare would seem to be the writer Nabokov invokes most frequently in his novels in English." Nabokov himself once said that the "verbal poetical texture of Shakespeare is the greatest the world has known."

Vladimir Nabokov, whom Time magazine in 1969 called "The greatest living American Novelist," was also a professor of literature for twenty years. While at Cornell he published his literal translation of *Eugene Onegin* in four volumes, together with almost nine hundred pages of seminal notes (over thirty references to Shakespeare) and his "Notes on Prosody." The latter was a booklength "outline of the differences and similarities" between English and Russian iambic tetrameters and revealed an astonishing knowledge of English as well as Russian poetry.

In 1947 Nabokov published a bitterly satirical novel about totalitarianism called *Bend Sinister*. In Chapter Seven he took the opportunity (which has puzzled scholars ever since) to make the following, apparently ironical, comments about the Stratfordian attribution:

A fluted glass with a blue-veined violet and a jug of hot punch stand on Ember's bedtable. The buff wall directly above his bed (he has a bad cold) bears a sequence of three engravings.

Number one represents a sixteenth-century gentleman in the act of handing a book to a humble fellow who holds a spear and a bay-crowned hat in his left hand. Note the sinistral detail (why? Ah, "that is the question," as Monsieur Homais once remarked, quoting *le journal d'hier*, a question which is answered in a wooden voice by the Portrait on the title page of the First Folio). Note also the legend: "Ink, a Drug." Somebody's idle pencil (Ember highly treasures this scholium) has numbered the letters so as to spell *Grudinka* which means "bacon" in several Slavic languages.

Number two shows the rustic (now clad in the clothes of the gentleman) removing from the head of the gentleman (now writing at a desk) a kind of shapska. Scribbled underneath in the same hand: "*Ham-let, or Home-lette au Lard.*"

Finally, number three has a road, traveler on foot (wearing the stolen shapska) and a road sign "To High Wycombe."

His name is protean. He begets doubles at every corner. His penmanship is unconsciously faked by lawyers who happen to write a similar hand. On the wet morning of November 27, 1582, he is Shexpera and she is a Wataly of Templa Grafton. A couple of days later he is Shagsper and she is a Hathaway of Stratford-on-Avon. Who is he? William X, cunningly composed of two left arms and a mask. Who else? The person who said (not for the first time) that the glory of God is to hide a thing, and the glory of man is to find it. However, the fact that the Warwickshire fellow wrote the plays is most satisfactorily proved on the strength of an applejohn and a pale primrose.

Several Stratfordian academics have suggested privately, in response to queries, that Nabokov's assertion in *Bend Sinister* that "the fact that the Warwickshire fellow wrote the plays is most satisfactorily proved on the strength of an applejohn and a pale primrose," may be taken at face value. Citing Caroline Spurgeon's *Shakespeare's Imagery* as a possible source, it is suggested that Nabokov may have felt that

only someone familiar with the particular fauna and flora of Warwickshire could have written the plays. Nabokov, the argument presumably goes, subscribed to a theory which says, in effect, that because of his "genius" Shakespeare was able to acquire by some sort of mysterious osmosis a thorough familiarity with court affairs and international politics, medicine and anatomy, law, music, birds, falconry, hunting, sailing, warfare, French, Latin, Greek, the environs of Italy, and mere, but, by Golly, he *had to be from Warwickshire* to know that applejohms and primroses existed in England!

Could such a man as Nabokov (who, by the way, was an accomplished naturalist) have really believed (for starters) that applejohms and primroses were not only endemic to Warwickshire but could not have been known by, say, a well-traveled nobleman from Essex (a hundred miles away and on the same latitude)? Or subscribed to the notion that only a rustic (with a manure heap in his front yard?) could have appreciated the charms of rural England? Not likely.

In 1941, shortly after he had come to this country, Nabokov wrote a review for *The New Republic* of Frayne Williams' book, *Mr. Shakespeare of the Globe*, in which he had some very pointed things to say about the Stratfordian habit of biography. He began as follows: "The biographical part of this book will not disappoint the imaginary not-too-bright giant for whom blurbs are fattened and human interest lavishly spread." He ended with this: "Finally, it is interesting to learn that 'it takes two to make a conversation and the same number to make love' -- which fact, together with the second-best bed ('the most intimate monument of her life') is about all we and the voluble author really know concerning that particular marriage."

But it Nabokov had real doubts about the authorship, why didn't he ever come right out and say so? Perhaps that was a tight that he did not need. The Nabokovs were very poor in the Forties and even up to the time of the success of *Lolita*, in the late 1950's, their finances were never off shaky ground. He was dependent, quite simply, on his sometimes precarious position in academe. Always suspected by the orthodox because of his staunch opposition to communism, he waded into further difficulty with his sometimes scathing appraisals of certain "established" authors and with his attacks on what he called "solidly unionized professional paraphrasts" and their "arty" mistranslations of works such as *Onegin*. Given what is known about the treatment of other, declared anti-Stratfordians at the hands of the orthodox, it would not be the least surprising if Nabokov had simply decided to keep his opinions to himself. Except, of course, for the few glimpses he did give us.

Anything else? Well, yes, as a matter of fact. In 1924 Nabokov wrote a little poem in Russian which his son, Dmitri, translated into English in 1988. Reprinted here with his kind permission, it is called,

#### *Shakespeare*

Amid grandees of times Elizabethan  
you shimmered too, you followed sumptuous custom;  
the circle of ruff, the silv'ry satin that  
encased your thigh, the wedgelike beard - in all of this  
you were like other men... True was enfolded  
your godlike thunder in a succinct cape.

Haughty, aloof from theatre's alarms,  
you easily, regretlessly relinquished  
the laurels twinning into a dry wreath,  
concealing for all time your monstrous genius  
beneath a mask; and yet, your phantasm's echoes  
still vibrate for us; your Venetian Moor,  
his enguish; Falstaff's visage, like an udder  
with pasted-on mustache; the raging Lear...  
You are among us, you're alive; your name, though,  
your image, too - deceiving, true, the word -  
you have submerged in your beloved Lethe.  
It's true, of course, a usurer had grown  
accustomed, for a sum, to sign your work  
(that Shakespeare - Will - who played the Ghost in *Hamlet*,

who lives in pubs, and died before he could  
digest In full his portion of a boar's heed)...

The frigate breathed, your country you were leaving,  
To Italy you went. A female voice  
called singsong through the iron's pattern,  
called to her balcony the tall *inglesse*,  
grown languid from the lemon-tinted moon  
and Verona's streets. My inclination  
is to imagine, possibly, the droll  
and kind creator of *Don Quixote*  
exchanging with you a few casual words  
while waiting for fresh horses - and the evening  
was surely blue. The well behind the tavern  
contained a pail's pure tinkling sound... Reply -  
whom did you love? Reveal yourself - whose memoirs  
refer to you in passing? Look what numbers  
of lowly, worthless souls have left their trace,  
what countless names Brantome has for the asking!  
Reveal yourself, god of iambic thunder,  
you hundred-mouthed, unthinkably great bard!

No! At the destined hour, when you felt banished  
by God from your existence, you recalled  
those secret manuscripts, fully aware  
that your supremacy would rest unblemished  
by public rumor's unashamed brand,  
that ever, midst the shifting dust of ages,  
faceless you'd stay, like immortality  
itself - then vanished in the distance, smiling.\*

How did Vladimir Nabokov feel about the authorship? You be the judge.

\*Copyright© 1979 Vladimir Nabokov Estate  
English version copyright© 1988 Dmitri Nabokov

\*\*\*\*\*

## MARK TWAIN, SHAKESPEARE, AND HELEN KELLER

By  
Tom Gott

Many Oxfordians may be unaware that when Mark Twain penned his anti-Stratfordian classic, "Is Shakespeare Dead?" (*My Autobiography*, New York: Harper, 1909), it was Helen Keller, celebrated activist for the sight-and-hearing-impaired (abetted by her equally famed teacher Anne Sullivan Macy and Anne's husband, author-editor John Macy), who stimulated Twain to do so. Let Joseph P. Lash, in a fascinating passage from his recent *Helen and Teacher*, tell the story (SOS members will wish to allow for the fact that while Mr. Lash has written a superb biography of Helen and Annie, in this matter he apparently felt obliged to "correct" his subjects and put his own Stretfordianism on record):

(Helen's and Annie's) last meeting with (Samuel) Clemens was at Stormfield — his new Italian villa-like home in the Connecticut hills near Redding...One of their fireside discussions while at Stormfield was about the discovery that a friend of John's, William Stone Booth, had made of an acrostic in the plays and sonnets usually attributed to Shakespeare (*sic*) that revealed the author to have really been Francis Bacon (the visit to Stormfield took place in

January 1909, eleven years before the Oxford authorship theory had been disclosed). Mark Twain was inclined to be skeptical and scoffing. They sent him Booth's book *Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon* and another book by G. G. Greenwood, *The Shakespeare Problem Restated*. It is difficult to tell who or what caused them to entangle themselves in the thickets of the "Did Bacon Write Shakespeare?" controversy and embrace the Bacon hypothesis. Another Baconian was John's classmate and fellow poet, Walter Conrad Arensberg, son of a Pittsburgh steel manufacturer and so staunch a convert to the Bacon hypothesis that he established a Francis Bacon Foundation.

There is no need here to examine the apparatus of hidden acrostics that Booth elicited from the Shakespeare canon to prove his thesis. Shakespearian scholars, even Helen's good friend, the genial William Allan Nelson, dismissed it. "No Shakespearian scholar was ever convinced by the Baconians," he later told Nella Braddy (Nella Braddy Henney, Annie's biographer and Helen's "beloved friend and literary counsellor"), "but those who started out with preconceived Bacon ideas had been." *Helen was outraged that scholars and editors dismissed the Booth book without even reading it. "To think they should be so scornful at the idea that the most learned, the most travelled, the most versatile man of his time could have written the poems and plays of Shakespeare, while they go about hugging the belief that a common, uneducated, unknown rustic actor wrote them," she lamented to the book's author (emphasis added).*

According to Lash, John Macy intervened at this point, asking as Miss Keller's agent if Richard Watson Gilder's *The Century* might be interested in an article on the controversy. Gilder cautioned them, saying that "he who strikes at a king must strike to kill!" Professing to have the then twenty-nine-year-old Miss Keller's best interests at heart, Gilder implied that the project was really John's and Annie's doing. Helen, stung by the suggestion — "How could (Gilder) dream that they would interfere with my right as a free woman to say whatever I liked!" — stubbornly submitted the article, recalling this moment much later as an important one in her career, for "...this...was the first time that I had let outsiders know that I would think for myself." Gilder rejected Helen's article, declaring himself "simply broken-hearted over your wasting your talents on the Baconian hypothesis."

I am indebted to Elizabeth Wrigley and Alice Amezcua, both of the Francis Bacon Library, Claremont College, for permission to quote from a photocopy of the letter Miss Keller herself posted to Richard Watson Gilder at about that time, since the original now resides in the archives of that great Baconian collection. The letter, which was meant to stimulate Gilder's interest in the proposed article, was sent from Wrentham (the home of Helen, Annie and John, just outside Boston) and dated February 17, 1909. It is typewritten and signed by Helen in the "square-hand" characters familiar to readers of her early autobiography, *The Story of My Life*, or of Mr. Lash's book.

Much of the missive itself is apt to make the reader smile, in its youthful and headlong certainty that William Stone Booth's findings of acrostic signatures yielding the name "Francis Bacon" are "perfect, unmistakable, (and) obvious..." It may be pointed out that Miss Keller, for self-evident reasons, had limited access to potential Stratfordian arguments and objections. Yet it must be said at once that — given her extraordinary memory for printed information — Helen had almost certainly learned much of Sir George Greenwood's anti-Stratfordian classic by heart; so it is hard to say how far she might have gone in helping demolish the Stratford theory: It only she had had more encouragement. Moreover, it was not imperceptive of Helen to write, as she did to Gilder, that "The beloved poet of Avon is dissolving into a mist, and in his place are rising two stalwart figures, Francis Bacon and his brother Anthony"; for some Oxfordians, Dorothy Ogburn and Chanton Ogburn, Sr. among them, have thought it likely that Lord Oxford's "cousin" Sir Francis Bacon was concerned at least with editing the Shakespeare First Folio alongside Ben Jonson. (Both Bacons were themselves aware that the powerful Cecil family had done much to suppress talent — whether political or literary — and the Ogburns point out that Sir Francis could have had Oxford in mind when expressing his own hope that the newly crowned James I would "be good to concealed poets.")

Helen continues: "I have been astounded to find on what meagre traditions the conjectured biography of Shakespeare of Stratford rests, and on what slender grounds the most fierce hostility is felt at the suggestion of Bacon as the author of the plays, Bacon, the Titan friend of mankind, Bacon whose splendid, pure character history has at last (been) rehabilitated." It may be proper to say that the Earl of Oxford has lately undergone a similar rehabilitation.

Nevertheless, a proposal of the Bacon brothers as twin geniuses behind the mask of "Shake-speare" was bound to fail, omitting as it did to take into account the Bacons' incompatibility of careers, political leanings and dates with the authorship of the great plays and poems. Among the concluding passages of Miss Keler's letter — which states that she can arrange for Gilder to see confidential proofs of Booth's yet unpublished book in support of her arguments — are phrases conveying Helen's partial foreknowledge of the treatment she was to receive. She writes: "I realize that, like most of our poets and literary men, you belong to the 'true' faith; you worship Shakespeare of Stratford. I know that at first blush you will think that I have deviated into a windy heresy." As we have seen, Miss Keler's premonitions were to prove all too accurate.

In fairness to Gilder, we should bear in mind that he had a long-standing interest in Helen's meteoric career as author, celebrity and crusader, and he was trying, by his own lights, to protect her from the harm that Baconian activism could conceivably have done her. But every publisher to whom she mentioned the Bacon hypothesis seems to have entertained similarly protective feelings. Mr. Lesh continues:

(Upon learning of Gilder's rejection, Helen's) back was up, and she submitted the article to another magazine with a request to the editor that if he would not print it to send it on to *The North American Review*. "I suppose it is taking an unbusiness-like advantage for a woman to appeal to the chivalry of an editor. But several friends have tried to prevent me from publishing my views on this question. I am hoping that you may be the knight who will come to my aid and take my rash opinions out of the dungeon-keep of prejudice. I do not think there can be much prejudice in your office against the Baconian hypothesis. Mr. Clemens's brilliant book must have converted his publishers and their advisers to disbelief in William Shakespeare (*sic*) of Stratford."

But no magazine would publish it. Mark Twain was (the Wrentham trio's) only ally. In fact, the canny Scotsman Neilson, discussing the Bacon adventure, suggested that Teacher (Anne Sullivan Macy) and Mark Twain may have been the key to it, for both were irrational and impulsive. (John) Macy had sent Helen's article to Mark Twain. He, too, gently tried to slow Helen down. "The reader's job should be made easy, not difficult," and Helen's directions for digging out the acrostics submerged in the Shakespeare text would simply weary him. "He won't do that hunting, anyway, for he is human, and the human being is an ass." Clemens thought the Booth book suffered from the same defects as Helen's article, but he considered Greenwood's book *The Shakespeare Problem Restated*, another volume that the Wrenthamites had sent him, as "able" work. He had "emptied" some remarks about it into his autobiography "and then took a notion to slam them into *Harper's Monthly*; but that would put them off much too long; so I made a booklet of them, to be issued today." (The booklet, "Is Shakespeare Deed?", was first published and distributed in 1909 by the Mark Twain Co., and thereafter by Harper & Brothers; Twain's indication that it belongs to his "autobiography" is misleading, but he was not very careful about preserving distinctions of genre. Near the beginning of the essay, where Twain writes that "A friend has sent me a new book, from England — *The Shakespeare Problem Restated*...", it is very likely that the "friend" referred to is Helen herself.)

"A perfectly negligible book," Neilson called the small volume. . . in which Clemens suggested that we knew as little about Shakespeare as we did about Satan. But Clemens quickly realized that although he was venerated, he had not killed the king, and wrote to his friends in Wrentham suggesting that, like him, they had better quit the field:

In that booklet I courteously hinted at the long-ago well established fact that even the most gifted human being is merely an ass, and always an ass, when his forbears have furnished him an idol to worship. Reasonings cannot convert him, facts cannot influence him. I wrote the booklet for pleasure — *not* in the expectation of convincing anybody that Shakespeare did not write Shakespeare. And don't you write (with) any such expectation. Such labors are not worth the ink, and the paper, except when you do them for the pleasure of it. Shakespeare, the Stratford tradesman, will still be the divine Shakespeare to our posterity a thousand years hence... (Lash, Joseph P. *Helen and Teacher: The Story of Helen Keller and Anne Sullivan Macy* 360-362. New York: Delacourt Press/Seymour Lawrence, 1980.)

Copyrighted © 1989, 1990 by Thomas A. Gott

## EDWARD DE VERE'S HEBREW

By

Gary Goldstein

The proposition that William Shakespeare knew the Hebrew language is not improbable when one realizes that the poet Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, wrote the plays and sonnets traditionally assigned to the man from Stratford.

No play is more revealing of William Shakespeare's Hebrew than *The Merchant of Venice*, especially the names of the four Jewish characters, and in particular the name of Shylocke. For more than 400 years, the etymological origins of Shylocke, Jessica, Tuball, and Chus have engaged the attention of Shakespeare scholars throughout the world. In this essay I propose that the Hebrew sources for these four characters point toward Edward de Vere being the author of *The Merchant of Venice*.

First of all, the spelling to be adopted is Shylocke with an "e," because that is the one used with consistency in the two Quartos of 1600 and 1619, and in the First Folio of 1623.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, Jessica is spelled lessica, whose Biblical Hebrew source has been recognized as Yiscah.<sup>2</sup>

In 1871, the German philologist Karl Elze discovered that the names Shylock, Jessica, Tuball, and Chus were to be found in Genesis, chapters X and XI.<sup>3</sup> Most interesting is the Hebrew source for Shylocke. You turn to the book of Genesis in the Old Testament unable to find Shylocke... until you consult a Hebrew text.

Transliterating the proper names correctly, we read in Genesis, X, 24: Arpachsad begat Shalach, and Shelach begat Ever.<sup>4</sup>

All the Jewish characters in *The Merchant of Venice* — Shylocke, Jessica, Tuball and Chus — are found together within the narrow compass of two consecutive Bible chapters. Jessica occurs nowhere else in the Bible, and, up to Shakespeare's time at least, in no secular literature. Shylocke, Tuball, and Chus all are in Genesis X; Shylocke and Jessica together in Genesis XI. Shylocke the chief character is therefore in both chapters, and the Jewish father and daughter in the *Merchant of Venice* are in the same Bible chapter, though not as father and daughter. Finding these four names in close conjunction, the principal ones excessively rare, is more than a coincidence. The quartet as such cannot be paralleled from any known book.

According to a rule in Hebrew phonology, we find Shylocke's name in two forms: Shelach and Shalach. From a Hebrew point of view, the standard form is Shelach, with Shalach occurring as a variation. Genesis X and XI has Shalach twice, Shelach four times. In all the Greek, Latin, and vernacular versions of the Old Testament, however, we find this spelled as Seleh and Salah; moreover, often these translations omit Shalach, the variant of the Hebrew name of Shelach, thereby blinding scholars to the puns that de Vere would ring upon the "double" name of Shylocke.

Our English playwright can duly render the Hebrew consonant Shin by sh; the Hebrew vowel segol by y; the Hebrew consonant lamed by l; the Hebrew vowel patach by o (a fairly near approach to an English ear); and the Hebrew consonant chet by ck, as in the pronunciation of Moloch, stomach, Loch (or Lock). But he adds a mute "e" to avoid, one imagines, the barbarity of letting a word end in a forbidden final consonant.

I believe that the original pronunciation must have been Shylocke with the i vowel, not the diphthong (ei) or i as sounded in the modern pronunciation. The letter y was far more used in 16th Century English to represent i than is usual nowadays. We still write Cyril, Syria, Sybil, and Lydia, for example. Proper names not derived from a classical tongue also affected the y; to take only a few examples where the syllable is open we have Lyly, Wyclif, Sydenham, Wykenham, and Lymington. In the Folio text of the *Merchant* itself we have Ryalto, Solyman, Phylosopher, and Pythagoras. In fact, nothing is more common than for y to be pronounced i in open syllables. The Hebrew vowel would not be rendered correctly by ei, as in Nile, but a somewhat lengthened i, as in "bid," would be adequate. For example, in Launcelet's banter of lessica, "When I shun Scilla your father, I fall into Charlbdis, your mother" (Act III, Sc. 5, 14-15), Scilla sounds like a pun on Shylocke.

There seems to be a similar subtlety in the transcription of Yiscah. lessica has three syllables: But go we in I pray thee lessica (Act V, Sc. 1, 43). However, in one line Yiscah in two syllables would fit better (Act V, Sc. 1, 27):

Did pretty lessica (like a little shrow)



As is evident, the trisyllabic Pronunciation is a departure from the Hebrew Yiscah. The case is roughly analogous to the name of Rivkah, which becomes Rebecca in transliteration because of the dictates of Greek phonology.<sup>5</sup> The main point is that lessica is an independent transliteration, not found in any Bible.

#### ***Philological Evidence and Symbolic Names***

The Elizabethan public would take these two names as untypical and unimportant; but our playwright had a special meaning to be guessed at only by the initiated, as verse 24 in chapter 10 of Genesis concludes: "...and Shelach begat Ever." This phrase provided de Vere the opportunity of creating a series of puns on himself and his father-in-law.

The first pun represents an exact phonetic trace of his own name — E. Ver. The second provides a symbolic parallel of his legal relationship with William Cecil, Lord Burghley — his father-in-law.

The name Ever also denotes Hebrew; consequently, Shylocke is the father of the ancestor and heroes eponyms of all the Hebrews. De Vere's vanity must have been pleased by this Biblical flattery. This is supported by a symbolic parallel with lessica. Hebrew commentators from Rashi<sup>6</sup> onward tell us that Yiscah was the early name of Sarah — Abraham's wife, or the first Hebrew wife. Thus, as Shylocke is an early Ever, lessica, appropriately, is an earlier Sarah.

For the name Jessice, the symbolic is supplemented with a philological meaning that provided de Vere another opportunity to practice his art of punning. The same Rashi commentary adds that the name Yiscah may be referred to the Hebrew stem *Saceh*, meaning to *look*, "since all men looked at her because of her beauty."<sup>7</sup>

Punning on the Hebrew meaning, de Vere gave his Jessica in the Merchant the reputation of a "looker-out" because she habitually gazed into the public street. So much so, that she was commanded by her father not to "thrust your head into the publique streete to gaze on Christian fooles with varnisht faces" (Act III, Sc. 5, 32-33). However, Launcelet wisely suggests that she was to "looke out at window for all this; there will come a Christian by, Will be worth e lewes eye" (Act II, Sc. 5, 41-43).

De Vere proceeds to play upon Shylocke's name in Hebrew and English. The first pun involves the variant spelling of Shylocke in Hebrew, which is Shalach. Other than chapters ten and eleven in Genesis, Shalach is found in the Old Testament in just one place: Leviticus, XI, 17. In that verse, shalach means "cormorant." A cormorant — a bird of voracious appetite which lives on fish — was an expressive name for usurer in Elizabethan England. Thus, the same mind that chose lessica, "the looker out," knew the double meaning of the following exchange between Selerio and the cormorant Shylocke.

Salerio: Why, I am sure if he forsaite, thou wilt not teke his flesh, what's that good for?

Shylocke: To baite fish whitall. (Act III, Sc. 1, 47-49)

In other words, Shakespeare was punning on the Hebrew in English for a very select audience which knew its Bible in the original.

By employing the Hebrew word Shalach, de Vere also was punning on Shylocke's name in Hebrew. Although the name Shelach is pronounced the same as the Hebrew word for cormorant, the noun ends in a different consonant (chaph sophit instead of chet) than the pronoun. In other words, de Vere found a homonym — a word pronounced the same but with a different spelling and meaning — specially suited to his purpose, but in Hebrew.

I also propose that the symbolist connected Shalach with the next word in the dictionary: Shalach(a). That is, a *skinner* or *flayer*. In fact, the Bond of Flesh stories that antedate the Merchant of Venice frequently mention a strip of skin, instead of a pound of flesh. If these propositions are accepted, it becomes clear that the writer of the Merchant was playfully etymologizing in Hebrew as well.

For these reasons, I think it highly probable that the Jewish characters in the Merchant were collectively chosen by an expert at a single sitting, by someone who knew how to read in Hebrew, and had read carefully the Old Testament in the language in which it was originally written.

#### ***Biblical Mythology***

Edward de Vere employed his knowledge of the original Holy Tongue to convey additional covert messages to his educated Elizabethan audiences. lessica identified Shylock's merchant friends in Act III, Sc. 2, 226-227:

"When I am with him I have heard him sweer to Tuball and to Chus, his Country-men."

Chus is a direct descendent of Ham, Noah's second son, who represents the Black race in Hebrew mythology. And in 16th Century Europe, it was widely held that Spanish — England's mortal enemy —



were of Moorish and Jewish blood. They were not considered Europeene and were constantly depicted in political and religious pamphlets as Moors. Thus, in using a name such as Chus for one of the Jewish characters, de Vere connected the evil of usury with the Moorish/Jewish/Spanish races — infidels and enemies of England.

Moreover, Tubal, Chus, and Shelach are all in the same chapter in Genesis, X, and are, respectively, descendants of Noah's three sons, Japheth, Ham, and Shem, who represent in Biblical mythology the great races of man: the Indo-Europeans, the Blacks and the Semites. De Vere apparently was warning his Christian brethren that the practice of usury (only recently legalized in England for Christians) would turn them into Jews.

### ***The Puritan Correspondence***

In writing *The Merchant of Venice*, the Earl of Oxford was attacking directly the practice of usury, a volatile issue which was fiercely debated in the pulpit and Privy Council throughout England in the 16th Century. Condemned from the time of Aristotle, usury was first openly permitted in England under Henry VIII. The practice was repealed under Edward VI in 1552, when usury was declared to be "by the word of God utterly prohibited as a vice most odious and detestable." It was revived in 1571 when William Cecil was Queen Elizabeth's Secretary of State, and a limit on interest of 10 percent was established. Finally, in 1597, the date given for the final version of *The Merchant*, the government passed an Act declaring usury to be "very necessary and profitable." At this point in time, Cecil had been Treasurer and Principal Secretary of State for more than a generation.

William Cecil's person and politics resonate with correspondences in the play: first, his role as leader of the Puritan faction in England enabled usury to be praised by Parliament and practiced by English Christians. Second, it was Cecil, and not the Jews of Venice, who habitually wore a long black gaberdine cloak and who carried a long staff. Third, it was Cecil who wrote the 1563 Act of Parliament declaring Wednesdays to be an enforced "fish day" (in addition to Friday and Saturday), in order to support the development of England's merchant marine. (Thus, the Shylocke puns on cormorant users, and Shylocke's comment on baiting fish.)

Indeed, the parallels between Shylocke the Jew and the Puritans of Shakespeare's time are such that I believe Shakespeare was criticizing the English Puritans in the person of Shylocke/Cecil: declaring them, in essence, to be nothing more than Jews. This accusation was not a novel idea in Elizabethan England. Evidence of this attitude can be found throughout the many pamphlets circulating in England from the early 1570s to the 1590s, which aired publicly the disagreements between the Puritan wing of the Anglican Church and the Church establishment.

Matthew Sutcliffe, in his *Answer to a Certain Libel* (1592), accuses the Puritans and their leader, Thomas Cartwright, of usurious and other cruel financial practices: "What else should we look for at their hands, seeing racking of rents, extremity of dealing, usury and unlawful practices of gain, and Turkish and inhuman cruelty, divers of these zealators of Puritanism pass both Turks and heathen."<sup>11</sup> In *The Merchant*, we see Shylocke abused as a "stony, inhuman wretch" and compared unfavorably with "stubborn Turks and Tatars" at the opening of the trial scene (Act IV, sc. 1).

Shylocke's rigid emphasis on the law is again paralleled by that of Cartwright in his controversy with John Whitgift, leader of the Anglican Church. Against the Puritan leader, Whitgift declares, in *Defense of an Answer* (1574), that his opinions "smelleth of Judeism," and demands with indignation: "What remaineth but to say that Christ is not yet come." Similarly, the anonymous author of *A Defense of the Ecclesiastical Regiment* (1574) supports Whitgift by saying: "I see not what can be intended by this new devised discipline, but only restitution of the veil, and clogging men's consciences with such Jewish observation, from the which we are enfranchised by the Gospel."<sup>12</sup>

In a pamphlet entitled *Survey of the Pretended Discipline*, there is an interesting parallel to Shylocke's famous refusal to eat, drink, or pray with Christians (Act 1, sc. 3): "Seeing our church, our government, our ministry, our service, our sacraments, are thus and thus... therefore they (Puritans) will not pray with us, they will not communicate with us, they will not submit themselves to our church... they will have nothing to do with us."<sup>13</sup> The same characteristic is reiterated at greater length by Whitgift in his *Answer to an Admonition* (1572): "These men (Puritans) separate themselves from our congregation, and will not communicate with us neither in prayers, hearing the word, nor sacraments; they contemn and despise all those that be not of their sect, as polluted and not worthy to be saluted or kept company with; and therefore some of them, meeting their old acquaintance, being Godly preachers, have not only

refused to salute them, but spit in their faces, wishing the plague of God to light upon them."<sup>14</sup>

Finally, just as Shylocke is repeatedly called a devil, especially by Launcelot (Act II, sc. 2) and by his opponents in the trial scene (Act IV, sc. 1), so the Puritans were often called devils by their enemies. The very words of Launcelot, characterizing Shylocke as "the devil incarnate" (Act II, sc. 2), echo the anonymous anti-Martinist tract, *Martin's Month's Mind*, which speaks of the Puritan Martinists as "very devils incarnate, sent out to deceive and disturb the world."<sup>15</sup>

From the preceding, it's evident the four inseparable names in *The Merchant of Venice* were chosen for the purpose of a drama or morality tale. In the earliest parables, anecdotes, and tales, we find a bloody minded merchant who is not a Jew; and in the Italian novel, *Il Pecorone*, the most immediate source for the Merchant, there is one Jew only — who is nameless.<sup>16</sup> On the stage, however, nameless speaking characters are awkward. This is the point where name-giving becomes imperative. And for William Shakespeare, who never wasted an opportunity to address as many audiences as possible, every name is telling.

However, once we accept the hypothesis that de Vere employed Hebrew in the Merchant of Venice as yet another method of satire, the question inevitably arises: where did Edward de Vere learn Hebrew?  
**Hebrew Education in Elizabethan England**

Edward de Vere was a well educated man of the Renaissance, graduating from Cambridge University at 14 years of age (1564) with a Bachelor of Arts, and from Oxford University at 16 (1566) with a Master of Arts. He was living during a period when Hebrew was taught at universities in England and on the Continent. In addition, books of Hebrew texts were printed with parallel translations in Latin and Greek. An unusual but illustrative example of this type of publishing was the great multi-lingual Bible brought out between 1569 and 1573 by the Plantin Press of Antwerp. The Plantin Bible was printed in Latin, Greek, Chaldean, and Hebrew, with a Hebrew grammar attached.

At least as early as 1556, Hebrew was being taught at Oxford University in England. The dictionary of National Biography informs us that Richard Mulcaster (1530? - 1611) graduated from Christ Church College at Oxford in 1556 with a Master of Arts, and that, "while still in residence, he added to his classical studies an acquaintance with Hebrew and other oriental languages, which won from Hugh Broughton the commendation that he was one of the best Hebrew scholars of his age."<sup>17</sup> In 1561, Mulcaster became the first headmaster of the Merchant Taylors school, and remained in that position until 1586.

In 1566, Queen Elizabeth I attended graduation ceremonies at Oxford University, with de Vere receiving his M.A., and her royal presence generated an outpouring of Hebrew translation and poetry.

"The 2nd of September, being Monday, in the afternoon the Queen thought to have heard Disputations in Christ Church Hall, but the stage taking up the room, it could not well be: so that, keeping for the most part within her lodging, Mr. Thomas Neele, the Hebrew Professor, presented her Majesty a book of all the Prophets, translated out of the Hebrew by him;..."<sup>18</sup>

The following day, the Queen "went on foot after dinner to St. Mary's Church, to hear Disputations in natural and moral philosophy, continuing from two of the clock till six; before whose coming there were divers copies of verses, in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, set upon the doors and walls;..."<sup>19</sup>

By 1570, what may have been an elective subject became a prerequisite for graduate level studies at Cambridge and Oxford, as "the definitive Cambridge statutes of 1570 required that the M.A. be a diligent hearer of daily lectures on theology and Hebrew for seven years, while five years sufficed at Oxford..."<sup>20</sup>

Another great English poet of the period, Edmund Spenser, was educated at the Merchant Taylors school when Mulcaster was headmaster, graduating in 1569. Spenser later attended Cambridge University, graduating in 1576 with a Master of Arts, six years after the statutes on Hebrew went into effect. One can therefore assume that Spenser had received a Hebrew education.

In fact, in a letter written by Anthony Bacon to Lord Burghley, in 1581, we find documentary evidence that seems to confirm that the university statutes were being enforced. In the letter, Bacon "commends the bearer (his friend), Mr. Blanchard, for his well-grounded knowledge in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin."<sup>21</sup>

Thus, it is quite likely that Hebrew was a living language when de Vere was writing his immortal plays and poems. While we perceive them to be antique languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin were considered by the Elizabethans to be Holy Tongues because the Old and New Testaments were written in Hebrew and Greek, respectively, while Latin was the official language of the Church. Consequently, to the Elizabethans, knowledge of these tongues was a measurement of one's religious and social qualities.

These points are significant, because other than a handful of New Christians — Jews who recently had converted to Christianity — no Jews were living in England as Jews. In fact, no Jews officially had been allowed in England since their forced expulsion by Edward I in 1290. De Vere, however, besides having graduated from Oxford while a Hebrew professor was in residence, had business dealings with New Christians both in England and Italy. These contacts probably provided him with opportunities for discovering the habits and language of the Jewish people.

#### ***Ames, Spinola, Golding, and Dee***

The most prominent of the New Christian merchants in Elizabethan England was Jorge Anez, whose family had been settled in London since 1521. The name soon became Anglicized as Ames.<sup>22</sup> Israel Ames, during the 1580s, was one of the confidential stewards of Edward de Vere. In fact, Ames purchased four lands from the de Vere estates in England: Tolebury, Northtofts, Skaths, and Standsted.<sup>23</sup>

Moreover, when Edward de Vere visited Venice in 1575-6, he ran out of cash and had to borrow money under personal bond of the representative of another New Christian family — the Spinolas, who maintained offices in London, Brussels, Paris, Genoa, and Venice. Indeed, Oxford's borrowings of Jewish financiers during his Italian travels amount to 3,000 pounds. This sum, as given in the Spinola accounting, recalls the 3,000 ducats which Anthonio had of Shylocke. Upon his return to England, de Vere would purchase property of Baptista Spinola the Elder in London.<sup>24</sup>

Another important source of Hebrew for de Vere probably was his uncle and Latin tutor, Arthur Golding. Golding was a devout Puritan who translated books into English from Latin, French, and Italian. The Puritans sect, moreover, revered the Hebrew Bible and it is not improbable to suppose that Golding, as a well educated translator whose patrons included both Lord Burghley and the Earl of Leicester, was conversant with the Hebrew language. Indeed, Golding showed early interest in matters Biblical when he translated in 1571 "John Calvin's Version of the Psalms of David," which Golding dedicated to his nephew, Edward de Vere.

Hebrew also had the distinction of being a language of mysticism and magic, both of which flourished during the Elizabethan Era in England. As de Vere was an intimate of Dr. John Dee, the foremost Elizabethan astronomer, astrologer, and mystic, whose manuscripts are filled with Hebrew words and symbols, it's likely that Dr. Dee could have provided Oxford with yet another avenue for learning the Hebrew language.<sup>25</sup>

#### ***Hebrew Notes Sounded In Other Shakespeare Plays***

The Earl of Oxford utilized his knowledge of Hebrew and the Bible in the names he assigned characters in his plays; the most famous example, of course, being *The Merchant of Venice*. However, in *The Tempest*, *Love's Labor's Lost*, and *Titus Andronicus*, de Vere also put to use his proficiency in the Hebrew language, as well as in Jewish history and Biblical mythology.

In *The Tempest*, for example, Prospero addresses the sprite Ariel as "My brave spirit!" (See I, ii, 207). Interestingly enough, the literal meaning of Ariel in Hebrew is *hero*.

Lexically, Ariel translates into "Lion of God," because *ari* means lion, while *el* denotes God. For Prospero to address Ariel as his brave spirit would therefore be in keeping with the exact meaning of the word.

However, de Vere seems to attach an ironic meaning to the praise that Prospero lavishes on his sprite, since we find Ariel being addressed as a "quaint spirit" later on in the play. This is a clue to the Biblical context of the word, for Ariel is to be found in the Old Testament only in Isaiah, chapter 29, verses 1 through 7<sup>26</sup>. It is used by the prophet as another name for the City of Jerusalem, as a term of reproach for abandoning God, who is now threatening Ariel: "Thou shalt be visited of the Lord of Hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest, and the flame of devouring fire." (Here, I propose is the source for the name of the play, *The Tempest*. Indeed, the entire message of this play in its entirety in order to properly interpret the meaning of this unusual play.) In the Bible, however, Ariel is never used as an adjective denoting bravery, nor as an individual's name, but as a term of reproach by the prophet in chastising Jerusalem for its bad behavior.

In *Love's Labor's Lost*, de Vere employed Hebrew in a multilingual anagram for one of the female characters that, probably deciphered, reveals the identity of one Anne Vavasor — a woman who bore the Earl of Oxford an illegitimate son, Sir Edward Vere.

Vavasor spelled backward is "rosavav." The last syllable of this anagram, "vav," is the Hebrew consonant written as a vertical line. Combining this visual clue with the verbal clue yields us Rosaline,

the character who plays temptress to Lord Berowne in the play, the latter character often described by numerous scholars as being autobiographical in nature.

In *Titus Andronicus*, de Vere named the play's villain Aaron. Significantly, Aaron has no surname, but is referred to only as "the Moor." As previously pointed out, a Moor in de Vere's time signified the Spanish nation, the archenemy of England. Historically, Aaron also was the only brother of Moses. Equally significant, Aaron was the first Hebrew priest, or first Jewish holy man.

For the Elizabethans, whose literate population was small, and whose educated population was even smaller but well versed in the classics and the Bible, Aaron the Moor called to mind the worst of all possibilities — The symbol of their mortal enemy, Spain, and the infidel religions of Judaism and Islam (the Moors being Moslems).

This technique of tying together the Jewish and Moorish races with villainy was employed in *The Merchant* in the character of Chus. Seeing it repeated in another of the Shakespeare plays confirms de Vere's method of propaganda, or perhaps tells us that he was simply unconsciously mimicking the prevailing prejudices of the time. In either case, it's easy to see how Hebrew was used to create potent symbols, whose messages would be understood on various levels according to the education and sophistication of Oxford's private and public audiences.

Most important is the realization that Hebrew can be added to the ever growing list of languages with which Edward de Vere was fluent.

(c) Gary Goldstein 1988, 1989

(Ed. note: Footnotes as indicated by the Arabic numerals will be sent to anyone who so requests by writing to Gary Goldstein, 123-60 - 83rd Ave., Kew Gardens, NY 11415).

\*\*\*\*\*

## DATING SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS 78 TO 100

By

Peter R. Moore

This article is sequel to "The Rival Poet of Shakespeare's Sonnets," which appeared in the Fall 1989 Newsletter, and which showed that the Rival of Sonnets 78 to 86 was Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex. Four of the fourteen points made in that article assist in the problem of dating, as well as in identifying the Rival. Essex's cosmetic connections, his exaggeration of Southampton's exploits on the Azores voyage, his figurative debt to Southampton resulting from that voyage, and his subsequent illness allow the Rival Sonnets to be dated between November 1597 and January 1598. This date is no more than a working hypothesis, but it is subject to further testing. The next significant event in the life of Southampton (to whom the Sonnets were addressed) was his departure for the Continent with a two year travel warrant in February 1598, and we observe that the first sonnet after the Rival Sonnets, number 87, begins with the word "Farewell."

Southampton left for France accompanying Sir Robert Cecil on a diplomatic mission to Henri IV, after which he intended to tour Italy. Elizabeth Vernon, his mistress and Essex's first cousin, was reduced to tears by his departure. Cecil and Southampton located Henri IV at Angers, were unsuccessful in their mission, and so Cecil returned to England in April, while Southampton headed for the fleshpots of Paris. In August, the visibly pregnant Elizabeth Vernon, one of the Queen's Maids of Honour, left the Court for refuge at Essex House, and old Lord Burghley died that same month. On September 3, Cecil wrote to Southampton in Paris, saying that the Queen was aware that Southampton had secretly returned to England, married his mistress, and slipped back to France, and that he was to come back to England forthwith. Meanwhile the new Countess of Southampton was jailed in the Fleet prison. Southampton was desperately trying to recoup huge gambling losses, and so he delayed his return from Paris. He came back prior to November 8, suffered a short spell of imprisonment, and his wife bore a daughter. From April through September 1599, Southampton sought glory campaigning under Essex in Ireland.

If Sonnet 87 refers to February 1598, then we can continue thusly. Sonnets 88 to 91 tend to confirm the separation of Shakespeare and the Fair Youth, i.e., "thou didst forsake me for some fault" (Sonnet 89, line 1), "Be absent from thy walks" (89.9), and "If thou wilt leave me" (90.9). Sonnets 88 ("place my merit in the eye of scorn," 1. 2), 89, and 90 ("Then hate me when thou wilt," 1. 1) indicate a quarrel between Shakespeare and the Fair Youth, which is consistent with the fact that Southampton remained a

devoted follower of Essex despite Shakespeare's attacks on him in the Rival Poet Sonnets. Sonnet 92 begins "But do thy worst to steal thyself away," which is plausible as a reference to Southampton's furtive visit to England in August and his secret return to France. Sonnets 93 and 94, and especially 95 and 96 discuss the Fair Youth's sinfulness, but before pondering that fact we should pause at the much discussed Sonnet 94:

They that have power to hurt and will do none,  
That do not do the thing they most do show,  
Who, moving others, are themselves as stone,  
Unmoved, cold, and to temptation slow;  
They rightly do inherit heaven's graces,  
And husband nature's riches from expense;  
They are the lords and owners of their faces,  
Others but stewards of their excellence.  
The summer's flower is to the summer sweet,  
Though to itself it only live and die,  
But if that flower with base infection meet,  
The basest weed outbraves his dignity:  
For sweetest thing turn sourest by their deeds;  
Lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds.

The first eight lines (the octave) describe politic persons who achieve power, and it is impossible to avoid tying them to the most politic Englishmen of the age, Lord Burghley (whose magnificent funeral coincided with Southampton's marriage) and his son and political heir Sir Robert Cecil. These two remarkable men were crafty, cautious, farsighted, moderate in the use of power, no more unscrupulous than the age they lived in, and were dedicated to the state and to the fortunes of their family. Under the monarch, they governed England wisely from 1558 to 1612. Soon after Burghley's death, a member of his household wrote a panegyric memoir of his late master which includes the following passages: "His natural disposition was ... slow to anger, ever shunning revenge, and never doing anything in fury or choler, neither yielding to passion, but always tempering his affections ... He was ... never moved with joyful or ill news. He could better cover his griefs than help it, and whatsoever was in his mind would never appear in his countenance or speech." It would be difficult to find a closer match to Sonnet 94's octave, and Sir Robert Cecil shared his father's poker-faced nature.

Burghley, the Lord Treasurer of England, was also Master of the Court of Wards from 1561 until his death. Discussions of the harshness and corruption of many Tudor institutions commonly make allowance for the times, but the Court of Wards was a scandal in its own day. It was a moribund feudal institution, revived by Henry VII, strengthened by his descendants, and destroyed by the Civil War.\* It seized upon underage heirs, sold them to officials and courtiers, and caused their estates to be legally plundered. Burghley kept the pick of the crop, six young earls, under his own guardianship. All six, two of whom were Southampton and Essex, were intellectually gifted, each received a superb education under Burghley's guidance, and five eventually turned against Burghley or his son. Burghley spied on and attempted to dominate his former wards after they became adults, he tried to make Southampton marry his granddaughter, and he reportedly assessed a huge fine to punish Southampton's rejection of the lady (which was a lawful penalty for a ward who turned down a suitable spouse). The passing of the great Lord Burghley was a landmark in the reign of Elizabeth I, and it must have been a monumental event to his former wards; let the octave of Sonnet 94 (especially line 5) be Shakespeare's epitaph on William Cecil, Lord Burghley.

Otherwise we may note that the octave of Sonnet 94 has nothing to do with its subject, unless one strives to force a link. It is a reasonable conjecture that revelatory material (presumably identifying Burghley and Southampton) was chopped out of two sonnets, with the remnants being joined to form the present Sonnet 94.

Some unspecified sins of the Fair Youth are harped upon in Sonnets 93 to 96: "thy sweet virtue answer(s) not thy show" (93, 14); "Lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds" (94, 14); "shame... canker ... spot ...sins ...lascivious comments ...dispraise ...ill report ...vices ...blot" (95); "fault ...

---

\*Further details are found in Joel Hurstfield's *The Queen's Wards*.

wantonness ... faulte ... faults ... errors" (96). This paternalistic chiding meshes perfectly with the scandal caused by Southampton's secret marriage to a pregnant Maid of Honour, and perhaps also with his excesses in Paris. Additionally, Shakespeare's remark about "the beauty of thy budding name" (95, 3) is most appropriate to the condition of the new Countess; the name of Wriothesley was indeed budding.

The first lines of Sonnets 97 and 98 mention Shakespeare's absence from the Fair Youth, and so one might suppose that Shakespeare departed while his friend remained. However line 12 of Sonnet 97 says "thou away" and line 13 of Sonnet 98 says "you away," which indicate the contrary. Sonnet 97 relates that the friend was gone during a summer and a "teeming autumn," i.e., harvest time or early autumn, while Sonnet 98 informs us that the friend was also away during the spring. Spring, summer, and early fall were precisely the seasons of Southampton's absence from England in 1598. Shakespeare's comment about the "teeming autumn" implies a good harvest; 1594 to 1597 were years of disastrous weather and ruined crops, known as 'the great dearth.' 1598 witnessed a good harvest that must have been all the more welcome after four bad years.\*

We will close the evidence with Sonnet 100's couplet:

Give my love fame faster than Time wastes life;

So thou prevent'st his scythe and crooked knife.

Southampton sought fame at the risk of his life in Ireland in 1599.

It should be pointed out here that finding the dates of Sonnets 78 to 100 was remarkably easy and could have been done in complete ignorance of the identity of the Rival Poet. A standard method of trying to date the Sonnets starts by noting that Sonnets 1 to 17 urge the Fair Youth to wed, which can be linked to unsuccessful efforts between 1590 and 1594 to get the underage Southampton to marry, while Sonnet 107 was almost certainly penned in 1603. One then examines Sonnets 18 to 106 for apparent references to external events and tries to tie them to Southampton's recorded life from 1590/94 to 1603. Sonnets 93 to 98 show the Fair Youth in trouble for wanton and lascivious behavior, and the only known sex scandal in Southampton's life was his secret marriage to a pregnant Maid of Honour in August 1598. Had anyone linked these two facts, no matter how tentatively, then everything else would have fallen into place. One could then note the coincidence of that wedding and Lord Burghley's funeral, and the fact that Sonnet 94's octave is a perfect description of Burghley. One could realize that "thy budding name" is a plausible reference to an expecting wife. One could see the references to absence, to stealing away, and to the seasons, and tie them to Southampton's trip to France. Finally, one could note the opening reference to wars in Sonnet 88 and the closing reference to fame and danger in Sonnet 100, and connect these to Southampton's sea and land campaigns in 1597 and 1599.

The twentieth century's acknowledged dean on the subject of William Shakespeare was the late Sir Edmund Chambers. In his magisterial *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, Chambers granted that "the case for him (Southampton) as the friend of the sonnets is now very generally accepted ... I do not think it a convincing one. If it were sound, one would expect to find some hint in the sonnets of the major interests of Southampton's early life; his military ambitions, his comradeship with Essex, the romance of his marriage" (vol. I, p. 565). Sir Edmund's excellent criteria are now met.

The two hypotheses offered in these articles (Essex as the Rival and the dates of Sonnets 78 to 100) are based on research in a university library rather than in the archives. But the papers of Anthony Bacon, Lord Henry Howard, and others connected to Essex still exist, and it would be extraordinary if these theories could not be confirmed, expanded, or, for that matter, be refuted by the archives.

The next article in this series will bring the Earl of Oxford into the picture created by the first two articles, and will also consider the words of some of the later sonnets.

---

\*The sufficiency of the 1598 harvest is indicated by Y.S. Brenner on pp. 281-2, "The Inflation of Prices in England, 1551-1650," *The Economic History Review*, December 1962, and by Peter Ramsey on p. 116, *Tudor Economic Problems*, 1963.

\*\*\*\*\*



*"For If the Queen Like Not the Comedy"*

By  
Tom Goff

(In the interests of greater readability and the avoidance of extensive and fatiguing annotations, Tom Goff decided to omit all but the most vital specific citations from the present article. Readers wishing to consult the original are asked to apply to the Editor, or to the writer himself.)

While giving us the few available facts of an imperfectly documented episode (the slaying of Sir William Cecil's "under cook") in the boyhood of Edward de Vere, seventeenth Earl of Oxford, Cheriton Ogburn, in his *The Mysterious William Shakespeare* (1984), writes that Lord Oxford's life comes down to us like a scattering of still-shots snipped from a reel of film, like a series of "flashlight photographs taken in the darkness." Accordingly, it is hard to demonstrate that the Earl wrote most or all of the "Shakespeare" plays; the task requires careful sifting of every play in the canon with one eye on the biographies of William Shakespeare (1564-1616) and Lord Oxford (1550-1604), the two main contenders for "Shakespeare's" honors. Nevertheless, many vivid scenes in the plays, such as Hamlet's "Mouse-trap" sequence in Act Three, do yield striking, defensible connections with incidents in Oxford's life, while "signifying nothing" in relation to Shakespeare's.

The "Mouse-trap" scene — perhaps the most famous turn of plot in all Shakespeare — finds Hamlet probing the "conscience" of evil King Claudius by presenting a play titled "The Murder of Gonzago"; and Shakespeare may have taken incident of Queen Elizabeth's early years on the throne, during her Cambridgeshire progress of 1564. Yet though the echo of the event seems to ring clearly in *Hamlet*, I have seen only two works by orthodox Shakespearean commentators calling attention to the parallel. More remarkable still, neither of the two writers (G. K. Hunter, Roland Mushat Frye) seems willing, as we shall see below, to draw logical conclusions about the playwright's identity from the date of the incident, on or about August 10, 1564; when Edward de Vere was accompanying the Queen on her progress, while William Shakespeare, then only a few months old, was presumably slumbering in an infant cradle in his native Warwickshire.

We know that Edward de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, then fourteen, followed the thirty-year-old Elizabeth on her Cambridge tour of early August 1564, since he is listed among the seventeen eminent noblemen on whom degrees were then conferred. Her Majesty was careful to be at her very best throughout the long visits and ceremonies, valuing learning as she did; and there can be "little doubt," writes scholar B.M. Ward, "that she undertook (the progress) with the definite objects of encouraging the University, and popularizing a university education among her courtiers." Oxford, too, surely approved the Queen's wish to elevate court standards of learning and decorum, as he was to demonstrate by sponsoring and prefacing translations of Cardan and Castiglione while still barely past his majority. If the spirits of either the monarch or her ardent young courtier flagged from the demands of a royal progress, there was still much to rally their energies as well: first a troupe of select student actors, then a company from King's College, performed for the sovereign and her assembled court for three consecutive nights in Cambridge's beautiful King's College Chapel.

Because of the queen's own fondness for the theater (it was, writes Elizabeth's modern biographer Neville Williams, her "active [political and financial] support [that] saved the drama [from the Puritans]"), Edward de Vere, too, was able to view here the Latin *Aulularia* of Plautus; and Nicholas Udall's English *Ezechias*; we may only speculate about the future consequences for world literature, though it is tantalizing to assess these fragmentary performance histories in the light of Shakespeare's knowledge of Plautus and his thorough schooling in the plays of his own time. Also on view was the *Dido and Aeneas* of a contemporary Cambridge man, rendered in more or less Virgilian Latin. (It is, oddly enough, "Aeneas' tale to Dido" that Hamlet remembers in Act Two, Scene Two when prompting the First Player to recite the "Hecuba" speech; while Hamlet, upon seeing the Player moved to tears by his own recitation, is in turn inspired to give "The Murder of Gonzago.")

The boy Earl of Oxford, then, saw these plays enacted at Cambridge, and possibly he had a glimpse of the rehearsals, too; for university Vice-Chancellor Roger Kelke was charged with directing the plays and selecting the student actors, but the Chancellor himself — none other than Oxford's guardian Sir William Cecil — was surely consulted throughout. Another important play reached rehearsal, though possibly neither the select players nor King's company itself had prepared the piece: *The Ajax Flagelliter*, actually a Latin translation from the *Ajax* of Sophocles, was scheduled for Her Majesty's entertainment.



Again we may note that Shakaspeare studied the Greek *Ajax* at some point in his career, according to scholar J. Churton Collins. But whether the young Edward de Vere was on hand to see *Ajax Flagelliter* prepared or not, on this particular occasion the performance was cancelled when Elizabeth altered her plans; and her change of schedule brings us to the next part of the story.

Gracious and good-natured though the queen was throughout much of the Cambridge progress (as virtually all of the contemporary reporters agree in stating), her temper and those of her retinue were bound to be strained at times on the journey: for a royal progress — described by historian Carolly Erickson as almost a secular pilgrimage in which the saint, not the worshipper did the traveling and the shrine was wherever she happened to be — was invariably crowded, slow, hard on one's purse, apparel and disposition. The boy who was to become "Shakespeare" may have felt as relieved as any, for all his love of the university environment, when the queen turned prematurely for home.

Elizabeth had to curtail the trip, pleading the obligation of a dinner visit (upon which all the court must attend) to the Bishop of Ely's Stanton residence; then a stay for at least the next night at Sir Henry Cromwell's estate of Hinchinbrooke. The disappointed colleges and students who had lavishly prepared still further royal entertainments were informed that Her Majesty was not to be overtaxed by attending more plays so late at night; these, in addition to the learned disputations, sermons, and other academic exercises, all of which she seems to have enjoyed greatly.

For there were deep-seated fears behind the apparent serene regret of the royal leave-taking, as Oxford and the other courtiers are sure to have known. To the normal risks and tensions of any regal progress were added specific worries for Elizabeth's health: she had survived a dangerous attack of smallpox in late 1562, her astrologers had predicted an early death for her from the start of the reign, and Mary Stuart was already a serious rival for the throne; worse yet, Elizabeth had made no apparent decision about her successor. Small wonder that it "was not unknown," says Erickson, "for Elizabeth to change her route abruptly on hearing rumors of local contagion." The *State Papers Spanish* tell us she responded to such fears now in just this way; for though rumors were often based on misinformation, Elizabeth was taking no needless chances. Once departed from the Elyan bishop's estate, she would now have sent the harbingers ahead to inform Sir Henry Cromwell of her imminent arrival.

Oxford like his liege lady would probably have found the "large and fruitful nunnery" of Hinchinbrooke a pleasing sight. Lady Antonia Fraser, expert on the Cromwells, informs us that the nunnery was granted to the Cromwell family by Henry VIII upon the dissolution of the Catholic monasteries. Hinchinbrooke offered a magnificent central house "partly adapted from the old nunnery, partly re-created in striking red brick diapered in black," and its stained-glass windows were emblazoned in heraldic emblems proclaiming the Cromwells' Welsh origins (no doubt a recommendation to the Welsh-descended Sir William Cecil). Since the brook at Hinchin flowed smoothly through the property, it probably supplied a family brewery equipped to furnish the kind of ale ("light and tart," notes Erickson) about which Elizabeth was most particular, even when on progress. Hinchinbrooke's "flat but fertile" environs, situated virtually at the gateway of the great Fenlands, provided ample space for hunting and hawking, both relished by the queen and her future playwright, as well as easy access to London by road or waterway.

Yet for all its amenities, Hinchinbrooke was to witness a disturbing incident; a characteristic display of Elizabeth's anger when provoked, which — if her eager young follower had yet come fully into *his* own character — would have been recorded and stored for later use, considerably yet recognizably refashioned as *Hamlet's* "Mouse-trap." Let us detain the reader no longer, but proceed to the only known account of the event, given by Spanish Ambassador to England Guzman de Silva in a dispatch to Margaret of Parma (half-sister to Philip II of Spain):

When the Queen was at Cambridge they represented comedies and held scientific disputations, and an argument on religion...The Queen made a speech praising the acts and exercises, and they wished to give her another representation which she refused, in order to be no longer delayed. Those who were so anxious for her to hear it, followed her to her first stopping-place, and so importuned her that at last she consented (*Calendar of State Papers Spanish 1558-67* at 375).

Guzman was writing from London at several days' distance; and Mary Susan Steele reports F.S. Boas's belief that the importunate players were not the Cambridge-approved students who had rehearsed the cancelled *Ajax Flagelliter*. Guzman probably thought they were of that company, Boas

suggests; but they may have been "younger scholars" following Elizabeth to Hinchinbrooke without authorization. Since Elizabeth — rarely one to refuse a reasonable petition from a subject — evidently decided to let the boys proceed with the play, sight unseen, let us return to Guzman's account:

The actors came in dressed as some of the imprisoned (Catholic) Bishops (now held in confinement by Elizabeth but previously in favor during "Bloody Mary's" reign). First came the Bishop of London ("Edmund Bonner") carrying a lamb in his hands as if he were eating it as he walked along, and then others with different devices, one being in the figure of a dog with the Host in his mouth. They write that the Queen was so angry that she at once entered her chamber using strong language, and the men who held the torches, it being night, left them in the dark, and so ended the thoughtless and scandalous representation. — London, 19th August 1564.

Elizabeth was known for her volatile temper; but she seldom let fly without provocation. Yet our knowledge of the accumulating fears preying upon her suggests that by the time of her arrival at Hinchinbrooke, she could well have felt close to boiling over. There should normally have been little to upset her in the students' manner of performance: anti-Catholic mummeries were shown fairly frequently at court, and "one Epiphany play," Erickson tells us, "featured crows in cardinals' habits, asses dressed as bishops and wolves representing abbots." Guzman does not say clearly whether the Hinchinbrooke actors were costumed in such half-human, half-animal attire; probably not, though possibly his use of the term "device" indicates that the boys carried placards like a nobleman's tournament shield with its *impresa*. More probable still, the offensive "device" of the dog with the Host in its mouth was borne in on a tray like a roast suckling pig with an apple in its jaws.

The slender evidence indicates that the play's matter as much as its manner provoked the queen; for the skit contained at least three highly offensive elements — no mean accomplishment for a troupe whose play was evidently stopped almost at the beginning! First, Protestant extremists were even now pressuring Elizabeth to take sterner action against the recusant Catholic bishops, especially against the hated but securely incarcerated Bonner; such ruthlessness, however, was yet foreign to the still young queen's nature. Second, Elizabeth was moving slowly towards religious reformation, and she winked at private Catholicism as long as public observances were firmly Anglican. But she was often criticized for banning the adoration of the Host of her chapel royal, and here — whatever their motives — were impudent students airing the controversy over the Host in the most indiscreet manner imaginable, before scandalized courtiers of many different private persuasions. The sacramental Host still had great symbolic importance to Elizabeth in her capacity as head of the Church, and here a foolish boy had stuffed it into the mouth of a dog! Third, and most unforgivable, was the players' insult to her late half-sister, Queen Mary.

Elizabeth favored policies directly opposing those of "Bloody Mary" (Protestantism instead of Catholicism, tolerance rather than Inquisition and *auto-da-fe*, dynastic independence instead of subjection to Spain as in Philip and Mary's regime); yet though she had hated Henry VIII's other daughter by Catherine of Aragon, Elizabeth felt the kind of sibling hatred which permits none but the offended sister to speak ill of her rival.

And what of the fourteen-year-old Earl watching the queen? Much as he liked plays and players, he would have had to file out of the hall behind Her Majesty and the torchbearers as she strode angrily toward her apartment, still swearing. Just three years before, Oxford would have helped his noble father the 16th Earl (soon to die suddenly) entertain the queen at Castle Hedingham; but had the boy ever seen her so angry before? "They write," says Guzman, "that the Queen was so angry..." It only we had "their" words, whoever "they" may have been, we could perhaps have had some of the monarch's own remarks — dangerous though these would have been to set down in ink. The queen's wrath at the players would have been a terrifying inspiration to Oxford, for whom Tudor dynastic history would have been as familiar as nursery rhymes.

The almost fratricidal competition between the two sisters (and Mary was at least once tempted to execute Elizabeth) would have been remembered by the adult "Shakespeare" when depicting, in *Hamlet*, the murder of a king by an interloping brother. Strangely, too, the marriage of Claudius and Gertrude, incestuous beyond legal doubt, was to reflect the incestuous (but state-approved) nature of Henry VIII's own marriage to Catherine, the wife of his deceased brother Arthur.

That, at least, is how things may have arranged themselves in Oxford's mind. The Hinchinbrooke

affair may have prompted Oxford to break radically with *Hamlet's* fictional sources, in making the poisoning of Hamlet's father a *secret* murder, one requiring Claudius's "occulted guilt" to "itself unkenneled in one [player's] speech" (*Hamlet* 3.2.80-81). Seeing the queen rise, thus revealing her disquiet at an affront to her late sister, could have let the boy Earl to long reflections on "conscience" — that of a king or queen above all.

Nor would the supporting cast have disappointed. If the stage dispositions at Hinchinbrooke were like those at Cambridge a few days earlier, Oxford saw the queen, "aloft," a contemporary says, "[in] a place of greater honor, covered with tapestry interwoven with gold...seen by all the spectators..."; and in secondary roles were "the Lord Chamberlain [the Earl of Sussex] and Mr. Secretary [Cecil, who] came in, bringing a multitude of the guard with them, having every man in his hand a torch-staff, for the lights of the play...and would not suffer any to stand upon the stage..." *Hamlet* the Elder, notes Charlton Ogburn, may have been Oxford's much later fusion of his father and Sussex; while Sir William Cecil, later Lord Burghley, was the original of Polonius. Considering how active he was in the proceedings, we may ask: upon seeing the queen rise to her feet, did Cecil cry out, "Give o'er the play" (*Hamlet* 3.2.262)?

Also present at the improvised theater was the prototype for Claudius, Lord Robert Dudley (soon to be made Earl of Leicester).. Usurper of Oxford's own lands — though a trustee and professed friend to Oxford's father — widely thought to have murdered his own wife Amy to become available to Elizabeth four years before, Dudley was a reputed poisoner of enemies, including Sussex who upon dying in 1583 was believed to be Leicester's latest victim. Since the whisper went that Elizabeth had shed mere crocodile tears over Lady Dudley's death, we may surmise that young Oxford had abundant raw material to mull over.

To all these emotion-laden possibilities, the next few years would add still more: it may be that Oxford's Italian trip would soon provide detailed notes on a very real "Murder of Gonzago" at the court of Urbino; while the primal source material for *Hamlet* was brought out in Belleforest's French by 1570. And all this matter was so much kindling, awaiting only Oxford's genius to ignite the mass into flame.

But is this conjecture accurate? Or is it all merely the willful imagining of a fanatical Oxfordian? Not if we choose to heed the divinations of an equally convinced Stratfordian, Roland Mushat Frye (one of the two orthodox commentators alluded to above). Professor Frye writes of *Hamlet's* play scene as follows:

How the actor of Claudius in [the original *Hamlet*] responded to the Mousetrap we do not know, but...it is possible that he saw the dumb show [Act Three, Scene Two, stage direction] miming his crime and that he was still able to contain himself — thereby increasing the suspense as to whether he was guiltless of regicide. But the re-enactment of the same scene in the playlet itself, accompanied by Hamlet's running commentary [Scene Two, 1. 144-259], broke down his reserve...he starts to his feet, cries "Give me some light! Away!" and rushes from the stage...his response tells Hamlet and Horatio what they need to know. But [his reaction] would not necessarily seem excessive to the court on stage, because he merely behaved as a monarch would be expected to do when offended by a play. Thus on one occasion when Queen Elizabeth was infuriated by a performance before her...

And Frye repeats Ambassador Guzman's story, mentioning particularly the Queen's taking the torchbearers with her. [Frye, Roland Mushat. *The Renaissance Hamlet: Issues and Responses in 1600*, at 134. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1984].

Frye is perfectly accurate when gauging the likelihood that Claudius, like Elizabeth (though from his Act Three soliloquy we imagine him to have stared, shaken and trembling with guilt at "The Murder of Gonzago"), actually presented an angry front when shown the stage rendition of his own evil deed. Thus Guildenstern is to tell Hamlet that "The King.../Is in his retirement marvellous distempered...with choler" (3.2.291-295); and Gertrude says, "Hamlet, thou hast thy father much offended" (3.4.8). But Frye, perhaps thinking Elizabeth's retirement at Hinchinbrooke merely typical of royal playgoing etiquette, draws no conclusion about the author's identity from the year of that event.

Somewhat more perceptive — though still muddled owing to Stratfordian preconceptions — are the thoughts of scholar G.K. Hunter, modern biographer of John Lyly. Hunter notes that the troupe of unauthorized Cambridge players meant to satirize "Roman practices in religion," and goes on to quote Guzman's report of the performance. Remarking the torchbearers' withdrawal in the wake of an angry Elizabeth, Hunter then says, "One is driven to wonder if any memory of the Hinchinbrooke exit informed Claudius' angry exit from *Hamlet's* *Mousetrap*..." Hunter then cites the following lines:

Oph. The king rises...  
 Pol. Give o'er the play.  
 King. Give me some light. Away!  
 Pol. Lights, lights, lights! [3.2.259-264]

He concludes, cautiously: "At any rate it is clear that provocation considerably less than Claudius was given would cause Elizabeth to disrupt the play and dishonor the playwright." [Hunter, G.K. *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier*, 148-149. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962.] But consider what Hunter has just written: "One is *driven* to wonder [emphasis added]..." Driven, it would seem, to ponder whether Elizabeth's hasty exit, far from being a commonplace of court theatergoing, was a particular and almost unique event remembered specifically in *Hamlet*. If so — given that our only record of the occurrence is Guzman's, culled from the Spanish archives of Simancas, and that further accounts in courtiers' letters or original English archives are just what we should *not* expect to find — why was Hunter not "driven" to infer from the date of the event (again, on or about August 10, 1564) that *Shakspera* cannot have remembered the queen's displeasure at the comedy; but the *actual* playwright, it would seem, must have done so?

Whether or not we can fathom Hunter's state of mind, it remains to try and answer the previous question: was Elizabeth's Hinchbrooke departure a singular instance? After such a scene, one thinks, plays for her diversion are sure to have been more carefully screened; and in fact, a reading of Mary Susan Steele's still authoritative *Plays and Mesques at Court During the Reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles* (Cornell University Press, 1926) tends to confirm this impression.

In the early years of Elizabeth's reign, while standards of etiquette were being evolved to handle the needs of an apparently frail young queen who was not expected to live long (at least in the unmarried state), "she had plays performed," notes Carroll Erickson. "These might or might not find favor; one group of players that appeared before her in 1559 'acted so disgraceful, that they were commanded to leave off.'" (This appears to be the occasion cited by Steele and witnessed by Henry Machyn in the pages of his *Diary* on December 31, 1559.) Yet, if Steele's work is still a sound guide, only this performance and that presented at Hinchbrooke — *on the record* — roused the monarch to termination of a play or dismissal of an acting company, though we do have indications of ordinary boredom or exasperation with other plays and players.

The next question is: what happened to render the queen's playgoing experiences — after August 1564 — apparently enjoyable, or at least consistently harmonious? And the answer is that those about the sovereign took steps to see that censoring was done well before Elizabeth was to attend. (This makes all the more remarkable — as Charlton Ogburn has indicated — the aged Elizabeth's disclosure to William Lambarde that "I am [the original of Shakespeare's] Richard II, know ye not that?") By 1571-72, says Steele, we find "One of the best descriptions to be had from the Revels Accounts of the activities of the office...":

All which vi, plays being chosen out of many and found to be the best that then were to be had, the same also being often perused and necessarily corrected and amended...[spelling modernized]

By then, in other words, Her Majesty's practices of censorship and suppression were fully operant. And in the later years of the reign, measures were stern enough to persuade Fulke Greville, for one, that he should destroy his own *Anthony and Cleopatra*, simply because of its coincidental resemblance to the Essex affair. The point is that perhaps important lessons in audition procedure were learned from the Hinchbrooke debacle and, one imagines, the relatively few episodes like it. At any rate, Professor Erickson draws our attention to a 1579 sermon in which the officiating cleric unwisely chose to remind his sovereign of her late half-sister Mary. What untold harm...had been done when Mary chose the Catholic Spaniard Philip for her husband...with hundreds of martyrs burned at the stake and thousands more forced into exile...He warned to his subject...no doubt reawakening in Elizabeth all her old hatred and resentment of her sister. She was furious that he should touch her sore spot...

Crackling with suppressed anger, Elizabeth did not wait for the sermon to end but rose and left the chapel...[The preacher] was still speaking when she and her crowd of attendants swept out, and observers turned to one another to remark that such an abrupt royal departure had never been seen before.

Once again — that peculiar sensitivity over the years of exile and ostracism at the command of her

sister: paralleled in Claudius's unease at the near disclosure of his fratricidal crime! How often had Elizabeth wished for the power to do what the Danish interloper was able to do in *Hamlet*? As for the gossiping onlookers, were they discussing the queen's behavior only with respect to church attendance, or was it that no one there remembered Hinchinbrooke? In any case, we may once again imagine Oxford, the impressionable fourteen-year-old of 1564: striving to find a place at court amidst a throng of politicians and "gilded butterflies," recently bereft of a much-loved father and made to witness the remarriage of his mother, possibly with indecent haste. His education — an enviable one — had been trusted unreservedly to Cecil, the man most active in subjugating him to royal wardship and wresting away his fortune. In short, Oxford's was just the pair of eyes to profit from a harsh revelation of the ills that royalty is heir to. We can see the future outlines of *Hamlet*'s most stirring scene in the embryonic shape of the Hinchinbrooke scandal, just as Ulysses (*Troilus and Cressida* 1.3.44-47) was to aver that

...in such indexes, although small pricks  
 To their subsequent volumes, there is seen  
 The baby figure of the giant mass  
 Of things to come at large.

Copyrighted© 1989, 1990 by Thomas A. Goff

\*\*\*\*\*

"*Social Snobbery is an unspoken shibboleth among the anti-Stretfordians.*"

(Harvard Professors Gwynne Evans and Harry Levin)

"...(Anthony Trollope) gave us, to the best of his ability, a faithful picture of the daily life of the upper and middle classes. If any contemptuously exclaim here, 'Aha! The upper and middle classes! Why did not that snob give us the daily life of the slum and gutter, on which all society rests today?' The answer is simple and convincing. He, as an honest realist, only told what he knew; and being a middle class person, he did not and could not know the daily life of the slum and gutter." (Quoted in *Bernard Shaw*, Vol. I, by Michael Holyroyd, Random House, 1988)\*

\* Contributed by Vera Ogburn.

\*\*\*\*\*

"I ... would entreat thy company

*"I ... would entreat thy company  
To see the wonders of the world abroad"*

Isn't it time for a two-week tour of Oxford country!

The tour will take place in Spring 1991, specific dates to be given later. 40 persons must sign up to go, as fewer than 40 would make the trip too expensive. The trip will cost between \$2,000.00 and \$2,300.00 per person. If enough people sign up for this two-week tour, we will engage the services of WITTE TRAVEL CO. of Grand Rapids, a firm which has been taking special interest groups to Europe for the last 20 years.

The idea of this tour came to some of us as a result of the annual Oct. meeting in New Orleans. It seemed to us there was an unusual degree of congeniality, enthusiasm, exchange of ideas and interest in the papers that were read. In short, the two day meeting was great fun. So, we thought, why not extend the pleasure in a two-week tour.

Places to visit that have already been suggested:

Westminster Abbey  
The Tower of London  
Castle Hedingham  
Windsor Castle  
The Stationer's Co.

Hampton Court Place  
The Inns of Court  
Bosworth Field  
Hatfield House  
Site of Wivanhoe

Burghley House  
Billesley Hall  
Foundations of Rose & Globe  
Theaters

If you are interested please contact Edith Duffy by May 30, 1990 at 2732 Dogwood Rd., Durham, NC 27705

\*\*\*\*\*

#### JOIN SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY AND RECEIVE QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

The purpose of the Shakespeare Oxford Society is to document and establish Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford (1550-1604) as the universally recognized author of the works of William Shakespeare. Each Newsletter carries articles which impart a wide range of corroborating information and commentary.

Student: \$10.00

Annual Dues Regular: \$25.00

Sustaining \$50.00 or more

1. Dues and requests for membership information to:  
Victor Crichton  
207 W. 106th St., Apt. 10-D  
New York, NY 10025
2. Submit materials for publication in the Newsletter to:  
Morse Johnson, Editor  
Suite #819, 105 West 4th St.  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

#### NOTA BENE:

The Shakespeare Oxford Society was founded and incorporated in 1957 in the State of New York and is chartered under the membership corporation law of that state as a non-profit educational organization. Dues, grants and contributions are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law. The Shakespeare Oxford Society IRS number is: 13,6105314. The New York Tax number is: 07182."



Morse Johnson, Editor  
105 West 4th Street, Suite #819, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

To the most Noble and Twin-like paire,  
*of truly Honourable and compleat perfection, Sir PHILIP  
HERBERT, Knight of the Bath to our dread Soueraigne  
King IAMES, at his Royall Coronation; Lord Baron of  
Sberland, Earle of Montgomery, and Companion in the  
vnparalleld and famous Fellowship, of the  
Order of the Garter.*

*As also, To the truly vertuous and Noble Countesse his Wife,  
the Lady Susan, Daughter to the right Honourable Edward Vere, Earle of Oxen-  
ford, Viscount Bulbec, Lord Sandford and of Badlesmere:  
and Lord High Chamberlaine of  
England, &c.*

Dear Mr. Ogburn:

March 31, 1990

...It was the inspiration of your example on the PBS documentary on the authorship controversy which spurred me to return to graduate school to study Elizabethan literature specializing in the authorship controversy...

Before I move on to other things I'd like to mention the enclosure\* which I provided under this cover. As you can see, it is a photocopy of a 1619 publication by Jaggard, dedicated to Philip Herbert, King James, and Susan Herbert nee Vere, with a long list of EO's titles, ending in the contextually provocative "&". I was astonished to discover this book at a book auction where I am periodically employed as a runner (an avocation which perfectly matches my intellectual and antiquarian interests), and purchased it for \$90. Perusing your own book, which I also located serendipitously at the auction some weeks ago, just in time for Christmas (it was, I confess, less expensive), I can find no mention of the politics of Jaggard's relations with Susan Vere prior to the publication of the Folio.\*\* This set me wondering if anyone has analyzed this question, and how one would go about doing it if no one has. In my opinion the present volume hardly constitutes a "smoking gun". Still, if you notice Jaggard's (though one may wonder if he is indeed the writer) metaphor of the garden goes beyond the invitation for the Herberts to stroll and pluck from it, but adjures them to "bestow when and where you list." Though subtle this is indeed provocative within the context. So, my first question is: what about all this stuff?

...I'm also interested in any general words of wisdom you might have for a young man in my position, trying to post a secure position on the academic playing field from which to sharpen the whetstone of my Oxfordian wit on the follies of the Stratfordian taith without jeopardizing my livelihood.

Very sincerely yours,

Roger Stritmatter, PhD Student in comparative literature,  
UMass Amherst

\*The above reproduction is only the core part of the enclosures sent to Charlton Ogburn.

\*\* The First Folio (1623) was published by Jaggard and dedicated to "the Most Noble and Incomparable Pair of Brethren, William, Earle of Pembroke, & Lord Chamberlain to the King's most Excellent Majesty, and Philip [Herbert], Earle of Montgomery, & Gentlemen of his Majesty's Bed-Chamber. Both Knights of the most Noble Order of the Garter, and our singular good Lords."



COULD SHAKSPER HAVE KNOWN OF  
"LANTERNES DES MORTS"?

By  
Linda B. McLatchie

I came across an interesting article in the March/April 1990 issue of *Archaeology*. The piece, entitled "Tale of a Churchyard Sleuth," was written by Michael Olmert, who teaches Shakespeare at the University of Maryland. While sightseeing in France, he unintentionally came across the meaning of a word that appears in Act V, scene iii, lines 83-84 of *Romeo and Juliet*. These lines are spoken by Romeo in the churchyard cemetery after he has killed Paris:

"I'll bury thee in a triumphant grave.

A grave? Oh no, a lantern, slaughtered youth."

Traditionally, Shakespearean scholars have defined "lantern" as a window-turret or cupola atop a building. But why would Romeo, who makes this speech in a cemetery, wish to commemorate Paris by burying him in a window-turret? It doesn't make much sense in terms of the setting of the scene or the context of the lines.

While visiting the churchyard of a small hamlet near Poitiers, Olmert noticed an obelisk-shaped, 35-foot-high tower in the cemetery. According to a guide book, the structure was called a *lanterne des morts*, a lantern of the dead. Says Olmert: "Then it occurred to me, a *lanterne des morts* is like a bell tower, except that it's silent. It illumines the way from church to final resting place [presumably by placing a light of some sort in the opening at the top of the structure]. Funerals took place at night."

Further quoting Olmert: "Romanesque lanterns were common enough to have been known by Shakespeare and his contemporaries. (They were not, apparently, constructed in England.) In 1970, roughly a hundred lanterns were still standing in France, Germany, and Austria, and some few remain in Switzerland, Eastern Europe, and Italy--yes, the land of *Romeo and Juliet*. Such towers would still have been the most imposing monuments in any Renaissance cemetery."

Olmert states parenthetically that these *lanternes des morts* were not built in England; and yet he assumes that they would have been known to Shakespeare--but which Shakespeare? How would Shaksper, a provincial Warwickshire man (I refrain from using the word "hick") who never, as far as we know, traveled outside England, have known about this peculiarly continental architectural form? I doubt that *lanternes des morts* were a hot item of conversation in either a London pub or the backwaters of Stratford. Oxford, on the other hand, traveled through Italy and France, and could have seen one or more of these imposing structures during his sightseeing.

As with so many other riddles in the Shakespearean canon, it's easy to explain the knowledge of *lanternes des morts* if we take Oxford as the author; it's quite difficult to explain if we take Shaksper as the author. Occam's razor, a guiding principle of science, states that the hypothesis that is simplest and accounts for the most facts is most likely to be the correct hypothesis.

Although never mentioning the authorship question in his article, Olmert closes with a quote that Oxfordians will find dripping in irony: "It's not what you don't know that hurts. It's what you know that ain't so!" Ain't that the truth!

\*\*\*\*\*

THE SYMBOLISM OF IAGO'S NAME

By  
Peter R. Moore

Various scholars, such as Murray Levith in his *What's in Shakespeare's Names*, have puzzled over the reason for giving the name Iago to Othello's nemesis. They note the fact that Santiago (Saint James) was the patron of England's archenemy, Spain, thus making Iago an appropriate villain for the Elizabethan stage; they discourse on the evil sounds of i-a-g-o; they translate the name into French (Jaques) and note that that name reminds of the English 'jakes' (latrine), which leads to jokes about privies; and they miss the point entirely.

As Saint George of England is the Dragon Slayer, so Santiago of Spain is surnamed Matamoros, the

Slayer of Moors. During the Spanish Reconquest, Santiago Matamoros was the spiritual leader of the Spanish soldiers; sometimes materializing to head the attack in person (or so legend has it). The device displayed on his shield is the severed head of a moor. It is as the symbol of unrelenting enmity toward moors that Iago is the appropriate name for the destroyer of Othello, the Moor of Venice.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### HAMLET'S "TRUE-PENNY": A NEW COINED WORD FOR OXFORD'S FATHER

By  
Stephanie Caruana

"Art thou there true-penny?" says Hamlet to the familiar ghost of his father. A chance discovery shed unexpected light on this word. It is well known that Oxford's grandmother on his father's side was Elizabeth Trussell. In *This Star of England* Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn, Sr. pointed out that "Trussell" means "trestle," or "candle-holder," and the wonderful pun in *Romeo and Juliet*:

Romeo:...I am proverb'd with a grandsire phrase:

I'll be a candleholder, and look on.

I chanced to look up the word "Trussell" in the OED and found an unexpected additional meaning: the upper iron, or mold, used in striking a coin. A "trussell" is a penny-mold. Oxford's father, John deVere, was the product of a mating between a Vere ("true") and a Trussell (penny-mold). He was obviously a "Vere-Trussell" or a "true-penny!"

This mighty pun indicates that Oxford was referring to himself as Hamlet, and to his own father as Hamlet's father's ghost. The first occurrence listed for "true-penny" in the O.E.D. is in 1589 in one of the Martin Marprelate pamphlets. The line from Hamlet is the third occurrence cited and dated 1602. I think the evidence supports a pre-1589 dating for *Hamlet* and the original "coinage" of Hamlet's "true penny" as referring specifically to Edward DeVere's father.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### BEOWULF, HAMLET, AND EDWARD DeVERE

By  
Ignoto

While much has been justifiably made of the telling coincidence between the Ovidian qualities of the works of 'Shake-speare' and Oxford's years of tutelage with Arthur Golding during the same years when the latter's translation of *Metamorphoses* appeared in print (1565-67), another tutorial connection between Oxford and a literary text carries equally remarkable implications.

In 1563 Laurence Nowell entered the household of William Cecil for the primary purpose of tutoring the thirteen-year old Earl (see: Marckwardt, A.H., ed. *Laurence Nowell's Vocabularium Saxonicum*, Univ. Michigan Press, 1952, pp. 3-5). An accomplished scholar of Old English, Nowell later compiled an Anglo-Saxon dictionary and while with Cecil drew up a handy map of England that no doubt Polonius would have made sure Laertes memorized (Marckwardt p. 5). As Kevin Kiernan judges (following others, e.g. Kemp Malone, ed. *The Nowell Codex*, Rosenkilde and Bagner, 1963) it was during that year, 1563, that Nowell most likely came into possession of a collection of manuscripts in the Old English hand, for on one of the manuscripts — the most famous — is found Nowell's name and the date 1563 (*Beowulf and the Beowulf Manuscript*, Rutgers Univ. Press 1981 p. 162 n). From Nowell the collection of manuscripts passed to Robert Cotton, the great antiquarian, eventually to be 'discovered' early in the 18th century by Humphrey Wanley, librarian for the fledgling library of the British Museum. Catalogued in the British Museum as *Ms. Cotton Vitellius A. XV*, because of its site under the Roman emperor Vitellius's bust, the part of the collection that bears Nowell's name and the 1563 date is better known to posterity by the more popular title, *Beowulf*. This manuscript of 3182 lines of Old English poetry (probably composed orally, then sometime later written down on vellum, apparently in the 11th century) — the *only* copy of the poem ever known to exist (and irksomely damaged by fire in 1731) — this manuscript of *Beowulf* was, again, in the hands of Laurence Nowell precisely when he was tutoring Oxford. But what was *Beowulf* to

'Shake-speare'?

Conventional scholarship on the play most likely to show such a link, *Hamlet*, is silent on any connection to *Beowulf* (e.g. Bullough in *Narrative and Dramatic Sources*, 1973, and Jenkins in the *Arden Hamlet*, 1982). The Stratford fellow couldn't possibly have known of the Old English manuscript of a poem that didn't 'surface' to literati until a librarian noticed it over a century later, the wisdom holds. Thus scholars focus (and generally accurately) solely on the mediaeval historian Saxo Grammaticus's *Historiae Danicae* and its translation by Belleforest in 1570 as *Histoires Tragiques* (not Englished however, until 1608...) for the skeleton of the story of Danish usurpation-madness-revenge, and of course for the name "Hamlet" itself, which Kemp Malone etymologically links to a Scandinavian root for "mad." But scholars (see Furness's *New Variorum Hamlet*, Lippincott, 1877) also realize that the play *Hamlet* abandons the obvious Saxo/Belleforest 'source' after the revengful killing of the uncle. That is, what happens after Amleth kills Feng in Saxo is *not* found in *Hamlet*, nor is any of the motif of Hamlet's death found in Saxo or Belleforest. Enter *Beowulf*.

In *Beowulf*, the hero as young warrior slays the monster Grendel and that creature's mother to save Denmark, then returns to his land of Geat to become benevolent, though heirless, king for fifty years whose events are absent from the poem. In mortal combat with a final dragon, both die, from poison and sword, Beowulf's only help coming from his loyal Wiglaf, who sees to Beowulf's funeral. (Already the knowing reader sees the Hamlet-Laertes duel, with Horatio-as-Wiglaf, working here.) In Burton Raffel's (New American Library, 1963) beautiful translation of *Beowulf*'s dying words:

"For this, this gold, these jewels, I thank  
Our Father in Heaven, Ruler of the Earth—  
For all of this, that His grace has given me.  
Allowed me to bring to my people while breath  
Still came to my lips. I sold my life  
For this treasure, and I sold it well. Take  
What I leave, Wiglaf, lead my people,  
Help them; my time is gone. Have  
The brave Geats build me a tomb.

When the funeral flames have burned me, and build it  
Here, at the water's edge, high  
On this spit of land, so sailors can see  
\*\* This tower and remember my name, and call it  
\*\* Beowulf's tower, and boats in the darkness  
And mist, crossing the sea, will know it."

Then that brave king gave the golden  
Necklace from around his throat to Wiglaf,  
Gave him his gold-covered helmet, and his rings,  
And his mail shirt, and ordered him to use them well;

\*\* You're the last of all our far-flung family,  
Fate has swept our race away,  
Taken warriors in their strength and led them  
To the death that was waiting. And now I follow them."

\*\* The old man's mouth was silent, spoke  
No more, had said as much as it could;  
\*\* He would sleep in the fire, soon. His soul  
Left his flesh, flew to glory.

(2794-2820 in Raffel)

Compare Hamlet's:

Horatio, I am dead,  
Thou livest. Report me and my cause aright  
To the unsatisfied.

(V.2.343-345)

O God, Horatio, what a wounded name,  
Things standing thus unknown, shall I leave behind me.  
If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart,  
Absent thee from felicity awhile,  
And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain  
To tell my story.

(V.2.349-354)

O, I die, Horatio.  
The potent poison quite oercrows my spirit.  
I cannot live to hear the news from England,  
But I do prophesy th'election lights  
On Fortinbras. He has my dying voice.  
So tell him, with th'occurents more and less  
Which have solicited — the rest of silence.

(V.2.357-363)

I would like to suggest that in the dying words of Hamlet we see a refiguring of the poignant exchange between the dying Beowulf and his faithful (and lone follower) Wiglaf — who also is a relative, a cousin, of his lord. Not insignificantly, both Beowulf and Hamlet are concerned not just about their own names and stories — which Wiglaf and Horatio will report — but also over the fate of the kingdom, the succession to the throne. Both lands either are or soon will be overrun by foreign power. And oddly, the puzzling slipping of time, the aging of Beowulf (1.2200 et seq.), bears a curious resemblance to the passage of time in which Hamlet appears in Act V to have aged from a Prince in early manhood to an ostensible thirty years of age (V.1.142-157).

Finally, just as *Hamlet's* finale echoes *Beowulf's*, so the 3182-line poem bears a dramatic texture close to the 3906-line play, though not hitherto recognized. In a study entitled *The Monodramatic Structure of "Beowulf"* (1975), John Mahoney explicates *Beowulf* as "monodrama":

that mode of drama in which a single actor assumes many parts  
distinguished by both a fullness of characterization and speech  
appropriate for each character...its norm becomes the heroic ideal.

Mahoney sees *Aeschylan* tragedy as an analogue of such a "monodrama"; I would contend that in *Hamlet* — in the play, in the protagonist, and in the author — we witness the essence of Mahoney's definition: "a single actor assumes many parts" epitomizes *Hamlet*, Hamlet, and 'Shake-speare.'

Conventional wisdom would likely cavil at the above similarities as 'not impressive, forced,' or perhaps would locate them in the world of 'sheer coincidence' or in some 'generic, cultural heritage of the Anglo-Saxon heroic saga' that a genius such as 'Shake-speare' of course 'would have known well.' Scholarly gatekeepers even might admit the congruities yet postulate their origins not in first-hand awareness of the *Beowulf* manuscript but in that most convenient of source plays, the mythical '*Ur-Hamlet*,' whose postulated author 'may have seen, may have heard, may have written'... However, as any observer of the 'Shake-spearean' critical industry could attest, if Laurence Nowell — master of Litchfield — could be shown to have *had* any connection to the Stratford youth or to the school he is postulated to have attended, we soon would be wading in our piscatory hip boots in *Hamlet-Beowulf* studies.

As for the youthful Oxford ever seeing the *Beowulf* story, I cannot imagine a tutor such as Nowell *not* at some juncture showing his pupil that poem — and telling the story — written in a hand from the days of the first earls of Oxford. De Vere, many years later to be sure, recollected, and "I am Beowulf" the Geat (343 in Raffel) became "This is I./Hamlet the Dane" (V.1.250-1). In any event, De Vere's documented proximity to the *Beowulf* manuscript adds an astonishing prelude to a virtuosity in letters as tragically

surpassing that, even as it shaped poets out of ordinary writers, shaped forever our language, it entombed its author, made him victim to a "readiness" to wager he could "win at the odds" when the end would come with that "fall at play," the last dragon.

\*\*\*\*\*

*"...retreating behind facades of scorn,  
contempt, indifference and quick dismissal."*

...unless you are a hopelessly committed Stratfordian, accepting 400 years of legend now solidified, or petrified, into fact, you must surely wonder if the untutored lad and sometime small-time actor from the country could possibly have been the author. Could he have had or acquired the author's genius for abstract thought, for poetry so magical it transcends time and geography, for the delineation of passions and emotions that equally transcend class, as well as place and time?

Summing up a television program examining the claims to the authorship of Shagsper of Stratford and Edward deVere, the 17th Earl of Oxford, producer Al Austin said: "Those who believe De Vere was Shakespeare must accept an improbable hoax as part of it, a conspiracy of silence involving, among others, Queen Elizabeth herself. Those who side with the Stratford man must believe in miracles."

But of the options and improbable as it is, the conspiracy of silence is easier to accept than the miracle. It is surmised - but there is no proof of it - that the Stratford man attended the local grammar school. Yet the author used a vocabulary of 17,000 words - twice as many of the well-educated John Milton. He also coined 3,000 new words from Latin and Greek roots.

Mark Twain, an early and eloquent doubter (who had probably never heard of Edward deVere), wrote in a small masterwork of invective called "Is Shakespeare Dead" that what we know of his life is "an Eiffel tower of artificialities rising sky-high from a very flat and very thin foundation of inconsequential facts." The reason we don't know more, Twain concluded, is that "he hadn't any history to record."

The evidence for De Vere is all circumstantial, monumental but in the end still circumstantial (It fills something like 900 pages in Charlton Ogburn's "The Mysterious William Shakespeare.")

The mystery is frustrating but it is also infuriating. Orthodox scholarship has chosen almost totally to ignore the possibility that an authorship question exists, retreating behind facades of scorn, contempt, indifference and quick dismissal.

It is true that the early advocates of Francis Bacon in particular carried their search for hidden messages encoded in the Shakespeare texts to such extremes as to invite ridicule. (They also did a disservice to those who find serious philosophical resonances between Bacon and the author.)

The exploration of the authorship question has been left, by default and necessity, to those outside academia - in the United States, in the case of the Earl of Oxford, to Charlton Ogburn and to Judge Minos D. Miller and his wife, Ruth Loyd Miller.

(Excerpt from a column in the Los Angeles Times (2/8/90)  
by Charles Champlin, Times Arts Editor).

\*\*\*\*\*

From TALK OF THE TRADE (5/14/90)

By

Leonore Fleischer:

The Bard or Not the Bard? That is the question taken up in a reprint from EPM Publications of McLean, Va. says EPM's Peter Exton, 'We have rescued *The Mysterious William Shakespeare: The Myth and the Reality* from the ruins of Dodd, Mead & Co. Author Charlton Ogburn examines what we do and do not know about three men: William Shakespere [sic] from Stratford; William Shakespeare, the poet-dramatist; and Edward deVere, 17th Earl of Oxford, whose biographical profile matches that of Shakespeare in many respects. Ogburn concludes, through stacks of circumstantial evidence, that deVere is the true identity of the Bard.

We are selling *Mysterious William* enthusiastically, but we've discovered something peculiar about

the Shakespearean authorities who should be a part of its audience. They hate the book. We thought serious scholars would value the thoroughness and detail, the culmination of more than many years of research. Yet the opposite is true. The entrenched Shakespearean establishment seems to fear the book. They don't reject it as poorly researched or badly written. They reject it as impossible, unfathomable, although they do not offer evidence that would silence Ogburn's blasphemy. They have been downright nasty, calling him and other Oxfordians "lunatics."

\*\*\*\*\*

"A Freudian Oxfordian"

By

H.R. Woudhuysen

(TLS April 20-26, 1990)

The problem evidently began early in Freud's life. A powerful influence would have been his teacher T.H. Meynert, a confessed Baconian. The pupil was sceptical that one man could have been sufficiently intelligent to have written both Bacon's works and Shakespeare's, but there was clearly a real difficulty here with the question of authorship and identity: who fathered the works? The answer was to come with J. Thomas Looney's book *"Shakespeare" Identified in Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford*, which was published in 1920. Freud read it twice, in 1923 and 1927, and to the distress of his English followers, particularly Ernest Jones, was converted. Although he was willing to talk about the subject privately among friends and admirers, Freud did not reveal his new belief in print for some time. References to it were made in a speech in 1930 when he received the Goethe Prize, but it was kept out of the 1935 English edition of *An Autobiographical Study* when its translator James Strachey explained the connotations the name Looney would have for English readers - Americans, however, were not spared Freud's insight. Freud finally came clean in a footnote to *Moses and Monotheism* and there is a note of his belief in the posthumously published revision of *An Outline of Psychoanalysis* of 1940.

Further evidence for Freud's conviction that all was not right in respect of the Stratford man's authorship of the plays and poems has come to light in the form of four letters Freud wrote to Percy Allen in 1935-6. These are being sold by Southeby's in their sale of Continental and Russian Books and Manuscripts, Science and Medicine on April 26: the best of the letters (the only one in German) is expected to go for as much as £7,000. Allen was a keen Oxfordian who published his first book on the subject, *The Case for Edward de Vere as William Shakespeare*, in 1930 and followed it with another three volumes arguing the same case in the next four years. He later became involved in spirit communications with the playwright, the Earl and the Lord Chancellor. Freud found Allen's own theories, among them that the Sonnets are addressed to Oxford's infant son, "recht phantastisch" and felt that Allen's methods of arguing and use of evidence were confusing and wrong-headed. Nevertheless, he eagerly awaited and read Allen's books. The letters also show that at this time Freud on no account wanted his views on the subject to be made widely public. The most interesting feature of this brief correspondence is Freud's acknowledgement of how hard it will be to prove the Oxfordian theory and make people believe in its truthfulness; "But", he added on New Year's Day, 1936, "I am confident that the resistance against Edward de Vere as Shakespeare will collapse at a time when psychoanalysis is still far from being acknowledged." The reason why Freud refused to believe in Shakespeare's authorship of his works, and found the resistance to the Oxfordian theory almost irritating, are intriguing. The Allen letters further document Freud's determination to believe that things are not as they seem.

\*\*\*\*\*

THE LEARNED AND THE LOU

By

Gary Goldstein

The first scene in act five of *As You Like It* has forever perplexed scholars: a character named William is introduced only to be insulted and threatened, then walked away, never to return. The entire short scene detracts from the dramatic coherence of the pastoral comedy.

Oxfordian scholars Eva Turner Clark, in *Hidden Allusions in Shakespeare's Plays*, Percy Allen, in *The Case for Edward de Vere as Shakespeare*, and Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn, Sr., in *This Star of England*, have commented upon this particular scene in order to explicate what appears to be a ciphered message from the dramatist that all was not right in his world.

Like them, I propose, first, that Shakespeare incorporated this particular episode into *As You Like It* to explicitly warn readers and spectators that a William who has somehow become associated with this play is not and was not the author of the play. I also propose that the dramatist in the "Touchstone-William" scene gives clues to his own identity — that he is a high-born person with strong ties to Arthur Golding.

Direct your attention to the lines:

Touchstone: Give me your hand. Art thou leamed?

William: No sir. (V, i, 37-38)

Touchstone then delivers an allegory about water and glasses:

Then learn this of me: to have is to have. For it is a figure in rhetoric that drink, being poured out of a cup into a glass, by filling the one doth empty the other. (lines 39-42)

By comparing this excerpt from the play with a scene from Plato's *Symposium*, we can decipher part of Shakespeare's message:

Agathon was sitting by himself at the bottom table, and cried out: Come and sit here by me, Socrates, and let me, by contact with you, enjoy the discovery which you made in the porch.

Socrates sat down and said: It would be very nice, Agathon, if wisdom were like water, and flowed by contact out of a person who has more into one who has less, just as water can be made to pass through a thread of wool out of the fuller of two cups into the emptier. If that applies to wisdom, I value the privilege of sitting beside you very highly, for I have no doubt that you will fill me with an ample draught of the finest wisdom. Such wisdom as I possess is slight and has little more reality than a dream, but yours is brilliant and may shine brighter yet;...

(Plato 37)

The metaphor of wisdom being passed instantly, like water, between two vessels, is mocked both in Plato and in Shakespeare, with the Elizabethan genius declaring that "to have [wisdom] is to have [it forever]" (line 39). But Shakespeare was doing more than mocking and pretensions of ignorant men. Touchstone, representing the dramatist himself, accuses William of assuming his (the dramatists') identity:

For all your writers do consent that *ipse* is he. Now, you are not *ipse*, for I am he. (lines 42-43)

David Bevington, Phyllis Hay Horton Professor of Humanities at the University of Chicago and editor of Bantam Books 1988 edition of the Shakespeare plays, glosses "your writers" as "the authorities." The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines *ipse* as Latin for "he himself, very." It is used as a pronoun denoting "himself, truly himself;" it is also "a slang name for a kind of ale, quasi 'the very thing.'" *Ipse* originated from the Latin term *ipse dixit*, itself a translation from the Greek, meaning "he himself (the master) said it."

With the information at hand, we can see that Shakespeare was stating, "even though all the authorities agree that you, William, are the master, I am saying you are not. I am the master."

Other clues in this short scene highlight the vast difference in social status between William and Touchstone. For instance, both Touchstone and William are described as "clowns," a word the *O.E.D.* denotes as "clod, clot, lump, which has been applied in various languages to a clumsy boor or lout." Indeed, the word clown is synonymous with a countryman, rustic, or peasant (*O.E.D.*) Despite this, the clown, William, removes his hat before engaging the other clown, Touchstone, in conversation.

Why?

Shakespeare alerts us by showing how each addresses the other throughout the scene: Touchstone uses "thou" toward William; William uses "sir" when speaking to Touchstone. Both terms were infused with social standing in the feudal world of Elizabethan England.

Touchstone: Is thy name William?

William: William, sir.

Touchstone: A fair name. Wast [was thou] born i' the forest here?

William: Ay, sir, I thank God



Touchstone: "Thank God" — a good answer. Art rich?

William: Faith, sir, so-so.

Touchstone: "So so" is very good, very excellent good, and yet it is not, it is but so-so. Art thou wise?

William: Ay, sir, I have a pretty wit.

Touchstone: Why, thou sayest well.

(Lines 20-29)

As a pronoun, says the *O.E.D.*, "thou" was "used familiarly to an inferior, in contempt or insult." "Sir," on the other hand, in 16th Century or in modern times, is used "as a respectful term of address to a superior."

Shakespeare employed the same technique in the opening scene of *Julius Caesar*: the dramatist directs our attention to the characters' social status immediately when Flavius and Marullus, tribunes of the people, continually address commoners by their trade names and as "thou." The commoners, in turn, continually address their tribunes as "sir."

Shakespeare further focuses our attention on Touchstone's superior social status by having Touchstone mock William by using the word "gentle" in apposition to the word "thy" when he tells William to replace his hat:

William: And good even to you, sir. (He removes his hat)

Touchstone: Good even, gentle friend. Cover thy head, cover thy head; nay, prithee, be covered. (lines 15-17)

The word "gentle" signified high birth and social station, according to the *O.E.D.*, for the primary meaning of the adjective when applied to people denotes "persons: well-born, belonging to a family of position; originally used synonymously with noble..." The word "thou," as previously indicated, denoted the very opposite.

On the other hand, both characters are described as clowns, albeit one serves a royal master, the other comes from and returns to a forest. Perhaps the dramatist felt that his true station in life had devolved to that of a jester, forcing him to keep company with the like of such as this William, whom he puts on a "thou" social level.

The dramatist also provides us with topical clues concerning Touchstone's true identity, derived from the etymology of the word "clown."

The *Oxford English Dictionary* cites Arthur Golding as the sole literary reference in illustrating primary and secondary uses of the word "clown" during the 16th Century. For the primary definition: a countryman, rustic, or peasant, implying ignorance, crassness, or rude manners. Arthur Golding's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1565). To the Reader, line 194: "The wise, the fool; the country clown; the learned and the lout." For the secondary meaning: a man without refinement or culture; an ignorant, rude, uncouth, ill-bred man. Arthur Golding's translation of *John Calvin on Deuteronomy* LXXXVII, 538 (1583): "Even such as have been counted the simplest clowns."

The significance of this is important when one considers that, in the *O.E.D.*, "the quotations are not merely examples of the fully developed use of the word or special sense under which they are cited; they have also to illustrate its origin..." (*O.E.D.* Intro.) We can therefore assume that the playwright wanted to direct our attention to his ties to Arthur Golding.

The most likely candidate for this would be Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, who was Golding's nephew. Golding also was de Vere's receiver (of his properties) and Latin tutor, and dedicated two books to his nephew. The first was in 1564, when de Vere was 14 years of age, an English version of Justin's previously untranslated *Abridgement of the Histories of Trogus Pompeius*; the second, in 1571, was *John Calvin's Version of the Psalms of David*.

One of the Latin clues in this scene reinforce the symbolism of employing Touchstone as a stand-in for Edward de Vere. The playwright has Touchstone declare to William: "Now, you are not *ipse*, for I am he." The English definition of the Latin word *ipse* — "he himself, very;" "himself, truly himself;" "the very thing" — provides us with a multilingual pun on the Earl of Oxford's patronymic, Vere. In plain terms, Touchstone is saying to William: you are not Vere, the master, for I am he.

We are given a further clue of identity in the naming of "Touchstone." A black stone related to flint, Touchstone was formerly used to test the purity of gold and silver. Hence, the use of touchstone to signify a test or criterion for determining the quality or genuineness of a thing — in this case, determining

the true identity of a master which Touchstone declares himself — and not William — to be.

In addition, the dramatist derived the metaphor of wisdom as water directly from Plato's *Symposium*, a book not known to have been published in English during the playwright's lifetime. It tends to confirm, rather than deny, Shakespeare's deep knowledge of Greek literature in the original Greek.

For these reasons, it is likely the persons symbolized by William and Touchstone in Act V, Scene I of *As You Like It* are William Shaksper of Stratford-on-Avon, and Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford. The former was a rustic who came from and returned to a forest (Arden), as did Shaksper of Stratford; the latter, a man of high birth who knew Latin and Greek, was the nephew, private student, and dedicatee of Arthur Golding, and who was considered by his literary peers in Elizabethan times to be a master playwright, "the best among us for comedy": Edward de Vere (Meres).

#### ENDNOTES

1. Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. New York: Bantam Books, 1988. Ed. David Bevington, Page 82.
  2. Plato. *The Symposium*. London: Penguin Books, 1987. Trans. Walter Hamilton. Page 37. This classical source was discovered by Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn Sr. See *This Star of England*. New York: Coward McCann, 1952. Page 1,004 footnote.
  3. *Oxford English Dictionary*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988.
  4. Op cit. Page XI.
  5. Meres, Francis. *Palladis Tamia*. London, 1598.
- (c) Copyright Gary Goldstein 1990

\*\*\*\*\*

#### DID QUEEN WRITE SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS? \*

Who wrote Shakespeare? That question has bedeviled a certain community of people since the mid-19th century. Among the strongest contenders in the melee, each with his own champions, are Francis Bacon and Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford, poet and patron of the arts.

But a new computer program developed by mathematician Robert Valenza of Claremont McKenna College in California advances an unlikely entry in the Shakespeare sweepstakes: Queen Elizabeth I, whose known poetic output consists largely of translations of the Psalms.

Valenza's new technique, called modal analysis, was put to work in the course of a 3-year project carried out by Ward E. Y. Elliott, professor of political science at Claremont. Elliott claims his study involves the most comprehensive computer-based testing yet of the various "claimants" to the mantle of the Bard.

Aided by a grant from the Sloan Foundation, Elliott and Valenza built on the work of statisticians Ronald Thisted of the University of Chicago and Brad Efron of Stanford University, who during the 1970s, developed techniques based on the frequency of word use to clarify issues of literary authorship.

In the first 2 years of the 3-year study, researchers applied a variety of additional tests comparing elements of Shakespeare's poetic style with those of 12 authors, including Bacon, de Vere, Christopher Marlowe, and John Donne. De Vere came out way ahead of the others, Elliott says.



Shakespeare versus Oxford. Among those who believe "the man from Stratford" could not have been the Bard, the learned Earl of Oxford has outstripped Francis Bacon as the most likely contender.

From the cover of *The Mysterious William Shakespeare* by Charlton Ogburn (distributed by EPM Publications Inc., McLean, VA, 1984).

But that was before Elliott applied Valenza's method, which he advocates as a "touchstone" for resolving questions of authorship. Instead of simply counting the frequency of stylistic usages, modal analysis seeks to measure "structural relationships" among a set of selected "keywords." Using that technique which "has been remarkably effective in distinguishing Shakespeare from non-Shakespeare poems," according to Elliott, de Vere merged "badly wounded." The Virgin Queen came out ahead of the rest.

And what does all this say about the validity of computer analysis of literature? Elliott says such methods are "very good at disproving authorship," although possibly not so good as proving it.

"A Column in *SCIENCE*, Vol. 248 (1990) by Constance Holden."

A reporter on a newspaper in Wooster, Mass. phoned and asked me to comment on Elliott's research. After first indicating that I did not speak for The Shakespeare Oxford Society, I reported:

In the first place, Professor Elliott's computer-analysis can never prove or disprove whether Will. Shakspeare of Stratford either wrote or did not write the works because that Stratford man left no writings whatsoever except six execrable signatures and, possibly, the four line doggerel on his grave marker which, in fact, bears no name. As for his 57 straw men and women candidates, most all are ludicrous, such as Ann Hathaway. Cardinal Wolsey, Mary, Queen of Scots and Queen Elizabeth. Furthermore, Francis Bacon, Christopher Marlowe and the 6th Earl of Derby have had some respectable following but all of them have been decisively ruled out by crucial factors. Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, is the only candidate whose character, life and literary output fits the authorship very nearly as hand in glove.

Professor Elliott has, therefore, not made any contribution to resolving the Shakespeare authorship question but only confused those who are not familiar with the findings by scholarly research for over 150 years.

Morse Johnson

\*\*\*\*\*

## TO THE EDITOR

¶While going through my file of old theater programs recently, I came across one for "Twelfth Night" as presented at the old Ford's Theatre in Baltimore. The stars were Helen Hayes as Viola and Maurice Evans as Malvolio — a glorious and immortal partnership.. my memory... places the date sometime during the first quarter of 1941 — 21 years after the publication of J. Thomas Looney's book and 11 years before the first of the Ogburn books. . .

WHO WAS

SHAKESPEARE?



G. Hammond Rever

*(With Apologies To Scholars)*

"Who was Shakespeare?" You answer, "Why don't be silly! He was the greatest genius that ever lived. He gave us 'Hamlet,' 'The Merchant of Venice,' 'A Midsummer Night's Dream,' 'The Taming of the Shrew,' That's all we have to know about him! Umph!" (You stick your nose up in the air at this point!)

That is undoubtedly the intelligent way to think of a writer. The fact that he has written great works, and through these great works and brilliant mind has permeated, effusing its brilliance to the reader, is a sufficient acquaintance.

But we're not so intelligent and are the kind of queer ducks who want to know something about the person William Shakespeare ... And what do we find out about him? Bombastic arguments, bickering, and more arguments. Scholars can't agree on his identity. The orthodox view is that William Shakespeare (i.e., Shakspeare) of Stratford produced the literature with which he was credited. He was the same William Shakespeare (i.e., Shagspere) who married Anne Hathaway when he was nineteen and she was twenty-four years of age.

\*\*\*

The opposing point of view shouts that all the great works attributed to the genius of "William Shakespeare" were actually done by Edward de Vere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford. The theorists prove their point by claiming that when Edward de Vere died, there was an immediate arrest of Shakespearean publication, even though William Shakespeare (i.e., Shakspeare) lived for twelve years following the death of de Vere. The reformed theorists prove that "Shakespeare" was Edward de Vere through many strong means. First of all the evidence of de Vere's lyric poetry could not be identified from that of "William Shakespeare." The biological evidence coincides exactly to that of "Shakespeare." Chronologically they are the same. The posthumous evidence tallies exactly with de Vere's. They conclude that he must have been a man of the higher aristocracy, a man with Feudal connections, of superior education, a follower of sport, a lover of music, loose and improvident in money matters, doubtful and somewhat conflicting in his attitude toward women, of probably Catholic leanings, but touched with skepticism. All these things Edward de Vere was, but Shakspeare wasn't. The creation of "Shakespeare" which doubtless reflects in some measure his own philosophy and personality express so fully the background and philosophy of de Vere, that the "reformers" are completely convinced that "Shakespeare" and de Vere are one.

¶¶After reading Gary Goldstein's excellent article on Edward de Vere's Hebrew — in which he pointed to Isaiah 29 as the probable source of *The Tempest* (not only its name but "its entirety in order to properly interpret the meaning of this most unusual play") — I was led to try my hand at an exercise which Stratfordians have made an artform: conjecture.

At the time that Oxford was writing *The Tempest* he must have sensed that death was near and that this would be his last chance to strike out at those in the Court society who had succeeded in robbing him of property, reputation, and — perhaps most of all — the acknowledgement that his was the genius of Shakespeare. He must have been damned mad about it. He would right the wrongs in fantasy.

So in Isaiah he found the thrust for what has been described by Coleridge and others as his most imaginative play. He saw not only Ariel as his avenging spirit, but he saw himself (as Prospero) assigned the omnipotence of Isaiah's enraged Jehovah:

"I have bedimm'd," says Prospero in Act V, "the noontide sun, call'd for the mufinous winds, and 'twixt the green sea and the azured vault set roaring war: to the dread rattling thunder have I given fire, and rifted Jove's stout oak with his own bolt: the strongbased promontory have I made shake: and by the spurs pluck'd up the pine and cedar: graves, at my command, have waked the sleepers, opened, and let them forth by my so potent art."

Is that not the sound and fury that one hears in Isaiah 30 in the "glorious voice" of a Jehovah who "will slow the lightning down of his arm, with the indignation of his anger, and the flame of a devouring fire, with a blast, and tempest"?

As to the Prospero speech in Act V, there are critics who say it's a paraphrase of Medea's prayer in Book VII of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The similarities are striking. And why not? Everybody knows that Ovid was one of Shakespeare's favorite sources. Even so, the Stratford favorite sources. Even so, the Stratford advocates need to be reminded from time to time that the noted scholar who translated Ovid's *Metamorphoses* for the Elizabethans was Edward de Vere's uncle, Arthur Golding.

In the end, Jehovah has mercy on his enemies and Prospero, satisfied that he has made his point, finds peace with his brother and renounces his art — in words which some have suggested as Oxford's farewell to the stage:

And deeper than did ever plummet sound  
I'll drown my book.

This point is beautifully articulated, of course, by Charlton Ogburn in his book, *The Mysterious William Shakespeare*. For example, on page 763 he writes:

But above all in *The Tempest*, the dramatist recognizes that the time has come when he must make an end. Prospero forswears his magic and releases Ariel. In the Epilogue that he delivers the dramatist addresses his audience for the last time:

Now my charms are all o'erthrown,  
And what strength I have's mine own,  
Which is most faint.

There are Stratfordians who call *The Tempest* an "upbeat" ending to Shakespeare's stage career. Upbeat is hardly the word that describes the play's Epilogue. But then, as Charlton Ogburn would be the first to tell us, Stratfordians have some difficulty in believing that Shakespeare was dying when he wrote it.

Gene Williamson

\*\*\*\*\*

## EVERY WORD DOTH ALMOST TELL MY NAME

By

Peter R. Moore

This article follows two earlier pieces, "The Rival Poet of Shakespeare's Sonnets" and "Dating Shakespeare's Sonnets 78 to 100." These showed that Shakespeare's Rival was Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, they confirmed the case for Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, as the friend to whom the first 126 sonnets were addressed, and they showed that sonnets 78 to 100 date from 1597 to 1599. These points are made without regard to the Shakespeare authorship controversy, which we now will

enter.

The Sonnets are Shakespeare's only direct autobiography; indeed, aside from two short formal dedications, they are his only surviving utterances in the first person. They are passionate, tormented, sometimes sordid, occasionally reticent (see Sonnets 33 and 88), and are manifestly heartfelt. They are the ultimate fusion of intense emotion and poetical skill, and they ought to form the centerpiece of any biography of their author. Others have written eloquently on why the Sonnets make no sense as the testament of William Shakspeare of Stratford, but do fit what we know of Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford. That this is so is testified to by the silence, variously glib, stony, or embarrassed, of orthodox biographers when they come to the Sonnets. This article will not present a full discussion of the Sonnets and the Oxford authorship theory, but will be limited to specific points that have come out of my research. The first two items were omitted from my first two articles, as the latter were purposely kept independent of the authorship controversy.

My article on the Rival Poet listed fourteen reasons for Essex, but there is a fifteenth that relates to Oxford and also to the matter of dating. Sonnet 85 says that Shakespeare "holds his rank before" the Rival (line 12). This passage has a clear surface meaning about love, but can also be taken as an allusion to certain events at the end of 1597. In October of that year, Queen Elizabeth elevated her Lord Admiral, Howard of Effingham (victor over the Armada and co-commander at Cadiz) to Earl of Nottingham, which made him the junior earl, close behind Essex. But his office of Lord Admiral (as well as a new office, Lord Steward) gave him precedence of all earls save Oxford, the Lord Great Chamberlain. Essex was infuriated by this relative demotion (as the Queen undoubtedly intended), and so he claimed sickness and refused to attend court, council, or Parliament until he was made Earl Marshal in December. The journal of the House of Lords therefore recorded that on January 11, 1598, Essex "having been created Earl Marshal ... took his place according to his said office, viz. next after the Earl of Oxon, Chamberlain of England, and before the Earl of Nottingham, Lord Steward and Lord Admiral." Thus Oxford "held his rank before" Essex.

My article on dating discussed Lord Burghley's character and Mastership of the Court of Wards, and noted that the octave of Sonnet 94 describes him with a remarkable balance of animosity and respect. It also pointed out that Essex and Southampton had been his wards, but, of course, Oxford too had been his ward, then became his son-in-law, and, from his point of view, had cause to resent Burghley. It is difficult to see why Will of Stratford would care, know, and dare enough to write those eight lines (besides satirizing Burghley as Polonius in *Hamlet*), but it is clear why Oxford would do so.

In Sonnet 122, Shakespeare apologizes for giving away some "tables" presented to him by Southampton, which are also called "tallies thy dear love to score" (l. 10); Southampton is assured that Shakespeare has retained their contents. The standard Stratfordian explication of this sonnet is truly bizarre. We read that the "tables" are a commonplace book, a blank notebook in which people in those days jotted down virtuous, wise, or clever thoughts, sayings, or fragments of literature for future mental and moral profit. As for the "tallies," the experts call this a reference to notched sticks used to count the score in an alehouse or to record debts among the unlettered. In other words, Shakespeare, apologizing as gracefully as he can for parting with a notebook filled with the Earl of Southampton's profoundest thoughts, likens the book to the IOU of an illiterate or a drunkard. One hardly knows whether to laugh, cry, or declare that we are beginning to get at the cause of the occasional quarrels between the Bard and the Fair Youth. As was pointed out some years ago, the only way to reconcile Shakespeare's equation of Southampton's "tables" with scoring tallies is by considering it as a reference to the ornamental sheets used to tally scores in a tournament. As it happens, Southampton and another earl were the top performers in King James' 1604 Accession Day Tournament. For Southampton to present his scoring sheet to Oxford, an undefeated tournament champion in his youth, seems quite appropriate. And Oxford, by then three months from death and perhaps no longer enamored of chivalric prowess, might have given the gift away.

As we have returned to consideration of dates, I will remark that Sonnet 111 can be quite plausibly dated to late 1603, but the arguments are too lengthy for this article and will be presented in another issue of the Newsletter.

Next, we should consider four sonnets, numbers 117, 119, 120, and 126, that seem to allude to events of February 8 and 19, 1601. On the former date, Essex and Southampton attempted a coup that failed, and they surrounded that night. On the latter date, they were unanimously convicted of treason by

a jury of twenty-five peers, the senior one of which was Oxford. A bit of background information is needed to understand how the verdict may have affected later relations between Oxford and Southampton.

First, Essex and Southampton were manifestly guilty of treason, and the judges and prosecutors easily destroyed their legalistic attempts to justify their actions. Also, impartiality of judges and jurors, the right to counsel, the rules of evidence, and other legal niceties were either nonexistent or were scrapped during treason trials in that period. A suspected traitor might clear himself during the pretrial investigation, but if the case went to court then guilt had already been determined; the trial was a public display of the wickedness of the accused and the power of the government. No Elizabethan treason trial produced any verdict but guilty (though there was one acquittal under Elizabeth's not too competent sister Mary, while another occurred right at the state of James' reign). Also, a unanimous verdict was necessary to convict a commoner, but only a majority was needed to convict a peer. Finally, the situation facing Southampton was quite different from that of Essex. The latter was the leader of the uprising, his third serious offense in as many years, and had let himself become politically isolated, so that no important people were likely to ask the Queen to show him mercy. On the contrary, the most powerful man in England, Sir Robert Cecil, wanted him dead, while other major figures like the Earl of Nottingham were his enemies. But the rebellion was Southampton's first major offense, he was a follower rather than the leader, he was liked by many influential people, beginning with Cecil, and despite his twenty-seven years and three campaigns, he was considered young and not fully responsible for his actions. In addition, he and Essex both claimed that their lives were threatened by their enemies, and that they rose up in self-defense. This plea was nonsense in Essex's case, but was partly true for Southampton. His enemy Lord Grey (a member of the jury) had attempted to slaughter him in the Strand in January and was punished with three weeks in jail. In short, Southampton had no chance of acquittal but did have a good chance of escaping execution.

Now we must consider the situation of a juror who wished to save Southampton. If the juror argued and voted for acquittal, then Southampton would have been convicted by a vote of twenty-four to one, the juror would have failed in his duty to Queen and country, he would probably have been imprisoned for a while (as happened to the jurors who acquitted Sir Nicholas Throckmorton in Queen Mary's reign), and, above all, he would have forfeited every ounce of credit with the Queen and Cecil. The only rational course was to vote for conviction and then join those pleading with the Queen to spare Southampton.

If Southampton was the Fair Youth, if Oxford was Shakespeare, and if the latter behaved as has been suggested during and after the trial, then what should we expect of later relations between the two? Southampton must have realized that Oxford took the only sensible course and helped to save his life. But emotionally, Southampton could not have completely forgiven those who voted, not so much for his death, as for the death of his hero Essex. After the trial, Essex's bravado was broken by his chaplain who insisted that Essex could not die in a state of grace unless he confessed and repented his crimes. Essex did so, and accused his sister and his closest followers of pushing him into rebellion; this was also true of Southampton, but with him alone Essex kept faith. We should therefore expect that later relations between Oxford and Southampton would be uneasy and scarred by unhealed wounds, and this is precisely what we find in some of the final sonnets.

Sonnet 126, Shakespeare's envoi, presumably alludes to the Essex uprising and Southampton's imprisonment by saying that the Fair Youth "hast by waning grown" (1. 3.). More significantly, Sonnet 117 pleads "But shoot not at me in your wakened hate" (1. 10), which plausibly describes how Southampton may have felt about a friend who voted to condemn Essex. In Sonnet 119, Shakespeare is still dealing with the wakened hate in general terms: "What potions have I drunk of siren tears/Distilled from limbeck fountains fowl as hell within ... *Still losing when I saw myself to win/What wretched errors hath my heart committed*" (11. 1-5). But Sonnet 120 gets much more specific on the same theme:

That you were once unkind befriends me now,  
And for that sorrow which I then did feel  
Needs must I under my transgression bow,  
Unless my nerves were brass or hammered steel.  
For if you were by my unkindness shaken,  
As I by yours, y'have passed a hell of time,  
And I, a tyrant, have no leisure taken

To weigh how much I suffered in your crime.  
O that our night of woe might have remembered  
My deepest sense how hard true sorrow hits,  
And soon to you, as you to me, then tendered  
The humble salve which wounded bosoms fits!

But that your trespass now becomes a fee;  
Mine ransoms yours, and yours must ransom me.

What earthly reason could Shakspeare of Stratford have had for writing such a poem to the Earl of Southampton, particularly line 5? But it is obvious why the Earl of Oxford would have written it, especially line 5.

Let us now consider some implications. The author of Shakespeare's Sonnets was intimate for a period of years (I would guess about ten) with the Earl of Southampton, whom he freely criticized, as he criticized Lord Burghley, and actually challenged the Earl of Essex. He wrote sonnets like 85, 117, 119, and 120 that defy elucidation under the Stratford theory, but which are easily explainable if Oxford wrote them. And, of course, the foregoing sentence also applies to sonnets like 125 which have been discussed by others. We also have some plausible dates for the later sonnets: March or April 1603 for Sonnet 107, late 1603 for Sonnet 111, and April 1604 for Sonnet 122. It rather looks as if Sonnet 126 was written on a deathbed around June 1604.

As it came to me that Sonnets 78 to 100 were written around 1598, I naturally tried to find out what Oxford was doing that year. But, save sitting in Parliament in January, his recorded life is an irritating blank. Yet it is otherwise for our friend from Stratford; we do know something of his activities (even including threats from the Rival Poet), and perhaps Shakspeare's advocates can still save the day. In February 1598, as Shakespeare was penning his touching farewell to Southampton in Sonnet 87, Shakspeare was being cited in Stratford for hoarding grain in time of famine. Feelings against the hoarders were so strong that one Warwickshireman prayed that "my Lord of Essex" would hang them at their own doors. Doubtless (to use a favorite Stratfordian word), the Rival Poet was contemplating revenge.

\*\*\*\*\*

From Gary Goldstein, Publicity Chairman:

K.C. Ligon's play, *The Isle of Dogs* - a play about Oxford, - which won the 1989 Deep South Writers Conference Award, will have a reading by actors in Boston in June. Charles Boyle is sponsoring the reading.

John Nassivera's play, *All the Queens Men* - a play about Oxford -, will be given a workshop production by the Pasadena Playhouse in California this autumn, in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Shakespeare Oxford Society.

Dom Saliani, a high school English teacher in Calgary, Canada, is preparing poetry textbooks for Canadian high school students in the 10th, 11th and 12th grades. He is including one of Oxford's poems, "It I Were a King," and one of his portraits. In the teachers' guide accompanying the textbooks, Saliani addresses the Authorship Question, summarizes the Oxfordian position, and provides an Oxfordian bibliography for future reference and reading.

Hank Wittemore, author of an upcoming biography of Ted Turner, is conducting research for a historical novel on Oxford.

A reporter in the London Bureau of the Wall Street Journal informs me that she recently presented her editors with a story on Oxford and was turned down because her editors had already seen too many stories on Oxford in the media.

Charlton Ogburn was told by the writer of the movie, *The Elephant Man*, that he intends to write a screenplay on the Earl of Oxford.



## TOWN MEETING TO EXPLORE SHAKESPEARE'S IDENTITY

The Shakespeare Oxford Society, in cooperation with the North Carolina Shakespeare Festival, will sponsor a Town Meeting on the identity of William Shakespeare on Saturday, August 4, at 2:30 p.m. in the High Point Theatre, High Point, North Carolina.

Dr. D.K. Fosso, writer and poet, who has taught Shakespeare to a generation of college students at Wake Forest University, will present the orthodox Stratford position. Joseph Sobran, author, syndicated columnist and senior editor of the National Review, will present research supporting Edward de Vere as the author of the Shakespeare canon. Charlton Ogburn, if physically fit, plans to be present.

The Board of Trustees of the Shakespeare Oxford Society, which will meet in High Point August 3 - 5, will attend a Friday evening performance of *Hamlet* which will open the Festival's 1990 season. All SOS members are invited to join the hoard at the Friday evening performance, also for a Saturday luncheon at 12:30 p.m. which will be followed by the Town Meeting. Luncheon and play tickets will cost a total of \$27. The Town Meeting will be open to the public without charge.

The weekend activities will center around the Radisson Hotel in downtown High Point which is giving SOS members a special rate of \$54 per room. Reservations may be made by calling 1-800-333-3333, identifying yourself as a SOS member. Reservations for the play and luncheon may be made by writing Trudy Atkins, 20 Forest Lake Circle, Greensboro, NC 27407; telephone: 1-919-299-0419. Deadline for reservations is July 25.

\*\*\*\*\*

### 1990 ANNUAL MEETING

Exciting plans have been made for the annual meeting of the members of The Shakespeare Oxford Society to be held on October 26, 27, 28 in the Doubletree Hotel, 199 Los Robles, Pasadena, Calif. (Special room rates: \$89 single, \$95 double, \$10 extra for additional person) Registration fee: \$35. Program and additional information and registration forms will be carried in the Summer Newsletter to be mailed on September 20.

\*\*\*\*\*

"I...would entreat thy company

To see the wonders of the world abroad"

A two-week tour of Oxford country will take place in the Spring 1991, specific dates to be given later. Cost between \$2,000 and \$2,300 if 40 persons sign up. We will engage the services of WITTE TRAVEL CO. of Grand Rapids, a firm which has been taking special interest groups to Europe for the last 20 years.

Places to visit that have already been suggested:

Westminster Abbey	Hampton Court Place	Burghley House	The Tower of London
The Inns of Court	Billesley Hall	Windsor Castle	Bosworth Field
The Stationer's Co.	Hatfield House	Site of Wivianhoe	
Foundations of Rose & Globe Theaters		Hedingham Castle (open only May-October)	

If you are interested please contact Edith Duffy by May 30, 1990 at 2732 Dogwood Rd., Durham, N.C. 27706

\*\*\*\*\*

### JOIN SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY AND RECEIVE QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

The purpose of the Shakespeare Oxford Society is to document and establish Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford (1550-1604) as the universally recognized author of the works of William Shakespeare. Each Newsletter carries articles which impart a wide range of corroborating information and commentary.

Student: \$10.00 Annual Dues Regular: \$25.00 Sustaining \$50 or more

1. Dues and requests for membership information to:

Victor Crichton, 207 W. 106th St., Apt. 10-D, New York, New York 10025

2. Submit materials for publication in the Newsletter to:

Morse Johnson, Editor, 105 West 4th St., Suite #819, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

NOTA BENE: The Shakespeare Oxford Society was founded and incorporated in 1957 in the State of New York and is chartered under the membership cooperation laws of that state as a non-profit educational organization. Dues, grants and contributions are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law. The Shakespeare Oxford Society IRS number is 13,6105314. The New York Tax number is: 07182.



105 West 4th, Street, Suite #819, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
Morse Johnson, Editor

To the Readers:

I have always found that few, if any, will open his or her mind to the case for Oxford until that person begins to have continuing doubts about the traditional attribution. Those doubts can certainly be, and have been, generated by such a comprehensive coverage and analysis of all pertinent evidence and assumptions as Charlton Ogburn's *The Mysterious William Shakespeare*. But too few can be inspired to read such a lengthy, albeit fascinating and brilliantly written, book. Recently, however, I realized that the materials set forth in two chapters of that book - "The Myriad-Minded Man of the Renaissance I and II" - in and of themselves can convincingly inculcate doubts. I have therefore written an article which is confined almost entirely to the materials in those chapters, somewhat abbreviated and somewhat supplemented, which have been both deduced and affirmed by Stratfordians and irrefutable facts which are relevant thereto.

If incorporated with the other contents in a Newsletter, this article certainly would not have the undiverted impact and be as easily duplicated and circulated as it would if printed separately. I have therefore printed this Newsletter in two sections. The elementary commentary in the first paragraph of its Preface is to orient uninformed readers.

Modesty aside - 9/10ths of the article, however, consists of quotations from others - , I hope Members of the Society will agree that Vol. 26-B could open up many minds as to the validity of the anti-Stratfordian position. For those who do, may I recommend and urge duplication and circulation by person or mail to professors, teachers, students, playwrights, actors, directors, critics, magazine and newspaper editors, et al.

It might induce some Stratfordians to recognize that their illusions have been perpetuated to justify their prestige as responsible scholars. Andrei Sakharov provided a noteworthy example. An article in the New York Review of Books (8/16/90) reports that he had written to his wife about the death of Stalin, "I am under the influence of a great man's death. I am thinking of his humanity," and that he "had thrust aside all political doubts to help the Soviet Union build its first thermo-nuclear bomb." The article then quoted from Sakharov's *Memoirs*:

I can't fully explain it - after all, I knew quite enough about the horrible crimes that had been committed...But I hadn't put the whole picture together, and in any case, there was still a lot I didn't know...but above all, I felt myself committed to the goal which I assumed was Stalin's as well...after a devastating war, to make the country strong enough to ensure peace. Precisely because I had invested so much of myself in that cause and accomplished so much, I needed, as anyone might in my circumstances, to create an illusory world, to justify myself.

\*\*\*\*\*

"Shake-speare & Co."  
Reviews of Current Oxfordian Books  
by  
Tom Goff

My purpose here is, first, to provide brief reviews of recent Oxfordian books which SOS members may have seen publicized but not methodically described in bibliographical terms; and, second, to introduce a new book from the pens of two of our own "bending authors." The hope is that members will be encouraged to decide which of these purchases is most worthwhile for school English departments; for personal reference; and for special or general collections. All of these titles are at least commendable; and in acquiring them, the purchaser need only be governed by considerations of budget and probable readership.

## I.

Charlton Ogburn's *The Mysterious William Shakespeare* (Dodd, Mead & Co., 1984, now distributed by E.P.M. Publications, 1003 Turkey Run Rd., McLean, VA 22101) may need no introduction; but in case any new Oxfordian has not yet read the book, I urgently recommend it. At 892 pages in hardcover (\$25.00 plus \$3.00 postage), it is the strongest one-volume statement of the case for the "strange, difficult, contradictory" Edward de Vere as the real "William Shakespeare." By and large, Ogburn's advocacy of de Vere occupies the book's second half; equally important, the first half states the case against the grain-hoarding, mean-spirited, rustic Shakespeare of tradition (and a thousand academic livelihoods). Writes Ogburn, "Surely it is a supreme irony that the outstanding works in the English language should be attributed to a man whose record contains nothing to counter the inference to be drawn from it that he was of limited literacy at best."

Giving us all the particulars of so damning a record, Mr. Ogburn then turns to de Vere's astonishing life story: the odyssey of the eccentric yet purposeful genius who, as 17th Earl of Oxford, was for much of his career the holder of the proudest title — short of Elizabeth's own — in England. Though evidently commissioned by the Queen to write the exalted plays that fortified England's resolve in moments of crisis, de Vere was also endowed (a mixed blessing) with his own Hamlet's satirical keenness, and with some of the forthright bluntness of *King Lear's* Kent. Such qualities — especially when combined with his playwright's imagination — made Oxford seem dangerous to his powerful rivals about Elizabeth's throne (particularly the crafty Cecil family). Added to his contemporaries' suspicions were the rigors of a social code forbidding Oxford and other nobles to take credit for their works of drama and poetry.

Thus it is, says Ogburn, that for all the gratitude owed the real Shakespeare even in his own day — for all his patriotism and surpassing art — "Everything falls into place...if we take it that in 1597 the persons in whose hands the matter rested decided that the authorship of the plays we know as the world's greatest would be lastingly concealed; that they would be...credited to the William Shakespeare [Oxford's chosen pseudonym] who had dedicated *Venus and Adonis*...to the Earl of Southampton [1593]; and that the idea would be floated that William Shakespeare was the peace-threatener, tax-evader, theatrical functionary, and possible play-broker Will Shakspeare [Ogburn spells the name as it is rendered in Stratford's burial register]."

Mr. Ogburn's book holds the reader spellbound with the help of its magisterial — yet relaxed and intimate — style; and the craftsmanlike prose yields moments of near poetry ([Of the ambitious explorers who made Elizabeth's reign an age of discovery,] "Some set their sights on lands where monuments of classical antiquity measure the heights of achievement men once had scaled, others on perilous shores of storied wealth beyond seas scarce acquainted with Western keels"). The author is ideally suited to the material, given his background as Shakespeare critic, novelist, intelligence analyst, naturalist, military historical (*The Marauders*), and (above all, perhaps) gifted popularizer of intricate subjects. This work is an essential purchase for high school and college English departments with keenly interested Shakespeare students; it is also an indispensable aid to further research in the topic, and a must for general or special (Shakespeare authorship) collections in public libraries.

## II.

Now for the paperback abridgement. Mr. Ogburn's qualities are still to the fore in Lord Vere's skillful and scrupulous British edition, *The Mystery of William Shakespeare* (£7.99 or its equivalent in U.S. currency, 779 pages, Sphere Books, 27 Wrights Lane, London W8 5TZ, England). Few cuts have been made in the genuine substance of the book; an appendix on the search for Shakespeare's lost manuscripts, the scholarly listing of citations, and portions of the prefatory material have been dropped. (My guess is that students consulting the bibliography, which appears to have been retained intact from the original edition, will occasionally find a given source treating matters fully covered only in the American hardcover; but this assumption needs testing.) Absent from the paperback are the concise (but optional) italicized previews of the material ahead which began each chapter in the Dodd, Mead version. Particularly meditative chapter endings have been reduced or dropped, and the neatly judged excisions have occasionally permitted telescoping two chapters into one.

The paperbound is most sharply reduced in the wealth of anecdotal comment — a feature of the

original — on the Oxford (and anti-Stratford) theory's troubled passage through the groves of academe. It's easy to see why Lord Vere (now Earl of Burford) and Mr. Ogburn chose, when considering those who read as they run, to omit the personal polemics from the British edition (some reviewers had felt such passages slowed the presentation of the Oxford case itself), but for me, Ogburn's historical rehearsal of the authorship dispute is an illuminating counterpoint to Oxford's own dark confrontations with Tudor bureaucracy.

Nevertheless, this is a most admirable abridgement; we really only need regret, perhaps, the loss of a few extended object lessons (Spenser, Lyly, etc.) in Elizabethan researchers' thoroughness (and consequent success) at probing archival sources for biographical information on the Stratfordian's contemporaries — yet finding nothing whatsoever of the remotest literary consequence in Will Shakspeare's life records. The point, however, is still adequately conveyed, despite the loss of this material. The other omission of substance is in the statements of rival authorship cases, item by item, for the Earl of Derby and others (though these have been adroitly summarized).

Most of the hardcover's illustrations (black-and-white, but quite good even when reproducing color originals) have been kept, and they survive the transition to paperback pretty well. The print is acceptably large and clear, and the sheer speed of delivery by Sphere Books, in my case at least, was astonishing. The cover illustration, depicting a First-Folio style "Droeshout" Shakespeare — but obviously *in maschera*, holding up a lorgnette-like false face — is a delight. An essential buy, particularly for collections with smaller budgets who can afford a condensed Ogburn, but with the assurance that the book's vital core is still intact. Oxfordians who will, "Then brook abridgement, and your eyes advance" towards this worthy purchase!

### III.

In making this case for Oxford, not only has Charlton Ogburn marshalled the incontrovertible exhibits; he has arranged them to point the way for future scholars. He touches, for example, on Shakespeare's skill — even in relatively crude early efforts such as *The Comedy of Errors* and *Love's Labour's Lost* — at adapting the Italian *commedia dell'arte* to his needs. Whence came this Italianate education? Certainly *Shakspeare's* known career bears no trace of the "long foreground somewhere" (Emerson's words to Walt Whitman) that must have been the playwright's. Ogburn discloses much of Oxford's "foreground," demonstrating that the de Vere theory may help us account for more than merely those poems and plays named as "Shakespeare's" by contemporaries. Are Golding's *Metamorphoses*, Brooke's *Romeus and Juliet*, the uncredited *Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*, and *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, just Shakespeare's "sources" or "influences?" Or are they his juvenilia?

Ogburn's analysis of these works indicates at least that if Oxford did not write them in their entirety, he sponsored, contributed to, assembled, or lent actual and spiritual guidance in behalf of them: exerting demonstrable ascendancy over any of the named authors involved. Sometimes, too, his physical presence at the creative locale and the unmistakable signs of youthful artistry and impulsiveness are tantamount to Edward de Vere's own sign-manual. And recently, two Oxfordians have stepped confidently forward to extend Ogburn's bold researches in hitherto almost uncharted realms of identification.

As if taking their cue from Ogburn's statement that "There remains much to be said of Oxford's poetry, attributed and otherwise [emphasis added], in its relationship to that which we know as Shakespeare's," Stephanie Caruana and Elisabeth Sears have issued in draft form (1989) their scholarly — but accessible — *Oxford's Revenge: "Shakespeare's" Dramatic Development from Agamemnon to Hamlet* (99 pages, paperback, Spear Shaker Press, Box 91, RR 1, Napanoch, NY 12458. Price: \$10.00. Shipping and handling: \$1.00 for 1st copy; \$.50 for each additional copy). Proceeding on Puttenham's remark that Oxford was among the noblemen or "gentlemen" at Court who (if not suppressing their work entirely) published without using their own names, Sears and Caruana also make use of Ogburn's belief in *Hamlet* as central to our understanding of Shakespeare/Oxford. Working from these two premises, the authors have probed into a mass of obscurely attributed Elizabethan revenge plays, pamphlets and classical translations, giving us an often highly speculative (but entertaining) account of young Edward de Vere's passage from immature Senecan imitator to accomplished artist.

Taking *Hamlet* as an end result for the purposes of their analysis, Caruana and Sears guide us past

several way-stations along the author's route, some of them conceivably little more than banana-skins on which the boy Earl slipped (*Locrine*, unpublished until 1595 and then credited to "W.S.", is styled one of Oxford's early "dramatic pratfalls"). At each advance in his conjectured shadow-career, Oxford's documented career to that point is outlined.

Objectivity requires my mentioning possible causes for concern. Some Oxfordians — particularly members most sorely troubled by the Shakespeare establishment's hostility — will welcome this little book with some inner misgivings. When our central thesis is attacked as "lunatic" by comfortable academicians, what good will it do us to champion the Caruana-Sears tenet, which is that many of Oxford's earliest writings were issued, some pseudonymously, some "anonymously," i.e., with the names of others actually living attached? Given the vast assortment of youthful writings (and presumed pen names) ascribed here to de Vere, how do we sort through the welter of styles (rhymed fourteeners, neo-Grecian choruses in iambic pentameter, and occasional bouts of near-doggerel such as "Shall I die? Shall I fly?") with any hope of finding the "real" Oxford? How would Oxford have induced Arthur Brooke (identified here as a minor translator and young cousin of the Earl of Cobham), George Gascoigne (*Supposes*), or John Studley (the named translator of Seneca's *Agamemnon*) to take "anonymous" credit for his works, given their almost certain knowledge that they would be called to account for both brilliancies and deficiencies? How do Sears and Caruana defend the assignment of *so much* work to Oxford on the grounds, first, of the named author's supposed incapacity to have written a given piece; second, on the apparent incapacity to have written a given piece; and on the apparent assertion that the finished product "sounds like" Oxford's handiwork?

I have no final answer to such questions. But though the authors concede that theirs is a "radical" - seeming hypothesis, some of their conjectures appear to proceed logically (if somewhat far) from tendencies in Ogburn's work. Close reading shows that Caruana and Sears rarely if ever ascribe a work to Oxford merely upon the basis of its "sounding like" his style: *Horestes*, for one, is credited to him because of its coinages or retentions of rare words appearing almost uniquely in Shakespeare; because of its introduction of the soliloquy; its thematic resemblance (the "guilty mother" motif) to *Hamlet*; and its use of songs and comedic elements along the lines of the "mingled drama" which Samuel Johnson termed a Shakespearean characteristic.

Moreover, the authors have tried to ground as many attributions as possible in biographical circumstance: the 1560 translation of Ovid's *Narcissus* is assigned a physical proximity to John de Vere's careful placement of Arthur Golding very near to the youthful Earl of Oxford at the time and locale of the *Metamorphoses* translation (which would certainly qualify as an "anonymous" work by the Sears-Caruana definition). We may hope that any less certain attributions will benefit from defense in depth as *Oxford's Revenge* is shaped into its final form.

True, if Sears and Caruana proceed logically from Ogburn, they also proceed rather far. When we see the appended list of works which they believe Oxford issued anonymously or under pen names, and find *Jack Juggler*, *Ralph Roister Doister*, and *Patient Grissel* included, skepticism is appropriate. The team of Caruana and Sears, one feels, proceeds on a roughly parallel course to that of Mr. Ogburn; but only a mild initial divergence is needed for nearly parallel lines to diverge ever more as they fly further towards the infinite. Are such works as *Roister Doister* truly the ones we wish to embrace in our view of Oxford's early career? Or are there other works — forever lost in our tragic lack of plays predating the 1590's and early 1600's — that Oxford is more likely to have written? Its raising of such tantalizing questions, however, is a measure of the fascination to be found in *Oxford's Revenge*.

If we are unafraid of daring speculation, if we can already believe that Oxford's genius fluctuated from the relative crudities of the *Famous Victories* through the vigorous *Metamorphoses*, to sensitive and polished lyrics such as "Woman's Changeableness" and thence to the dramas that continue to stir the world, perhaps in embracing additional works we are merely acknowledging the restless versatility of genius itself, as we do with Pablo Picasso. In our present state of knowledge, however, our decision whether to accept Caruana's and Sears's ascriptions will be based partly on faith.

Nevertheless, the authors have a vital point in their favor: Shakespeare, whose languages surely included Latin, Greek, French and Italian, must have translated and dramatized extensively in training for his life's work. In brief, if the works cited here aren't young Oxford's, then we have yet to find his genuine fledgling efforts, some striking, some ungainly (and many concealed), much as these are. Meanwhile, by one yardstick, *Oxford's Revenge* is doing well: the booklet sold briskly at last year's SOS Annual Meeting

in Kenner, Louisiana (Ms. Caruana informs me that about 150 of the original 300 copies are still to be had).

*Oxford's Revenge*, too, has its salutary uses even for those who are unwilling to agree with its central thesis: for example, the authors measure the extent of illiteracy in Shakespeare's England, quoting a reasonable figure (95%); Andrew Gurr's *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* goes further, perhaps, in analyzing illiteracy by class, occupation and residence in or out of London, but the point is effectively made; such information could be useful to all Oxfordians in jousts with stubborn Stratfordians. *Oxford's Revenge* is recommended, then, as a worthy second purchase for collections already possessing *The Mysterious William Shakespeare*; the volume should be read, however, after acquaintance with Ogburn's masterpiece.

\*\*\*\*\*

To the Editor:

All the members of our Society would agree, I am sure, that the Society's newsletter does us great credit and has been the vehicle for highly important contributions to an understanding of the question of Shakespeare's identity, of Lord Oxford as Shakespeare and of what the plays can tell us. The point is too evident to need enlarging upon. It must be expected of any periodical, however, that some of its contents will invite query or dissent. There are some in recent issues on which I feel I must express a view.

To begin with the first page of the most recent issue (Spring, 1990). The point of publishing Mr. Stritmatter's letter of March 31st seems to me lost in default of comment on it. The letter enclosed a photocopy of a publication of 1619 by Jaggard which Mr. Stritmatter declares was "dedicated to Philip Herbert [Earl of Montgomery], King James, and Susan Herbert, nee Vere, with a long list of EO's titles ending in the contextually provocative 'etc.'" What seems to me most provocative, however, as I wrote at the time, is that the work was not dedicated to King James, who would have been named first if it had been. (James comes in because Philip Herbert was "Knight of the Bath to our dread Sovereign King James.") But the dedication begins "To the most noble and twin-like pair." This raises the question of who the other member of the twin-like pair was. Certainly Susan Vere and Herbert could not be considered a twin-like pair. Moreover, it is evident that Jaggard did not have her in mind in this role, for after reciting Sir Philip's honors he goes on in a separate paragraph to speak of "As also... the Lady Susan, daughter of the right honorable Edward Vere, Earl of Oxenforde," etc. As was pointed out in the newsletter, the First Folio was dedicated to "The most noble and incomparable pair of bretheren, William, Earl of Pembroke,... and Philip, Earl of Montgomery..." One would suppose, then, that Jaggard meant to dedicate his 1619 publication to the two Earls. Which leaves the question of what happened to Pembroke. Has anyone any ideas?

The same issue contains Gary Goldstein's exegesis of the scene in *As You Like It* between Touchstone and William. Mr. Goldstein deserves great credit for having discovered in Plato the metaphor of "drink, being pour'd out of a cup into a glass, by filling the one doth empty the other," as it is in the play. As a minor point, I should certainly take issue, however, with his assertion that the metaphor "is mocked both in Plato and in Shakespeare." I cannot see that it is mocked in either. My objection is that Mr. Goldstein bases the assertion on his having put words in Shakespeare's mouth; he has "the Elizabethan genius declaring that 'to have [wisdom] is to have [it forever]'" He offers no explanation of the dramatist's having so truncated his sentiment if that was what he meant. May I suggest that we stand by the arresting interpretation of the line proposed by Charles Vere, now Earl of Burford? Pointing out in the *Newsletter* that the Italian for "to have" is *avere*, he observes that with the translation the line reads "*Avere is avere*," or "*A Vere is a Vere*," which I must say I find persuasive — especially in the absence of any other explication of "To have is to have" that makes sense — and hence of the utmost significance.

Mr. Goldstein's article, "The Learned and the Lout," begins with the contention that "The first scene in act five of *As You Like It* — the one we have been considering — "has forever perplexed scholars." This is a breathtaking misstatement of fact unless the author restricts the term "scholars" to inhabitants of academe. The essentials of Mr. Goldstein's elucidation have long been in print, which he neglects to acknowledge while telling us that his own presentation is copyrighted.

With regard to Gary Goldstein's piece in the fall, 1989, issue of the *Newsletter*, entitled "Hamlet's Art of Falconry," I hope I may be forgiven when I say I take the strongest exception to it. In it the author purports to analyze Hamlet's remark that "I am but mad north-north-west; when the wind is southerly, I know a hawk from a handsaw" — properly a hemshaw, a heron. Repeating the well-known observation



that the first half of the remark could refer to Oxford's losses in support of the attempt to find a northwest passage across North America to the Orient, Mr. Goldstein finds in the second half that Oxford "is telling his noble audiences ... that he and his father-in-law, William Cecil, are mortal enemies and warning Cecil himself "that he knows who his mortal enemy is." This astonishing conclusion he reaches through misinformation and attenuated reasoning of the kind that put us at the mercy of ridicule from the orthodox. ("You see the kind of nonsense the case for Oxford is based on.")

The major steps in his argument are the significance of the heron to the ancient Egyptians and the bird's migration along the Nile, none of which has the least relevance to the habit of the heron in England, and a citation from an ill-conceived publication of 1635, which tells us that "the heron or hernshaw...hath a marvelous hatred to the hawk, which hatred is duly returned," and that "When they fight above the air, they labour both especially for this one thing, that one may ascend and be above the other." Now Oxford was an attentive and, as we should say today, compassionate observer of nature. He would have known that hatred is an emotion for which wild creatures, in their struggle for existence, have no surplus energy; malevolence is strictly a function of human nature. To the hawk — the falcon, to be specific — the heron represents a potential square meal while to the heron the hawk is simply a dangerous foe to be eluded. It is true that in the pursuit by the former of the latter, each tries to gain the advantage to altitude, the falcon in order to stoop upon the quarry with outstretched fists and break its back, the latter in order to escape. The author of the 1635 tidbit to the contrary notwithstanding, they do not "fight." Mr. Goldstein further informs us, as being presumably much to the point, that "the heron, in Egyptian mythology, fed upon *Ver* (French for worm) as it migrated north," which is reaching very far indeed, even apart from the fact that, whatever Egyptian myth-makers may have believed, herons do not feed upon worms. That is not all. Herons being a favorite quarry of falconers, Mr. Goldstein informs us — interestingly enough, I admit — that herons and their eggs were protected by Act of Parliament, but then goes on to assert that "William Cecil as Lord Treasurer and Principal Secretary of State,...was able to protect himself and his progeny by ensuring that hunters like de Vere were unable to molest 'herons' or their eggs" — an assertion that to me qualifies for the "How's that again? Department."

The trouble with characterizing the relationship between Oxford and Cecil as analagous to that between hawk and heron, apart from its being without perceptible justification, is that it makes Oxford out to be a dedicated predator and Cecil his hapless prey who seeks only to evade his death-dealing onslaught.

A further point. Mr. Goldstein asserts categorically that "only aristocrats and royalty were allowed to hunt with the hawk, the noblest of birds and a born hunter." The truth at which Mr. Goldstein is aiming is that only nobleman of the rank of earl and above were privileged to fly the peregrine, a fact of some interest in view of Shakespeare's frequent allusions to falconry in which it is the peregrine that figures; it was the peregrine that was flown against herons. Each social rank had a species of hawk, deemed appropriate, assigned to it, beginning on the lowest rung, according to the *Boke of St. Albans* (ca. 1486) with priests and holywater clerks, to whom was allotted the small but efficacious sparrow-hawk.

Finally, in the winter, 1990, issue of the *Newsletter*. Mr. Goldstein would have us believe, if I construe correctly a sentence badly garbled by the printer (I assume), that the "entire message" of *The Tempest* can be interpreted only in terms of Isaiah 29, which one gathers he considers its source. (This comes just before a fantastic derivation of "Rosaline" from an anagram in Hebrew of four letters in "Vavator" spelled backwards.) Well, it is true that "Ariel" occurs in the first line of Isaiah, but as the name of Jerusalem, and that mention is made of a visitation by "The Lord of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest, and the flame of devouring fire." However, if the reader detects any further parallel between Isaiah and Shakespeare's play or finds the spirit of the two other than poles apart, I shall be very much surprised.

Charlton Ogburn

Dear Editor:

Jan. 24, 1990

Although I was delighted to see my letter to Mr. Ogburn reprinted, along with that tantalizing dedication to *Mexia's Treasury* (1619) on the front page of the Spring newsletter, I'd like to apprise any curious readers of an important inaccuracy in my description of the dedication. King James is named in the dedication only to assist in identifying Phillip Herbert as a Knight of the Bath and not, as I stated in my letter, as a dedicatee.



Furthermore, as Mr. Ogburn has so kindly pointed out to me, there is an enigma about the entire dedication. One would expect that the "most noble and Twin-like pair" would refer to Phillip and William Herbert, the dedicatees of the first folio. The conjunction "as also" would seem to apply that Susan Vere is not the second twin. However, Montgomery was a title of Phillip Herbert's and not of his brother William. Therefore the dedication seems to name only one of the "Twin-like pair" and leaves the identity of the second one obscure. The reason for this lacunae are not apparent. If any readers can dispel the mystery, I would be most grateful.

In the meantime, I suggest that this discovery be taken as an indication of the extraordinary opportunities which are still available for Oxfordian sleuths. That smoking gun is out there somewhere. Let's find it!

Roger Stritmatter

Dear Charlton Ogburn:

July 23, 1990

My reaction to the "Twin-like paire" is different from yours. I thought immediately that Phillip and Susan were twin-like in being related to the best Elizabethan writers in being patrons of the arts, in having many dedications made to each, and in probably seeming to Jaggard like twins. I further thought immediately that the Folio dedication was probably to be made to this pair, Susan being deVere's daughter, who no doubt promoted the publication of the plays, rather than to William and Phillip as the pair of brethren. You seem to think that Phillip and William would be more twin-like than Phillip and Susan, but I don't see why. A married couple is a more obvious pair than two brothers are a pair.

Also it seems clear to me that the dedication "to" Phillip and "As Also to" Susan logically makes them the pair...

Winifred L. Frazer

Ed. note: Gary Goldstein informed me by letter (7/26/90) that he did not agree with Mr. Ogburn's critique but "If...*avere* in Italian means 'to have' (it) would obviously add great resonance to the line in *As You Like It*, 'to have is to have,' but does not invalidate my own analysis."

\*\*\*\*\*

CLAREMONT MCKENNA COLLEGE'S SHAKESPEARE CLINIC\*

By

Peter R. Moore

Last April the Shakespeare Clinic of Claremont McKenna College, headed by political science Prof. Ward Elliott, released statistical results from its three year study of the Shakespeare authorship problem. The Clinic used a computer to compare selected linguistic tendencies in Shakespeare's poetry to fifty-eight of his contemporaries, including the Earl of Oxford. The conclusion is that none of the other poets wrote like Shakespeare, hence it was highly unlikely that any of them was the true author of Shakespeare's works...

I was naturally quite interested in these results, and so I wrote to Prof. Elliott who responded in a most cooperative manner, mailing me a great deal of material and phoning me on three occasions... The [Clinic's] tests are of two types, [one being] nine "conventional" tests... [which this] article is concerned with...

The nine tests are as follows. "Line Beginnings" tests word choice at the start of sentences and lines

\* Ed. Note: Mr. Moore submitted a much more detailed, comprehensive and lengthy analysis but authorized me to foreshorten it. I will duplicate and mail a copy of his complete article to anyone who writes me.

of verse. I have not seen an explanation of how it works, but the "Report" says that Oxford matches Shakespeare, so I didn't pursue it. "Feminine Endings" counts the percentage of verse lines that end with an unstressed syllable; Oxford got a tentative mismatch on this test. "Open Endings" counts the percentage of verse lines that have no punctuation mark at the end. Oxford reportedly matches Shakespeare on this test. Oxford reportedly mismatched Shakespeare on the remaining six tests. "Hyphenated Compound Words" counts the rate of such words per thousand words in the verse of each author. "Relative Clauses" counts the rate per thousand words of relative pronouns and clauses beginning with such words as 'that,' 'which,' 'who,' and 'whom.' "Percentage Word Length" counts the number of words of each poet that are made up of one letter, two letters, three letters, etc., up to twelve-letter words, expressing each as a percent of the total. As no poet uses many words of thirteen or more letters, the summed percentage of one-to twelve letter words should amount to almost 100%. "Exclamation Points" counts the rate of occurrence of this punctuation mark for each author. "Reading Ease" and "Fog Index" are unexplained combinations of sentence length and word length. Incidentally, Prof. Elliott remarked to me that his group regards hyphenated Compound Words, Relative Clauses, and Exclamation Points as their best tests.

...

Before looking further into the nine tests, I would like to express several reservations to this procedure. First, Shakspeare of Stratford is not tested, maintaining his status as the Teflon candidate. Second, when scientists or engineers devise a new yardstick or other measuring device, it is normally validated on known distances before being used to measure a disputed or unknown quantity. The Shakespeare Clinic's nine conventional tests ... have not been validated. Third, the canon of poems for Oxford is small and uncertain, as he had no known involvement in the publication of fifteen of them.

Fourth, the Shakespeare Clinic's "Report" ignores the time factor. Shakespeare's poetry was published from 1593 to 1609 and was probably not begun until the early 1590s... Nine of Oxford's poems had been published by 1576, three more were quoted in a book that appeared in 1582, the next three are of uncertain date, while the last was responded to by Sir Philip Sidney, who died in 1586. There is a gap of about fifteen years between the bulk of the Oxford canon and the start of Shakespeare's nondramatic verse ... three important events occurred during or just before the gap. Oxford traveled extensively in Italy and France in 1576, which should have greatly increased his knowledge of the languages and literature of those nations; on his return he was regarded as an Italianized Englishman. This trip followed the writing of his first nine poems and possibly some of the others. Next, the English language was in a process of transition throughout the period. Not only was its vocabulary increasing by leaps and bounds, but it was changing in more fundamental matters like pronouns, possessives, punctuation, and verb forms. [To quote] from A.C. Partridge's valuable *Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama*:

"In vocabulary, accidence, syntax, colloquial usage, spelling, punctuation, and handwriting, the period from Spenser's 'Shepherd's Calendar' (1579) to the closing of the theatres (1642) was one of great flexibility, fluidity and change. A writer who began his literary career in one writing style might end it in another markedly different in its details." (p. 106).

...

Sir Edmund Chambers' preface to *The Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse* describes the poverty of English poets during the middle decades of that century, concluding:

"The most hopeful of them was Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, a real courtier, but an ill-conditioned youth, who also became quite mute in later life. The revival begins with Edmund Spenser's 'Shepherd's Calendar' in 1579. And thereafter, of course, there is God's plenty." (p. vii).

The reader of the "Report" is confronted with pages and pages of tables containing thousands of numbers. Anyone familiar with this sort of work knows that the data can not be taken on trust. [Mr. Moore illustrates that the data is inaccurate]

The Clinic feels that one of its best tests is its exclamation mark count; Shakespeare's works show some exclamation marks, and May's edition of Oxford's poems show none. But, again, the Clinic neglected the time factor. According to Partridge (pp. 124-126), the exclamation mark was not used in England until the 1590s, that is, after Oxford's poetry was written!

Alert readers may have wondered how the Clinic could judge Shakespeare's use of exclamation marks, as there is no presumption that the punctuation in Shakespeare's early texts is his, rather than that of a scribe or publisher. The answer is that the Clinic took its punctuation for Shakespeare straight from the 1974 Riverside edition of Shakespeare's works, edited by Prof. G. Blackmore Evans of Harvard. The clinic did not bother to study Elizabethan punctuation, nor did they notice Prof. Evans' careful description (pp. vi and 39-40) of his unusual, intentionally archaic approach to punctuation. Three of the Clinic's nine tests are direct counts of punctuation (Open Endings, Hyphenated Compounds, and Exclamation Marks), while two more are also dependent on punctuation (Reading Ease and Fog Index depend on sentence length, which depends on the placement of periods, question and exclamation marks) . . .

On the matter of hypens we may note another item. Over 99% of the Shakespeare poetry analyzed by the Clinic was originally printed by two publishers, Richard Field printed "Venus and Adonis" and "Lucrece," while George Eld printed the Sonnets and "A Lover's Complaint" (for Thomas Thorpe). The Clinic's "Report" shows some significant differences in hyphenation between these two publishers, with Field using about 70% more hyphens per thousand words . . . Does this reflect Shakespeare's word use changing over time or genre; does it capture punctuational differences between Field and Eld; does it simply pick up variations in Prof. Evans habits; or is it something else? These are the sort of questions the Clinic should have asked before making assertions like "Shakespeare...loved compound words." (Prof. Elliott to the *Washington Post*, April 17, 1990) . . .

I mentioned earlier that the Clinic's nine conventional tests had not been validated, to which the Clinic might reply that the high rate of consistency among different blocks of Shakespeare's poetry is validation of sorts. But it is not validation of the conventional tests' ability to distinguish different poets, rather than distinguish different editors . . .

English punctuation in Shakespeare's day was evolving rapidly with printers being far ahead of the educated public (save for Ben Jonson). Most surviving manuscript letters, poems, and plays are very lightly punctuated, and punctuation was then added by scribes, play directors, and printers. Expert conjecture on Shakespeare's punctuation is tentative and conflicting. . . Commas, semi-colons, colons, periods, and question marks are used today according to a logical grammatical system. But we simply accept the dictionaries' authority on 'already,' 'all-around,' and 'all right,' which, so far as I can see, reflects no particular logic, but rather the usage dictated by a few authoritative books like the King James Bible and standard editions of Shakespeare, and a few authoritative lexicographers like Samuel Johnson and Noah Webster. Any study of Shakespeare that has a punctuational basis must consider these matters in detail. The Clinic failed to do so.

Let us consider the four non-punctuation dependent tests. The Clinic passed Oxford on Line Beginnings and, as we have seen, he also passes on Percentage Word Length once the Clinic's faulty data is corrected, but he allegedly fails on Relative Clauses. This test has two main subtests, Relative Pronouns and Relative Clauses. Oxford is within Shakespeare's range and within two standard deviations of Shakespeare's mean on Relative Pronouns, so he passes that subtest. The Relative Clause subtest is broken into six categories, and Oxford is well within Shakespeare's range on five of them; he is outside Shakespeare's range in having too many relative clauses beginning with the word 'that.'

On the total Relative Clause subtest score, Oxford shows 60 relative clauses, but would have passed had he had only 58. In other words, Oxford matches Shakespeare on six of seven subtests, but is given a 'mismatch' for two too many 'thats.' This...outcome could be reversed by a small change in Oxford's canon, but let us accept the methodology and improve the test by considering the time factor. . .

Casual inspection reveals that the number of 'thats' falls off sharply with the later poems . . . In other words, the youthful Oxford was already moving in Shakespeare's direction, and so when the time factor is taken into account, Oxford passes on Relative Clauses.

We now consider the final test, Feminine Endings ... Oxford has virtually no feminine lines, while about 10% of Shakespeare's lines are feminine. Clearly Oxford mismatches Shakespeare, but that is to be expected if the time factor is considered. Poetry in that period first sought to achieve regularity of meter and then moved toward studied irregularity. This trend is found in sixteenth century English poetry in general, in dramatic verse in the second half of the century, and in Shakespeare's works. Feminine lines are a form of irregularity, and so we should not expect to find as many in Oxford's youthful poetry as in Shakespeare's mature poetry.

In conclusion, the "Report" of the Shakespeare Clinic has the following initial faults. Shakspeare is let off the hook, the methodology has not been validated, Oxford's small and uncertain canon makes a treacherous basis for statistical analysis, and the time factor has been ignored. As we begin to examine the tests in detail, they crumble. Serious bias is seen in setting up the scoring system, as Relative Clauses and Relative Pronouns are lumped together as one test, when they are really two different things, while Reading Ease and Fog Index, which really measure the same thing, are counted as two tests. I do not think that this bias was intentional ... errors in counting up the basic data are found with ease; one of them, Daniel's word count, sticks out like a sore thumb ... Oxford is hit for lacking exclamation marks though his poems were written before there were any such marks. All of the five punctuation tests simply capture the usual pointing of the Riverside Shakespeare ... The Clinic failed to 'standardize' its data, to use the technical term for removing the effects of extraneous variables. The four tests not based on punctuation might hold some interest if the data could be trusted, which is not presently the case. But even if they were redone properly, they would only have the status of evidence, data, or tendencies subject to interpretation rather than decisive tests. At any rate, and for what they're worth, they support the Oxford theory.

\*\*\*\*\*

*"I have never been more fascinated and intrigued. Where has he been all my life!"*

Shakespeare/Oxford Society

July 18, 1990

Dear Sir:

I very much wish to join your Society. . .

I certainly regret having heard of Oxford only last year on a PBS broadcast! I had always dismissed "Other Authorship Theories" as so much nonsense, but this program was quite interesting, and Oxford's advocates seemed so convinced and so devoted! I began my own investigation out of mere curiosity, starting with *Dict. Nat'l. Biog.* and whatever else I could find in the peerages, *Essex Worthies*, Burghley biographies and of course looking at the known facts of the Stratford "Bard" with new eyes. By golly, Oxford looked like the man in too many ways to ignore. Keeping what I had learned in mind, I reread Shakespeare . . . It was, in a sense, reading it for the first time. Suddenly lines took on new meanings, characters took on new life. That wasn't enough, though. I took a "crash course" in Elizabethan history, biographies, and literature, and a "hidden Oxford" in the middle of it all seemed to be the only explanation for obscure events and writing. Finally I read with much delight Charlton Ogburn's *The Mysterious William Shakespeare*. There, in print, were many of my own conclusions, along with numerous letters and documents which I had longed to see. Still, I have a few further thoughts which I would like to share with Oxfordians or anyone interested.

My background and qualifications as any kind of authority on Edward De Vere may seem lacking, but my enthusiasm for his cause is not. I have never been more fascinated and intrigued. Where has he been all my life!

I'm married, age 59, with children and grandchildren, and have been a substitute teacher for many years. High school valedictorian. B.A. degree (Plan II liberal arts) University of Texas, 1953, Magna Cum Laude. (Within the degree, hours for English major, history minor; education credits for permanent Teacher's Certificate over and above other hours.) Phi Beta Kappa. I have maintained a life-long love of English history and literature, and indeed just about everything relating to England. (My husband and I have made six trips within the last ten years, including two visits to Stratford, which I now begrudge except for the plays) . . .

My husband, a banker and attorney, is a descendant of the early Maryland Cecils. Through the second marriage of the fifth son (Thomas) of the elder son Thomas (Exeter), he is therefore the 9th great-grandson of the arch-villain of the whole works---Burghley! Doesn't that make it interesting for us!

(We visited Burghley House on one of our trips. Now he has to listen to my constant railing about his ancestor.) We have forgiven Burghley in this much: without him, there would not have been a "Shakespeare" as we have him today. Oxford's talents and genius would have developed along quite different lines, one Images . . . happier for him, but sadder for the literature of the world, and a loss to the English language...

And I believe his influence on the literary scene is far greater than has been imagined, and goes beyond his known associates and friends. I think there are some amazing discoveries to be made, and some good chuckles to be had when some of those passages are "decoded." . . .

Sincerely,  
Fran Gidley  
(Mrs. William J. Gidley)  
600 N. Whiting St.  
Baytown, Texas 77520

\*\*\*\*\*

#### NORTH CAROLINA SHAKESPEARE FESTIVAL

Aug. 3-5, 1990

Trustee Trudy Atkins brilliantly arranged for The Shakespeare Oxford Society to participate in the annual Shakespeare Festival in High Point, N.C. on August 4. High School Teachers, who had previously attended seminars on the authorship question, were presented Certificates by David Helberg, former Associate Superintendent of Greensboro, N.C. Public Schools, at a luncheon sponsored by our Society. Charlton Ogburn, introduced as "The Myriad-Minded Man of the 20th Century," then gave an outstanding, convincing and enthusiastically applauded summary of the case for the "Myriad-Minded Man of the Renaissance" and the case against the unlettered Stratford man.

At a Town Meeting in the afternoon, which attracted a large and attentive audience, Joseph Sobran, syndicated columnist and Senior Editor of the National Review, skillfully made the case for deVere and Professor D. K. Fosso of Wake Forest University advocated the traditional attribution. This debate was objectively covered in the High Point Enterprise in an article starting on the first page, by the Greensboro News-Record in an article under the banner head on the City-State Section, and by the Raleigh News and Observer in an article on the front page of the Lifestyle Section.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### From THE DRAMATISTS GUILD QUARTERLY (Spring 1990)\*

Prompted by the recent references in print to the Earl of Oxford, K. C. Ligon, author of *Isle of Dogs*, a prize-winning play about the Earl, offers this detail about the man who some believe wrote the Shakespeare plays:

"In 1586, Edward De Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, then 36, received a Privy Seal Warrant signed by Elizabeth I for a grant of 1,000 pounds per annum (a sum of amazing size at that time, equal perhaps to 1 percent of the total cost of maintaining the civil government of England). Oxford was not asked to account specifically for this money paid from the Secret Service Fund, giving the apparently unmilitary enterprise the flavor of politics nonetheless. I believe the grant was a commission for the writing of the English Chronicle plays, to be presented on public stages by Oxford's company and others, and fostered works like *Henry V*, which feverishly promoted the glory of a unified British people, who, in the late 1580s were under serious threat of foreign invasion. By the time the Armada failed in 1588, many successful historical plays had been performed. Oxford, well-known in court circles as a masterful dramatist and the patron and employer of playwrights, is thought to have been at the center of a profound connection between theater and the corridors of power, and not only witty in himself, as Falstaff says, "but the cause that wit is in other men."

Ligon's aforementioned play, *Isle of Dogs* (not *I Love Dogs*, as one of her characters in her play-within-a-play surmises), was the 1989 winner of the \$1,500 Miller Award, given specifically for a play about some aspect of De Vere's life. The award, presented by the Deep South Writers Conference at the

University of Southwestern Louisiana, is endowed by a Jennings, La., couple with an abiding interest in De Vere. There were 17 entries for the 1989 Miller Award, "a healthy number" Ligon thought, for an unusual entry category.

An actress as well as a teacher at Circle in the Square Theater, Ligon became interested in De Vere when a friend gave her a biography, and she was instantly struck by the dramatic possibilities of this man as Shakespeare, she explained, 'I couldn't dream up a more likely person to have written the Shakespeare works than De Vere, or a less likely candidate, frankly, than the man from Stratford, about whom we know so little - and what we do know does not suggest his having been a writer of any kind.'

\*Contributed by Gary Goldstein

\*\*\*\*\*

#### 14TH ANNUAL MEETING AND CONFERENCES OF THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY

Oct. 26, 27, 28, 1990

Doubletree Hotel 191 N. Los Robles, Pasadena, Ca. 91101 (800) 528-0444 or (818) 792-2727.

For further information contact Conference Chairman: Barbara Gilfillan Crowley, 815 Linda Vista Ave., Pasadena, Ca. 91105 (818) 795-8221.

\*\*\*\*\*

TENTATIVE ITINERARY FOR PROPOSED SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY 14 DAY TOUR OF ENGLAND IN MAY 1991 (Around twenty members of the Society have enlisted - estimated cost between \$2000 - \$2300 per person).

First Day - Flight to London; 3 days in London includes Westminster Abbey & Hall, Inns of Court, Sites of Rose and Globe Theaters and a Shakespeare play at the Barbican; 9 days in Country, includes Hedingham Castle, Wivenhoe, Cambridge, Warwick Castle, Cotswolds, Stratford, Bath, Wilton House, Rugby, Oxford and Hampton Court and staying in such accommodations as Swan Hotel, Lygon Arms and The Angel; 1 day in Canterbury or London, and last day return to U.S.

Several people have shown interest in staying longer and seeing more. As long as later return date is specified when purchasing ticket, one may stay longer without impunity!

Anyone who wishes to join or has any ideas for an extended tour, or wants more specific details, please contact Edith Duffey, 2732 Dogwood Rd., Durham, N.C. 27705 (919-489-3938) or Betty Sears, 36 Pertridge Ln., Boxford, Ma. 01921 (508-887-6570).

\*\*\*\*\*

#### JOIN SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY AND RECEIVE QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

The purpose of the Shakespeare Oxford Society is to document and establish Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford (1550-1605) as the universally recognized author of the works of William Shakespeare. Each Newsletter carries articles which impart a wide range of corroborating information and commentary.

Student: \$10.00 Annual Dues Regular: \$25.00 Sustaining \$50 or more

1. Dues and requests for membership information to:

Victor Crichton, 207 W. 108th St., Apt. 10-D, New York, New York 10025

2. Submit materials for publication in the Newsletter to:

Morse Johnson, Editor, 105 West 4th St., Suite #819, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

NOTA BENE: The Shakespeare Oxford Society was founded and incorporated in 1957 in the State of New York and is chartered under the membership cooperation laws of that state as a non-profit educational organization. Dues, grants and contributions are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law. The Shakespeare Oxford Society IRS number is 13,6105314. The New York Tax number is: 07182.



Morse Johnson, Editor  
105 West 4th Street, Suite #819, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

## GEORGE SAMPSON:

"How did (the Stratford-on-Avon man) reach the wit, the humor and the assured mastery of verse exhibited in a delightful early comedy like *Love's Labour's Lost*? These are some of the questions to which we (Stratfordians) desire an answer, but answer there is none."

-v.-

## GEORGE SAMPSON:

"...(anti-Stratfordians are) a succession of cranks representing the extreme of ignorant credulity and morbid ingenuity."

## PREFACE

Tradition has attributed the works of William Shakespeare (or Shake-speare) - as the name was consistently spelled on all the published works - to Will. Shakspeare - as his name was spelled in the Burial Registry (1818) - who was born in Stratford-on-Avon in 1564. A preponderant majority of Shakespearean scholars and buffs have endorsed that attribution and are identified as Stratfordians, and a minority of Shakespearean scholars and buffs have rejected it and are identified as anti-Stratfordians. This long time and world-wide controversy has been labeled the Shakespeare authorship question. (Stratfordians quoted or referred to herein are identified by capitalizing their names and the anti-Stratfordians are not capitalized. References to the Stratford man's documented life, experiences and learning are indicated by the name, Will. Shakspeare, and deductions based on what the works reveal about the life, experiences and learning of their author are indicated by the name, Shakespeare.)

The purpose of this article is to illustrate that by their own deductions, depictions and perplexities and their recognition of irrefutable facts, Stratfordians have demonstrated that Will. Shakspeare could not have been the author of the works of Shakespeare.

\*\*\*\*

Prior to Will. Shakspeare's assumed departure from Stratford to London around 1587-88, his birth, marriage and the birth of his three children are the only extant recorded facts about him. Since there are no facts proving that Will. Shakspeare attended any school, Stratfordians have been compelled to rely on hearsay not reported until the early 18th century by NICHOLAS ROWE:

...tho' (Will. Shakspeare) was the eldest son, (his father) gave him no better education than his own employment [a butcher and/or draper]. (His father) had bred him 'tis true, for some time at (the Stratford) Free-School\* where 'tis probable he acquir'd the little Latin he was master of: but...the want of his assistance at home, forc'd his father to withdraw him from thence...(Emphasis added.)

\* Ed. note: The roster of that school's pupils and its curriculum during the 1570s have never been located. It is, however, possible that Will. Shakspeare studied Latin during his assumed foreshortened attendance there.

Stratfordians recognize that the only extant handwritings of Will. Shakspeare are six shakily written, with some blots and illegible letters and variably spelled, signatures on four documents, in none of which



Is the last name spelled "Shakespeare" or has any association with literary interests, and were only inscribed in the last four years of his life.

JAMES O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPS:

Removed prematurely from school, residing with illiterate relatives in a bookless neighborhood, thrown into the midst of occupations adverse to scholastic progress - it is difficult to believe that when he first left Stratford he was not all but destitute of polished accomplishments. He could not, at all events, under the circumstances in which he had then so long been placed, have had the opportunity for acquiring a refined style of composition.

Sir G. G. Greenwood reported that:

...exception has been taken to [the above] phrase, 'bookless neighborhood'...It is...obvious that all Mr. PHILLIPS meant was that the possession of books among the good people of (Stratford) was a very exceptional distinction indeed; and this is fully borne out by the fact that so many townsmen, 'aldermen and burgesses' included, are shown to have been illiterate (and) the great majority of the good people of Stratford, in Shakespeare's time were altogether illiterate...

RICHARD GRANT WHITE:

It is only in London that those plays could have been written. London had but just before Shakespeare's day made its metropolitan supremacy felt as well as acknowledged throughout England. As long as two hundred years after that time the county of each Member of Parliament was betrayed by his tongue...(Shakespeare's) language would have been a dialect which must needs have been translated to be understood by modern English ears.

EDWARD GARNETT and EDMUND GOSSE:

Nothing is more remarkable in (Shakespeare's) earliest productions than their perfect polish and urbanity. The principal characters in *Love's Labour's Lost* are princes and nobles, true to the models he might have found in contemporary society. The young patricians in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* have in every respect the ideas and manners of their class. The creator of such personages must have been in better company and enjoyed a wider outlook upon society than can easily be believed attainable by an actor or a resident in a single city...that knowledge of good society (and) easy and confident attitude towards mankind which appears in Shakespeare's plays from the first and which...are so unlike what might have been expected from a Stratford rustic or London actor. (Emphasis added.)

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS:

...If we are forced to think of (Will. Shakespeare) as early snatched from school, working all day in a butcher shop, growing up in a home devoid of books and of literary atmosphere...we find it hard to understand how he suddenly blossomed out as one of England's greatest men of letters with every mark of literary culture.

J. DOVER WILSON:

It is also clear that, if the author of *Merry Wives* knew his middle class, the author of *Love's Labour's Lost* had made himself equally familiar with the life, manner and conversation of ladies and gentlemen of the land. To credit that amazing piece of virtuosity to a butcher boy who left school at 13 or even to one whose education was nothing more than what a grammar school end residence in a little provincial borough could provide is to invite one either to believe in miracles or to disbelieve in the man of Stratford.

Stratfordians recognize that from the time Will. Shakespeare is assumed to have arrived in London, the first recorded mention in London of the name Shakespeare (however spelled) - then only as a poet - was in 1593, as an actor not until 1595, and as a playwright not until 1598.

**SAMUEL SCHOENBAUM:**

...By 1592 (Will. Shakspeare) had made his mark as a playwright.

Authoritative Stratfordians have claimed that during the period 1587-88 - 1595 Will. Shakspeare was a prominent and busy actor which required frequent participation in rehearsals and performances during the daytime, was familiar with the administrative and artistic responsibilities for many of the operations of an acting company, and mastered the techniques and lore of dramaturgy and fraternized with other playwrights, poets, actors and aristocrats.

Authoritative Stratfordians have also claimed that during the same 1587-88 - 1595 period he, with a quill, and if during nighttime only by candlelight, wrote at least as many as 10 of the plays according to almost all Stratfordians, the elegant and lengthy poems *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* and at least 50 technically demanding and polished sonnets.

**ALLARDYCE NICOLL:**

Sometimes, we may suppose, the peculiar parallels between the plays and works by others may be due to coincidence, to the intermediary writings now lost or to that of conversations with friends but even when allowance has been made for all such possibilities, enough remains to warrant the assumption that Shakespeare was easily familiar with Latin, French and Italian, that he read widely in these as in English, and that he frequently took the trouble to examine several renderings of a story before he himself sat down to write ...we are coming more and more to believe that he took far greater pains with his preparatory planning than had hitherto been supposed. Quite clearly, he read much more than Holinshed's *Chronicles* when he was writing the history plays.

Many Stratfordians have also recognized that Shakespeare's works attest that their author had been an omnivorous reader. The following is a list of authors (last names only) of the books, some of which by that time had not been translated, Shakespeare had read at least in part, or, in some instances, had extensive conversations about, as deduced from the plays, sonnets and poems by, among others: A.L. ROWSE; KENNETH MUIR; WILLIAM ALLEN NEILSON and ASHLEY HORACE THORNDIKE; JOSEPH SATIN; T.W. BALDWIN; PAUL N. SIEGAL; and VIVIAN THOMAS:

Aeschylus, Aesop, Atricens, Alexandrinus, "Anonymous", Appian, Ariosto, Aristophanes, Augustine, Bandello, Boccaccio, Bright, (Arthur) Brooke, Buchanan, Caesar, Camerarius, Cerdano, Castiglione, Catullus, Caxton, Chaucer, Cicero, Cinthio, Daniel, Dante, De Belleforest, de Montemayor, duBartas, Eden, Elyot, Erasmus, Euripides, Fabian, Fiorentino, Forman, Foxe, Froissart, Fullbecke, Galen, Garnier, Gascoigne, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Gower, Grafton, (Saxo) Grammaticus, Guazzo, Hakluyt, Hall, Harsnett, Henryson, Hesoid, Hippocrates, Holinshed, Homer, Horace, Howard, Josephus, Juvenal, Legge, Leslie, Livy, Lucian, Lucretius, Machiavelli, Mantua, Marienus, Martial, Mexia, Montaigne, More, Ovid, Painter, Palingenius, Paracelsus, Pasqualigo, Petrarch, Plautus, Pliny, Plowden, Plutarch, Pythagoras, Quintilian, Rabelais, Rawley, Riche, Ronsard, Sallust, Scot, Seneca, Sidney, Silvayn, Sophocles, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Straparola, Stow, Suetonius, Tacitus, Tasso, Terence, Thomas, Twyne, (Polydore) Vergil, (Mero) Virgil, Warner, Wright, Xenophon and five Arthurian romances.

**T.W. BALDWIN:**

It is easy enough to find books once owned by Ben Jonson. Had Will. Shakspeare purchased books as ardently as he did...real property, we should certainly have more trace of his activities in that way...we have no absolutely conclusive external proof that he ever owned a book of any kind.

**WILLIAM ALLEN NEILSON and ASHLEY HORACE THORNDIKE:**

...only a fraction of what any author reads leaves a mark that can be identified in what he writes.

Since there were no public libraries in London at that time, where and how did Will. Shakspeare find and read those books, save for Latin classics which, if he attended that Stratford Free-School, he may have been exposed to? As one of many examples, the book, which was undoubtedly the creative springboard for *The Merchant of Venice*, certainly could only have been found, if at all, in a private library in London. About that book, JOSEPH SATIN wrote:

The most productive source of this play is a novella by Giovanni Fiorentino...which appeared in a collection of his entitled *Il Pecorone*...in 1378. *Il Pecorone* consists of fifty novellas divided into 'Days', groups of ten stories like its model the Decameron...The 'merchant of Venice' story is the first story of the fourth day, and no translation of it existed in Shakespear's day. We may assume that Shakespeare read it in the original (Italian)...

Charlton Ogburn:

...*Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age*. Published in 1918 under an ode to Shakespeare by the Poet Laureate, ROBERT BRIDGES, the work covers its subject in thirty chapters, each of which takes up a different feature of the Elizabethan Age with particular reference to the treatment it receives in Shakespeare. The two-score contributors are all (Stratfordians)...

...(It) devotes 150 pages to "Sports and Pastimes" in Elizabethan and Jacobean times. Hunting, falconry, coursing with greyhounds, archery, fencing and duelling, horsemanship, dancing, and games are treated in detail and illumined with quotations from Shakespeare that show his precise and comprehensive knowledge of the subject. A portrait of the dramatist is limned as a man of leisure able to have indulged freely in the nobility's active diversions and make himself proficient in them. If he was ever guilty of a slip in treating them he has not been caught in it. Concluding the section on hunting, the Honorable J.W. FORTESCUE comments that probably 'in all ages good sportsmen, like good men, are rarer than bad: but good there must have been in all times, and among the best of the sixteenth century we must certainly rank William Shakspeare.'

PAUL M. SIEGAL:

From the very beginning of his history plays Shakespeare conceived of history as being an organic process - germinating, growing, decaying, renewing itself...*Titus Andronicus*, written very early in (Will. Shakspeare's) career and without a source, 'seems to be', as T.J.B. SPENCER says, 'a quintessence of impressions derived from an eager reading of Roman history rather than a real effort at verisimilitude,' as contrasted with 'the care and authenticity' of the later Roman plays. The political institutions in it are derived from many periods in Roman history (Emphasis added).

VIVIAN THOMAS:

Clearly, *Titus Andronicus* stands apart from the three plays categorized as Roman. This early play lacks the rich historical source material which Shakespeare was able to draw on for his mature Roman plays, but it merits more than passing consideration because it reflects so clearly Shakespeare's early awareness of the potency of Roman insights into Shakespeare's exploration of the relationship between the conflicting values of warfare and civilised living (Emphasis added).

T.J.B. SPENCER:

Ancient, and in particular Roman, history was explored as the material of political lessons, because it was one of the few bodies of consistent and continuous historical material available...In writing his Roman plays Shakespeare was touching upon the gravest and most exciting, as well as the most pedantic, of Renaissance studies of European scholarship...

...in spite of literary admiration for Cicero, the Romans in the imagination of the sixteenth century were Suetonian and Tacitan rather than Plutarchan...it required a considerable intellectual feat to substitute the Plutarchan vision of Rome (mostly republican) for the customary line of the Imperial Caesars. Montaigne and Shakespeare were capable of that feat. Not many others were.

VIVIAN THOMAS:

The aim of this book is to show how a clear understanding of Shakespeare's exploration and articulation of Roman values provides an invaluable means of gaining fresh critical insights into the Roman plays. The most striking feature of these plays is that, more than any other group of plays or any individual play, they create an intense sense of a social universe - not just a sense of place but an awareness of the values, attitudes, aspirations, and idiosyncrasies of the different Romes which are portrayed in *Titus Andronicus*, *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*. Shakespeare gives a palpable sense of the Roman world in diverse ways: the physical landmarks of Rome, such as the Tiber and the Capitol, are mentioned with great frequency; there are numerous references to Roman manners and customs - the Feast of Lupercal in the opening scenes of *Julius Caesar* for example; political and religious institutions and officials are ever present, such as tribunes, aediles, patricians, augurers, flamens (priests) or lictors (ushers); the mythology of the pantheon and references to the gods pervade the plays; and Roman history, including most vitally its Trojan origins, is focused in the minds of the major participants. Yet, when all this is recognized, the most important reason for feeling such an intense awareness of the peculiar quality of these societies is the articulation of Roman values. These values are not platitudinous precepts but deeply held convictions about the relative worth of different kinds of human actions. Consequently, it is possible to identify those qualities which are most esteemed in these Roman worlds.

Shakespeare's profound historical insights about, and comprehensive knowledge of, ancient Rome attest that by 1589 he was an intensive, innovative and experienced scholar.

CUSHMAN K. DAVIS:

(...that Shakespeare was) more addicted to the employment of legal nomenclature than any English writer (excepting, of course, the jurists) is incontestable...  
...law terms were present in his mind as standards of comparison with things which nothing but his own despotic imagination could have brought into relevancy.  
...They came from the mouth of every personage; from the queen; from the child; from the Merry Wives of Windsor; from the Egyptian fervor of Cleopatra; from the love-sick Paphian goddess; from the violated Lucrece; from Lear, Hamlet, and Othello; from Shakespeare himself, soliloquizing in his sonnets; from Dogberry and Prospero; from riotous Falstaff and melancholy Jacques. He utters them at all times as standard coins, no matter when or in what mint stamped. These emblems of his industry are woven into his style like the bees into the imperial purple of Napoleon's coronation robes.

RICHARD GRANT WHITE:

No dramatist of the time, not even Beaumont, who was a younger son of a judge of the Common Pleas, and who after studying in the Inns of Court abandoned law for the drama, used phrases with Shakespeare's readiness and exactness...legal phrases flow from his pen as part of his vocabulary, and parcel of his thought...It has been suggested that it was in attendance upon the courts in London that he picked up his vocabulary. But this supposition not only fails to account for Shakespeare's peculiar freedom and exactness in the use of phraseology, it does not even place him in the way of learning those terms his use of which is most remarkable, which are not such as he would have heard at ordinary proceedings at nisi prius...And, besides, Shakespeare uses his law just as freely in his first plays, written in (Will. Shakspeare's) first London years, as those produced at a later period. Just as exactly too; for the correctness and propriety with which these terms are introduced have compelled the admiration of a Chief Justice and Lord Chancellor. (Emphasis added.)

Sir James Plaisted Wilde, O.C.:

(Shakespeare had a) perfect familiarity with not only the principles, axioms, and maxims, but the technicalities of English law, a knowledge so perfect and intimate that he was never incorrect and never at fault...The mode in which this knowledge was pressed into service on all occasions to

express his meaning and illustrete his thought, was quite unexampled...That he should have descanted in lawyer language when he had a forensic subject in hand, such as Shylock's bond, was to be expected, but the knowledge of law in Shakespeare was exhibited in a far different manner: it protruded itself on all occasions, appropriate or inappropriate, and mingled itself with strains of thought widely divergent from forensic subjects.

EDGAR FRIPP:

The facts...demand [that Will. Shakspeare had] professional experience in an attorney's office, and without doubt at Stratford in or about the years 1579-87.

When asked about the possibility of Shakspeare having been a clerk in an attorney's office before he came to London, Lord Chief JUSTICE CAMPBELL replied:

...it might reasonably be expected that there would have been deeds and wills witnessed by him still extant, and after a very dilligent search none can be found.

Sir James Plaisted Wilde, Q.C.:

It cannot be doubted that the Lord CAMPBELL was right in this. No young man could have been at work in an attorney's office without being called upon continually to act as a witness, and in many other ways leaving traces of his work and name. There is not a single fact or incident in all that is known of (Will. Shakspeare), even by rumour or tradition, which supports this notion of a clerkship. And after much argument and surmise which has been indulged in on this subject, we may, I think, safely put the notion on one side, for no less an authority than Mr. GRANT WHITE says finally that the idea of his having been a clerk to an attorney has been 'blown to pieces'.

KARL ELZE:

The poetic imagination may be ever so lively and creative and the power of intuition ever so highly developed, one thing cannot be disputed, namely that it bestows upon no one a knowledge of facts, but that such a knowledge can only be acquired by experience or must be imparted by others...Should we therefore succeed in pointing out in *The Merchant of Venice* or elsewhere any knowledge of positive facts respecting Italy, which (Shakespeare) could have obtained only in one of these two ways, and could it then be proved that he did not acquire it from books or oral communication, his journey to Italy would be established (Emphasis added).

As a result, Professor ELZE concluded that Shakespeare could not have acquired that knowledge of Italy from books or oral communication and set forth evidence that he must have visited Italy:

...(the description of Belmont in *The Merchant of Venice*) has its prototype unquestionably in one of those splendid residences, surrounded with well-kept gardens and adorned with treasures of art, which the merchant princes of Venice possessed even in Shakespeare's day. From the context it appears with certainty that (Shakespeare) possessed a perfectly accurate knowledge of the locality...(In that play Portia orders her servant to),

'Bring them I pray thee, with imagined speed,

Uhto the tranext, to the common ferry

Which trades to Venice'

The nonsensical word 'tranext', which is found in all the quartos and folios, and has been retained even by the Cambridge editors, proves that copylists and compositors possessed no knowledge of the word, and still less of the thing itself. Even the word 'tragect', which Theobald has correctly restored, is not a genuine English word, otherwise the poet would not have added the apposition 'to the common ferry', which he surely did only to make the meaning clear to his readers and hearers. What visitors to Venice do not here directly recognize the Venetian traghetto (tragetto)? The ferry takes us across the 'laguna morta', and up the great canal to the city, where we in spirit land at the Rialto. Shakespeare displays a no less accurate knowledge of this locality than that of the villas along the Brenta, as he does not contound the Isola de Rialto with the Ponte di Rialto. He knows that the exchange 'where the merchants do most congregate' is upon the former, nay he appears to have been better acquainted with the Isola de Rialto than Coryat, fifteen years afterward, for the name of Gobbo, which he had bestowed on the clown,

reminds us vividly of the Gobbo di Rialto, a stone figure which serves as a support of the granite pillar of about a man's height, from which the laws of the Republic were proclaimed...

J. ISAACS accuses Shakespaare of blundering by identifying the 16th Century Italian artist Julio Romano as a sculptor, when Romano, as the Professor asserts, was only known as a painter:

Does this not prove complete ignorance, and could he have committed such an unpardonable mistake if he himself had been in Mantua...how and when he came across the name (Julio Romano) Lord only knows.

Almost 100 years before Professor ISAACS' self-gratifyingly cancelled Shakespaare's travels in Italy, Professor ELZE had pointed out that one of the Latin epitaphs on Julio Romano's tombstone [in Mantua] praised his sculpturing as being his "chief excellence".

Professor HUGH R. TREVOR-ROPER:

Shakespeare's knowledge of Italy was extraordinary. An English scholar who lived in Venice has found his visual topographic exactitude in *The Merchant of Venica* incredible in one who has never been there.

DR. ERNESTO GRILLO:

...the topography [in *The Merchant*] is so precise and accurate that it must convince the most superficial reader that the poet visited that country.

SIR EDMUND K. CHAMBERS:

Much research has been devoted to a conjecture that (Will. Shakspeare) spent part of this period (1592-1594) in northern Italy. It is certainly true that when the plague was over...began a series of [Shakespeare's] plays with Italian settings, which was something of a new departure in English drama, that to a modern imagination, itself steeped in Italian sentiment, (Shakespaare) seems to have been remarkably successful in giving a local colouring and atmosphere to these and even that he has shown familiarity with some minute points of local topography.

Charlton Ogburn:

That is the ultimate orthodox authority, SIR EDMUND K. CHAMBERS, speaking - one supposes with reluctance. But the two or three years he assigns to those possible travels were the very ones during which (Will. Shakspeare) was supposed to have been writing the long and demanding narrative poems, *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*. Moreover, by CHAMBERS'S own reckoning, the years 1592-1595 were those in which the Italian plays came out - *Comedy of Errors*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Two Gentlemen of Venice*, and *Romeo and Juliet* - along with *Richard the Third*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *Love's Labour's Lost*: busy years. Of course nothing in Shakspeare's record suggests that he had ever traveled anywhere except between Stratford and London.

IVOR BROWN:

Shakespeare's marine contacts are strange and worth investigation. My own conviction is that [Will. Shakspeare] certainly did have voyages.

LIEUTENANT-COMMANDER A.F. FALCONER in his *Shakespeare and the Sea*:

...that [Will. Shakspeare], on coming to London ...brought with him knowledge of the sea and the Navy can be seen from (Shakespeare's) earliest plays (Emphasis added).

VICE ADMIRAL SIR IAN L.M. McGEOGH:

Professor FALCONER points out that whereas many educated Elizabethans understood the art of navigation...only those who actually served at sea could acquire a profound knowledge of the practice of seamanship and the correct meaning and use of the terms proper to the working of ships. That Shakspeare possessed such a profound knowledge is instanced many times. An example which interested me particularly, as showing inspired accuracy of allusion, seasoned

with wit, is quoted by Professor FALCONER from *King John* iv. 2.23:

And like a shifted wind unto a sail,

It makes the course of thoughts to fetch about.

Tacking is to bring a ship's head to lie the other way. True. And "to fetch about" is synonymous with "to tack"; but subtler still is the reference to "course", which is not only the direction in which a ship is heading, but also the name given to the principal sail on any mast of a square-rigged ship.

EDWARD GARNETT & EDMUND GOSSE:

(Many passages prove Shakespeare's familiarity with the needs and aspects of the sea (as a result of) the long voyage which [Will. Shakespeare] must have made at some time or other in his life.

DR. LANCE FOGAN:

(Shakespeare's) 37 plays and poetry contain more than 700 references to medicine and psychiatry. Modern medical literature contains papers describing the Bard's accurate descriptions of symptoms and diseases by rheumatologists, obstetricians, paediatricians, ear, nose and throat specialists, dentists, orthopaedists and specialists in the disease of the elderly. Psychiatrists and psychologists have documented Shakespeare's extraordinary depth and insight in volumes that would fill the shelves of libraries...

We can only speculate on how [Will. Shakespeare's] mind absorbed and contained as much, and how he came by this knowledge. We know virtually nothing about this man and none of his personal papers survive...(Shakespeare's) medical knowledge is beyond the ken of the well-educated laymen even in 1990...In his dramas the important medical insights, diagnoses and pronouncements are made not by physicians, but by lay people...

Charlton Ogburn:

(Professor ALFRED B. HARBAGE) quotes the 'impressive' physician who understood the ailing Lear's needs:

Our foster-nurse of nature is repose,  
The which he lacks. That to provoke in him  
Ara many simples operativa, whose power  
Will close the eyes of anguish.

'He prescribed,' says HARBAGE, 'nothing further than a sedative, fresh garments, music, and, wisest remedy of all, the attendance of Cordelia at his side. The treatment deserved its success.' He contrasts this enlightened, quite modern professional approach with medicine as typically practiced in (Shakespeare's) day, drawing upon the case-book of Shakespeare's son-in-law [Dr. John Hall]. A seventy-year old whom Dr. Hall treated was 'oppressed with Melancholy, and a Fever with extraordinary heat.' The doctor applied 'Radishes sliced besprinkled with Vinegar and Salt to the soles of the patient's feet' to draw back the 'Vapors', which caused 'startling and fear'. 'This,' says Professor HARBAGE, 'was his mildest prescription. Leeches were applied, and emetics, phisics, and ametics administered, all composed of frightening ingredients,' one being an 'Emetick Infusion' containing 'oxymel of Squills'.

JAMES E. HARTING:

Before proceeding to examine the ornithology of Shakespeare, it may be well to take a glance at his knowledge of natural history in general...

POPE has expressed the opinion that whatever object of nature or branch of science Shakespeare either speaks of or describes, it is always with competent if not with exclusive knowledge. His descriptions are always exact, his metaphors appropriate, and remarkably drawn from the true nature and inherent qualities of each subject...

But to come to the Ornithology. (Shakespeare's) accurate observations on this subject, apt allusions, and beautiful metaphors (are) to be met with throughout the plays...

Apart from the consideration that a poet may be expected, almost of necessity, to invoke the



birds of song, Shakespeare has gone further, and displays a greater knowledge of ornithology, and a greater accuracy in his statements, than is generally the case with poets. How far we shall succeed in proving this assertion, it will be for the reader of the following (276) pages to determine.

GEORGE B. HARRISON

Readers often complain that there is no good biography of [Will. Shakspeare]. There can never be...There are the plays in which again and again Shakespeare used his experiences but nothing to show where and how [Will. Shakspeare] came by them.

EDWARD QUINN:

The more one looks at the facts of [Will. Shakspeare's] life, the more one becomes convinced that they have very little to do with Shakespeare's plays.

HUGH R. TREVOR-ROPER:

Of all the immortal geniuses of literature, none is personally so elusive as (Shakspeare)... It is exasperating and almost incredible that he should be so. After all, he lived in the full daylight of the English renaissance, in the well-documented reign of Queen Elizabeth and King James I ...Since his death, and particularly in the last century, he has been subjected to the greatest battery of organized research that has ever been directed upon a single person. Armies of scholars, formidably equipped, have examined all the documents which could possibly contain at least a mention of [Will. Shakspeare's or] William Shakespeare's name. One hundredth of this labour applied to one of his insignificant contemporaries would be sufficient to produce a substantial biography. And yet the greatest of all Englishmen, after this tremendous inquisition, still remains so close to a mystery that even his identity can still be doubted.

In 1662 Reverend Dr. JOHN WARD became the vicar of Stratford-on-Avon and kept a notebook. EDMUND K. CHAMBERS cites from that notebook covering the years 1661-1663:

I have heard that (Will. Shakspeare) was a natural wit without any art at all. (Emphasis added.)

S. SCHOENBAUM:

(Reverend THOMAS) FULLER'S crowning achievement is the *History of the Worthies of England* (1662)...To prepare the compilation FULLER traveled about the country...gathering his materials: he consulted documents...and interviewed local inhabitants and relatives\* of his worthies. Yet FULLER'S sketch of (Shakspeare), the first attempt at a formal biography, is remarkably deficient in both meat and condiment.

...he instances [Will. Shakspeare] as the poet who is born, not made: the naturally smooth diamond, unpolished by any learning. (Emphasis added.)

\*Ed. note: Shakspeare's granddaughter, Lady Bernard, and his sister, Judith Quiney, were both alive in 1662 and living in Stratford-on-Avon.

Sir G.G. Greenwood:

(Leonardo da Vinci: 1452-1519) may, indeed, be fitly compared with Shakespeare, for, if we are to believe Mr. Sidney Calvin, he was 'the man whose genius has the best right to be called universal of any that has ever lived - one to whom a recent biographer has deservedly applied COLERIDGE'S description of Shakespeare - 'a myriad-minded man.'...As a boy he was put to study under Andrea del Verrocchio, a 'thoroughly capable and spirited craftsman alike as goldsmith, sculptor, and painter.' He was enrolled in the list of the Painters' Guild of Florence. Under Verrocchio he studied till his twenty-fifth year. Subsequently, he was taken into the special favour of Lorenzo the Magnificent, and readers of Florentine history will not need to be told what this would mean, or the immense advantages which it would confer on a student of literature, science, and art. From his earliest days, we are told, Leonardo 'flung himself into the study of nature with unprecedented delight and curiosity.' He 'toiled among bats and wasps and lizards,

forgetful of rest and food.' He worked hard at anatomy, geometry, and optics. He enlarged his experiences by travels to Egypt, Cyprus, Constantinople, Armenia, and the coast of Asia Minor. He was endowed by a genius so extraordinary and so universal that he seems, as it were by intuition, to have anticipated some of the greatest discoveries of later ages, and as such we render him the homage of our wonder, and our admiration. But there is no miracle here, no mystery, no irreconcilable *non sequitur*, such as make the alleged Shakspeare-Shakespeare identity something which seems to shock us as even monstrous because contrary to the whole world's experience. Richly gifted as was Leonardo, writes Mr. John Addington Symonds, he did not trust his natural facility. 'His pettence was no less marvellous than the quickness of his insight. He lived to illustrate the definition of genius as the capacity for taking infinite pains.' What analogy is there here with the case of the unlettered provincial, Player Shakspeare, the easygoing, jovial boon-companion, writing *currente calamo*, by plenary inspiration, (according to the hypothesis), unblotted pages of immortal poetry and equally immortal philosophy, for the instruction, delight, and wonder of all time? (Emphasis added.)

### Conclusion

In the words of Sir G. G. Greenwood:

That Shakspeare the 'Stratford rustic and London actor' should have acquired this learning, this culture and this polish; that *he* should have travelled into foreign lands, studied the life and topography of foreign cities, and the manners and customs of all sorts and conditions of men (all this *sub silentio*); that *he* should have written some half-dozen dramas, besides the *Venus and Adonis* dedicated in high-sounding language to a great earl of Elizabeth's Court, besides qualifying himself as a professional actor (to say nothing of performing the functions of horse-holder and call-boy); that *he* should have done all this and a good deal more between 1587 and 1592 is a supposition so wild that it can only be entertained by those who are prepared to except it as a miracle. 'And miracles do not happen'!

No; Shakspeare of Stratford cannot, by any possibility, be made to equal Shakespeare of the Universe. Reason denies it.

### Addendum

The purpose of the Shakespeare Oxford Society is to verify that Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford (1550-1604) wrote the works whose authorship was, for documented political and social mandates, concealed under the pseudonym, "William Shakespeare". His heritage, life, culture, education, accomplishments, experiences and interests exactly fit the depictions of Shakespeare set forth above, as one example strikingly illustrates: At the age of 14 de Vere was paid the following tribute by the scholar and translator, Arthur Golding:

It is not unknown to others, and I have had experience thereof myself, how earnest your honour has naturally grafted in you to read, peruse and communicate with others as well as the histories of ancient times, and things done long ago, as also the present estate of things in our day, and that not without a pregnancy of wit and ripeness of understanding. (N.B. the Roman History plays on pp. 4 and 5).

The only litigated case in which the authorship of Will. Shakspeare was directly at issue is *In Re Hopkins' Will Trusts v. Francis Bacon Society Inc. and Others* (3 All England Reports 46, 1964). Miss Hopkins bequeathed one-third of her residuary estate to the Francis Bacon Society for finding the Bacon-Shakespeare manuscripts and "to encourage the general study of the evidence in favor of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to (Shakspeare)." The questions at issue raised by her heirs were, "Whether finding Shakespeare manuscripts was so improbable as to render the bequest impractical or futile" (and) "Whether the expressed purpose of the bequest was in law a valid charitable purpose." Justice Wilberforce held:

...the evidence in favour of (Will. Shakspeare) is quantitatively slight. It rests positively, in the main, on the explicit statements in the first folio of 1623 and on continuous tradition, negatively on the lack of any challenge to this ascription at the time. The form in which scholars express the result of this evidence is, not that it proves (Will. Shakspeare's) authorship, but that there is no reason to doubt it...There are a number of known facts which are difficult to reconcile with (Will. Shakspeare's) authorship...Moreover, as Professor Trevor-Roper of Oxford points out, so far from these difficulties tending to diminish with time, the intensive search of the nineteenth century has widened the evidentiary gulf between (Will. Shakspeare) and the author of the plays...  
...the question of the authorship cannot be considered as closed.

#### Citations

- Ogburn, Charlton. *The Mysterious William Shakespeare, The Myth and the Reality*, N.Y. Dodd Mead & Co., 1984. (This monumental book is the source of many of the quotations and references herein.)
- Adams, Joseph Quincy. *A Life of William Shakespeare*, Boston: Houghton & Mifflin, 1923
- Beldwin, T. W. *Shakespeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greek*, Urbana: U of Ill. Press, 1944.
- Brown, Ivor. *A Word in Your Ear*. Dutton, 1945. *Shakespeare*, Time Reading Program Edition, 1962.
- Campbell, Lord Chief Justice John. *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*: London, 1859
- Chambers, Sir Edmund K. *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Davis, Cushman K. *The Law in Shakespeare*, St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1894.
- Elze, Karl. *Essays on Shakespeare*, Trans. by L. Dora Schmitz. London: MacMillan, 1874.
- Falconer, Lt. - Commander A. F. Shake. Auth. Review, No. 14, Autumn, 1965.
- Fogan, Dr. Lance. "The Neurologist of Avon", *New Scientist*, Jan. 20, 1990.
- Fripp, Edgar I. *Shakespeare, Man and Artist*, London: Oxford U. Press, Humphrey, 1938.
- Garnett, Edward & Edmund Grosse. *English Literature: An Illustrated Record*.
- Greenwood, Sir George. *The Shakespeare Problem Restated*, London: John Lane The Bodley Head, 1908.
- Grillo, Dr. Ernesto. "Shakespeare and Italy": Shake. Auth. Review, No. 6, Autumn, 1961.
- Helliwell-Phillips, James O. *Outline of the Life of Shakespeare*, London: Logman's 6th ed., 1888.
- Harbage, Alfred. *Conceptions of Shakespeare*: Harvard U. Press, 1966.
- Harrison, George B. "Book Week", *Wash. Post*, 6/21/70.
- Harling, James E. *The Birds of Shakespeare*, Chicago: Argonaut Inc., 1965.
- Isaacs, J. "Shakespeare After 400 Years", *The Listener and BBC-Television News*, London, 10, Nov. 1966.
- Massey, Gerald. *Shakespeare's Sonnets Never Before Interpreted*: London, 1966.
- Muir, Kenneth. *Shakespeare's Sources*, London: Meuthen & Co., 1981.
- McGeogh, Vice Admiral Sir Ian L.M.: Shake. Auth. Review, No. 14, Autumn 1965.
- Neilson, William Allen and Ashley Horace Thorndike. *Facts About Shakespeare*, N.Y.: McMillan, 1937.
- Nicholl, Allardyce. *Shakespeare*, London: Meuthen & Co., 1952.
- Quinn, Edward. "How to Know Everything About Shakespeare", "Book World", *Wash. Post*, 6/12/70.
- Rowe, Nicholas. *The Works of Mr. William Shakespeare*, London: Towson, 1709.
- Rowse, A. L. *What Shakespeare Read and Thought*, N.Y.: Coward, McCann & Geoghean, 1981.
- Sempson, George. *The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: The Univ. Press, 1981.
- Satin, Joseph. *Shakespeare and his sources*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.
- Schoenbaum, Samuel. *Shakespeare's Lives*, N.Y.: Oxford U. Press, 1970. *William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Siegel, Paul N. *Shakespeare's English and Roman History Plays*, Cambridge: Assoc. Univ. Press, 1988.
- Spencer, T.J.B. "Shakespeare and Elizabethan Rumors", *Shakespeare Survey* 10, 1957.
- Thomas, Vivian. *Shakespeare's Roman Worlds*, London: Routledge, 1989.
- White, Richard Grant. *Memoirs of the Life of William Shakespeare*: Boston, 1865.
- Wilde, Sir James Plalsted Q.C. *The Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy: A Judicial Summing Up*: London, 1902.
- Wilson, John Dover. *The Essential Shakespeare*: Cambridge U. Press, 1932

105 West 4th, Street, Suite #819, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202



## David Lloyd Kreeger

(Died November 18, 1990)

Excerpts from the notable and extraordinary obituary in The Washington Post (11/20/90)

When David Lloyd Kreeger died Sunday, the music stopped, and every institution for the arts in Washington felt the silence he left behind.

He was born in New York City, the son of Russian immigrants who operated a grocery. He graduated from Rutgers University and Harvard University law school where he was editor of the Law Review. He had learned to play the piano as a child and supported himself in college and law school by playing piano at the Adirondacks.

Kreeger lived his life at an *allegro con brio tempo*. A fire and fervor for the arts, for people and for institutions burned in him so brightly that it made of his small figure a torch. You could see it in receiving lines - as chairman of nearly every cultural institution in Washington at one time or another, he was a principal greeter. His eyes would light up, his hand would take yours, and you felt as though the event and your presence were a thrill in his life. Even after he was stricken with the cancer that eventually killed him, he kept the love of life that so cheered those who met him.

His millions helped build the Kreeger Theater at Arena Stage, the Kreeger Auditorium at the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the Kreeger Music Building at American University and endowed the David Lloyd Kreeger concertmaster's chair of the National Symphony Orchestra. As president of the National Symphony, a job he held from 1970 to 1978, Kreeger recruited Mstislav Rostropovich, the world's most renowned cellist, to be the orchestra's music director.

Kreeger was an amateur violinist and the proud owner of a Stradivarius violin, which he sometimes played in concerts at his home in the company of such musical luminaries as Leonard Bernstein, violinist Isaac Stern and cellist Pablo Casals.

"Dave was the cultural center of Washington before it was a cultural center. And to his actions and words, in great part, Washington owes its centrality," violinist Isaac Stern said at Kreeger's 80th-birthday party, a little over a year ago.

Although he was better known for his art collection, which included works by Picasso, Monet, Degas, Renoir, van Gogh, Bonnard, Braque, Kandinsky, Sisley, Dufy and Pissaro, Kreeger treasured his violins the most.

Described by friends as the "quintessential Renaissance man," Kreeger was an aggressive tennis player, an energetic and graceful ballroom dancer and an enthusiastic scholar of English literature. He was convinced that Edward De Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford, was author of most of the works attributed to William Shakespeare, and he sponsored debates on the issue in the United States and in England (Emphasis added).

A few passages from  
THE VINDICATORS OF SHAKESPEARE  
A Reply to Critics  
by  
G. G. Greenwood

In June, 1908, I published, through Mr. John Lane, of "The Bodley Head," a book bearing title *The Shakespeare Problem Restated*, in which I endeavored to set forth the arguments which seem to me to support the case of those who hold that Shakspeare, the Stratford player, was not, in truth and in fact, the author of the plays and poems given to the world under the name of "Shakespeare," while leaving the question of the true authorship absolutely untouched. I published the work with some anxiety, for, as I wrote in my Preface, I had a shrewd idea of the sort of treatment which could be meted out to it. "The High Priests of Literature will treat it," I said, "with frigid and contemptuous silence. The College of Stratfordian Cardinals will at once put it on the Index. The Grand Inquisitors, - or Inquisitress! - of the Temple by Avon's sacred stream will decree that it shall be burnt (metaphorically, at any rate), by the common hangman . . ." It is true that the leviathans of literature have, as I anticipated, not condescended to take much notice of it, but have left the battle to the small fry. The Dreadnoughts have remained at their moorings, while the submarines have been despatched to the attack. But the torpedoes which have been launched have proved to be of the "soft-nosed" variety, and, although the hull may have been slightly damaged in places, the threatened ship still rides the waves of controversy.

And now, dropping metaphor, I will deal fairly and squarely with that criticism which has mainly prompted this rejoinder.

*"The Defamers of Shakespeare"!*

As already mentioned, Sir Edward has classed me, together with a distinguished scholar and lawyer, the late Judge Webb, among those whom he is pleased to style "the defamers of Shakespeare." I should feel more resentment at this odious appellation if it were not so palpably absurd.

For how, pray, have I defamed Shakespeare, or what Shakespeare have I defamed? Not certainly the immortal poet for whom I have expressed unbounded admiration. No, the real defamers of "Shakespeare" are the men who wrote, and the men who have repeated with approval, those preposterous lines which tell us that the bard who is not of an age but for all time,

For gain not glory, winged his roving flight,  
And grew immortal in his own despite.

But if I have not defamed Shakespeare the poet, can I be said to have defamed Shakspeare, the Stratford player? I deny it absolutely. The defamers of Shakspeare of Stratford (unless, indeed, what they have recorded is "true in substance and in fact"), can be none other than the old note-collectors, and memoir-writers, such as those reverend gentlemen, John Ward, and William Fulman, and Richard Davies; such as John Aubrey, and Nicholas Rowe, and John Manningham, and the later biographers who have accepted and repeated the stories, sometimes far from edifying, which these chronicles and diarists have related concerning the man who is so generally identified with the "Swan of Avon." Yet were it not for such stories none of the so-called "Lives" of Shakespeare could have been written; and to accuse a modern critic of "defamation" because he re-states them and makes inquiry as to their value and their consequence, is manifestly ridiculous. For my part I may say that so far from adopting such anecdotes and traditions in an uncritical spirit, I have been constrained by legal considerations to cast the gravest doubt upon the story of Shakspeare's deer-stealing escapade (to take an example), although to have accepted it as true, following in the wake of Mr. Sidney Lee, and other orthodox authorities, would obviously have suited me much better in view of the case which I had to present. Nor have I laid any stress at all upon the tales of Shakspeare's hard-drinking propensities, for which, nevertheless, tradition furnishes us with some testimony, which cannot be altogether set aside as a *quantite negligeable* . . .

The fact remains, as I have already written, that with regard to the life story of Shakspeare of Stratford, as the biographers have handed it down to us, "from first to last there is not one creditable act in the whole of it - not a single act indicative of a generous, high-minded, and great-souled man, not one such

act that has a jot or tittle of evidence to support it." This, surely, is a fact that we must all deplore. Possibly the biographers have done the man an injustice, but, if so, it is they, and not we of the "unorthodox" school, who are responsible for it. And if it should be established that the difficulty which Hallam so strongly felt, viz., in "identifying the young man who came up from Stratford, was afterwards an indifferent player in a London theatre, and returned to his native place in middle life, with the author of *Macbeth and Lear*," is one that we are no longer called upon to contemplate, and that this man of the barren and banal life-story is not, in truth and in fact, the immortal poet whom none has dared defame, and at whose shrine we all must worship, then shall we have amply earned the title of "The Vindicators of Shakespeare."

Let us now resume the consideration of some of Sir Edward Sullivan's pronouncements . . . "The truth is," he writes, "for all that may be said to the contrary, that pre-eminence in the world of literature is not, and never will be, the monopoly of the educated or the high-born." Nothing could more clearly show than this sentence how entirely this new Stratfordian protagonist has failed to understand the arguments advanced by those who believe with Hallam that player Shakspeare was not the real Shakespeare of the *Plays and Poems*. Nobody, so far as I know, has ever been so idiotic as to maintain that preeminence in the world of literature is "the monopoly of the educated or the high-born," nor can I conceive that any useful purpose is subserved by that method of controversy which consists in ignoring the real contentions of one's opponent in order to trample upon foolish arguments attributed to but never in fact advanced by him.

"No man who is not either well educated or high-born can possibly become a great poet"! Such is the proposition which Sir Edward Sullivan would fain put into my mouth, knowing that a thousand instances are vociferous to the contrary . . .

That a man of humble birth and very imperfect education may rise to the highest ranks of literature is one of the notorious facts of human history. Take the constantly cited case of the "Ayrshire ploughman," for example . . . From the days of my boyhood the poetry of Burns, so graphic in description, so terrible in satire, so tender in the most exquisite of love songs, has been to me a wonder and a delight. But wherein is it that Burns so much excelled? . . . "The Ayrshire Ploughman sings of the scenes in which he has been bred; of the burn and the heather; of the sweeping Nith and the banks of the braes of bonny Doon. He sings of the Scotch peasantry, of their customs, as in 'Halloween,' and, above all, of the sweet Scotch lassies, whom he loved not wisely but too well. And all this in his own homely dialect. The very genius of lyrical poetry speaks from his mouth, but speaks in that Scottish language for the interpretation of which the English reader requires a glossary . . ."

The question is not whether a man of lowly birth and of imperfect education can, if naturally endowed by genius, write high-class poetry. The question is, what kind of poetry will he be able to write? If, for instance, Burns had written such a poem as *Venus and Adonis*, we might have had a real parallel between his case and the supposed case of Shakspeare the player-poet. "Had Burns, say at the age of twenty-five, written highly polished and cultured English, abounding with classical allusions, showing intimate knowledge of Court life and fashionable society, and dealing in such a life-like manner with foreign countries as to lead readers to suppose that he must have paid a visit to their shores; had he discussed divine philosophy for all the ages and for every phase of human life; had he held the mirror for mankind - had the Ayrshire ploughman done all this and a great deal more, then indeed there might have been some analogy between his case and that of Shakespeare," according to the received hypothesis.

#### *The Burbages and the Earl of Pembroke*

But here we are confronted with a question which has often been asked, but to which, so far as I am aware, no answer has yet been given. The hypothesis is that in 1623 Shakspeare of Stratford had been recognized as the great poet and dramatist, the "sweet swan of Avon,"

"Soul of the age,  
The applause, delight, the wonder of our stage."

Well, twelve years after the publication of the Folio containing these eulogistic lines, viz., in 1635, Cuthbert Burbage, and Winifred, the widow of Richard Burbage, and "William his sonne," presented a petition to the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, the survivor of the "Incomparable Pair" to whom the

Folio had been dedicated, and then Lord Chamberlain, praying that their rights in the theatres built or owned by Burbage the elder, father of Richard and Cuthbert - those theatres where Shakespeare's dramas had been presented - should be recognized and respected. The petitioners are naturally anxious to say all they possibly can for themselves, and the company of the players with whom they were associated. One of those players and one of "the partners in the profits of . . . the House" was William Shakspeare. And how do they speak of him? Do they remind the Earl that one of their company had been that man of transcendent genius, Shakespeare, the great dramatist, the renowned poet, upon whom Ben Jonson had pronounced such a splendid panegyric, and whose collected works had been dedicated to himself and his brother? Surely they ought to have done this! Surely they would have done so if such had been the fact! Yet what do they say? "To ourselves we joined those deserving men, Shakspeare, Hemings, Condall, Phillips and others, partners in the profits of what they call the House"; and as to the Blackfriars Theatre, there, they say, they "placed men players, which were Hemings, Condall, Shakspeare." Now to me it does seem incredible that the Burbages should thus have written about Shakespeare calling him a "man-player," and speaking of him in the same terms as of the other players, viz., as a "deserving man," if, indeed, both they and the Lord Chamberlain knew that he was the immortal poet who was "not of an age but for all time," and whose works had been dedicated to the two Earls, to their everlasting honour! Why this extraordinary reticence, - if Shakspeare and Shakespeare are identical? This is the question to which, so far, no reply has been given.

\*\*\*\*\*

## SHAKESPEARE'S NATIVE TONGUE

by

Gary Goldstein

I would like to begin this lecture by quoting the first paragraph of Appleton Morgan's book, *A Study in the Warwickshire Dialect*: "Circumstantial evidence may be explained away by the testimony of other circumstances. Internal evidence may be upset by context. But words are detectives that never fail to detect, and whose reports cannot be bribed, distorted, or gainsaid. No man can write in a language he has never heard, or whose written form he has never learned."

Consider that paragraph and then consider this fact: The plays of William Shakespeare have been studied for four hundred years, yet no scholar will state what language the plays were written in.

I'll be bolder: No scholar will admit that the plays were written in standard English. The dialect accepted as the country's standard language was called "East Midlands" because it was the dialect of the eastern middle Counties of England. It had been the language of London and the Court since the 1450s.

In the words of the English linguist Martyn Wakelin, in *English Dialects: An Introduction*: "Standard English in its written form was an upper class dialect developed in London in the late 14th Century, mainly on the basis of the influential dialect of East Midland immigrants."

Another English linguist, G.L. Brook, in his *English Dialects*, enlarges on why East Midlands dialect became the standard: "From the 15th Century onwards," he writes, "one dialect, that of the East Midlands, began to be regarded as a standard, largely because of the accident that the two universities and the capital of the country were in that area."

Wakelin believed that the East Midlands dialect also became the standard spoken language of England by the end of the 16th Century. He writes: "The well-known precept in George Puttenham's *The Art of English Poesie*, in 1589, in which the poet is advised to 'take the usual speech of the Court, and that of London and the shires living about London within sixty miles,' is one of a number of definite statements to the effect that educated, upper-class London and southern speech is by this time the model for those who wish their speech to be of the best sort."

Scholars don't know how the actor from Stratford learned to write fluently in a language different from the one he used in his native Warwickshire. Indeed, no evidence exists that the school at Stratford even taught him to write in standard English.

Appleton Morgan writes: "William Shakespeare had been, up to his eighteenth year, a resident of Stratford-upon Avon, a Warwickshire village, where were spoken a dialect and a patois quite as distinguishable from other British dialects as from the urban English. For this Warwickshire boy to have achieved the plays was one thing, the most miraculous miracle of genius heaven has vouchsafed mankind. To have written the poem of *Venus and Adonis*, however inferior to the plays, genius itself



would have been inadequate without the absorption of certain arbitrary rules of composition and the learning by rote of the existence of certain arbitrary trammels and limitations of diction, vocabulary, and of prosody. But," continues Morgan, "There was not much of an academy in Stratford town to purify the burgher's patois in Shakespearean times. Even up at the capital, in London, it was very little better than down in Warwickshire. The members of Elizabeth's Parliament could not comprehend each others speech. This was long before there was any standing army in England. But when the soldiers Elizabeth summoned were grouped in camps, they could not understand the word of command unless given by officers from their own particular shire. And with Stratford grammar school, or any other grammar school, in full blast — the youngsters were not taught English, as they might be drilled in three or four textbooks prescribed by the crown. Dr. Halliwell-Phillipps and Mr. Furnivall have each prepared lists of these textbooks. But among them all, there is not one that suggests instruction in the mother tongue. That the youngsters were supposed to learn at home, if they learned it at all. And at home, as well as in this grammar school, it is absolutely impossible that the lad Shakespeare acquired or used any other dialect than the Warwickshire he was born to, or that his father, mother and neighbors spoke."

It may be equally compelling to discover how Shakespeare learned the dialect of Essex, because he used more than a hundred different types of Essex vocabulary and grammar in 27 or the 37 plays that he wrote.

I propose that Shakespeare would have learned how to write in the standard language — of London and the Court — as a matter of survival. But how explain that Shakespeare used only one or two words of Warwickshire dialect in his plays.

As Professor Ward Elliott wrote in the fall-winter 1989 issue of the Shakespeare Newsletter: "A glance through Joseph Wright's English Dialect Dictionary reveals that only one of the ten Warwickshire words long invoked by Shakespeare scholars — honeystalks — could possibly be peculiar to Warwickshire. All the other nine were found in other counties."

Moreover, Appleton Morgan discovered "a complete absence of Warwickshire dialect in the poem of *Venus and Adonis*."

To become a great writer in a foreign tongue is a feat that has been repeated by others, but to erase one's native tongue is a feat that linguists claim is simply impossible.

Shakespeare did use various dialects in his plays, but to dramatize character traits for effect — to satirize one's origins, education, sense of humor, or social status. And he used these perfectly, as Morgan writes: "There is no confusion in the dialects in the plays when used as dialects."

"Indeed," says Morgan, "at least once Shakespeare introduces a dialect in a locality where it does not belong, and so calls attention to it and to the contrast between it and the speech of the other characters present. The occasion referred to is where Edgar meets Oswald in the fields near Dover and disguises his speech by using the Somersetshire dialect.":

Oswald: Wherefore, bold peasant, darest thou support a published traitor? Hence: lest that the infection of his fortune take like hold on thee. Let go his arm.

Edgar: Chi'll not let go, zir, without vurther 'casion.

Oswald: Let go, slave, or thou diest!

Edgar: Good gentlemen, go your gait, and let poor volk pass. An ch'ud ha' bin zwaggered out of my life, 'twould not ha' bin zo long as 'tis by a vortnight. Nay, come not near th' old man; keep out, che vor, ye, or ise try whether your costard or my ballow be the harder: chill be plain with you.

Oswald: Out, Dunghill!

Edgar: Chi'll pick you teeth, zir: come, no matter vor your foins (IV, vi. 239).

Morgan provides another example of this use of dialect in Act four, Scene four of *Henry the Fifth*. He states: "The scrap of an Irish ballad which Pistol mutters in response to the French prisoner who

believes that Pistol has captured him on the field of Agincourt, is another example proving that the Bard knew perfectly well that a dialect was, and that the dialect of one section of England was unintelligible to the native of another."

The belief that native speakers could not be understood by speakers of other dialects helped establish one dialect as the standard of the country. As Wakelin phrases it: "The use of dialect in literature in the early new English period to characterize rustic speakers (such as Edgar in *King Lear*) would also seem to be an indication of the growing belief that one type of English was alone superior to others.

Shakespeare himself gives us evidence of this belief in his play *As You Like It*, Act three, Scene two, lines 334 to 338:

Orlando: Your accent is something finer than you could purchase in so removed a dwelling.

Rosalind: I have been told so of many. But indeed an old religious uncle of mine taught me to speak, who was in his youth an inland man ...

That Shakespeare felt compelled to write of his uncle's youthful origin when explaining why he spoke a refined English tells us that the Bard understood that one's early life, one's upbringing, formed the way one speaks as an adult. Moreover, the fact that Shakespeare refers to the isolation of the speaker's dwelling tells us that he understood language to be a social achievement, not an academic exercise performed by oneself and a book. Finally, in this short exchange, Shakespeare indicates that fine speech could not be achieved in a rustic setting.

On the other hand, Shakespeare used the southern dialect of Essex throughout the plays as a common form of expression and within the context of standard English. Unlike standard English, Shakespeare wouldn't have learned the Essex dialect because there wasn't any need — it was just another dialect. To my mind, that Shakespeare never used Essex dialect to dramatize character traits reveals the extent to which he himself was using this dialect on a day-to-day basis. For this reason I think it instructive to listen to how Shakespeare wrote in the Essex dialect.

I will first give examples of the Essex vocabulary in the plays.

In *Henry IV, Part I*, Prince Hal says to Falstaff: "How now, blown Jack?" In Essex, blown describes cattle swollen after eating too much food. In the same play, a local trader says of a horse: "The poor jade is wrung out of all cess." In Essex, cess means utterly changed. Later, the trader uses the word chamber-lye: "Your chamber-lye breeds flies like a loach;" where chamber-lye means fermented human urine. Prince Hal in the same play says of Falstaff that: "Falstaff sweats to death, and lards the earth as he walks along." To lard means that Falstaff oozes fat and so sweats the earth by dripping on it as he walks.

In *Henry IV, Part 2*, Falstaff greets the Chief Justice thus: "I am glad to see you abroad. I heard say your Lordship was sick." In Essex, abroad meant out of doors. In the same play, hostess Quickly says to the beadle: "You starved bloodhound. Thou atomy, thou!" In Essex, atomy means skeleton, being an abbreviation of anatomy, and a contemptuous term for an inconsiderate person.

Shakespeare uses the word canker for the wild rose itself, although the Essex dialect word means a disease of the fruit tree or rust on metal. In *Much Ado About Nothing*, Don John says: "I had rather be a canker in the hedge than a rose in his grace."

In *King Lear*, the Fool declares: "Tom's a-cold." It is simply the Essex way of saying cold. Lear says to Goneril that he has: "A daughter, who, I am sure, is kind and comfortable." Comfortable in the sense that she is kind and easy to get on with, or agreeable.

In *Anthony and Cleopatra*, Cleopatra says: "The maid that mills and does the meanest chares," when she would have said chore or job in standard English.

In *Twelfth Night*, Olivia says: "O, what a deal of scorn looks beautiful in the contempt and anger of his lips!" The word deal means a large amount.

In *Troilus and Cressida*, Ajax says of Ulysses: "An 'A be proud with me, I'll feeze his pride." Meaning that Ajax will drive away his pride. Also in the play, Shakespeare has been misprinted, when Pandarus says to Troilus that: "We'll put you I' the thills." The word thills should be fills, which means the two short

chains attached to the collar of a cart-horse. Or when Pandarus says: "A whoreson rascally tissick so troubles me." Tissick refers to a tickling cough. When Theristes talks about: "A sleeveless errand," he means a useless errand.

In *As You Like It*, Celia tells Rosalind about her lover that: "He hath a Rosalind of a better leer than you." Meaning he has someone who has a better scowl or frown than Rosalind.

In *Hamlet and Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakespeare uses the word mouth when he would otherwise use the word faces or grimaces. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Helena tells Hermia: "Make mouths upon me when I turn my back." And in *Hamlet*, when Hamlet tells Rosencrantz: "Is it not very strange, for my uncle is king of Denmark, and those that would make mouths at him while my father lived would pay fifty marks for his portrait in little."

In *Romeo and Juliet*, Mercutio uses Openarse, the name of that medlar pear, in a sexual pun: "O, Romeo, that she were, O, that she were an Openarse, and thou a poppering pear!" Later, Paris, upon being told that Juliet is dead, says: "Have I thought long to see this morning's face, and doth give me such a sight as this? To think long is to grow weary or impatient. When Romeo says: "I dreamt a dream tonight." He means he dreamt a dream last night.

In *Richard III*, Buckingham greets Queen Elizabeth: "Good time of day unto your Royal Grace." Time of day meaning to greet in passing.

In *Merry Wives of Windsor*, when the host of the Garter Inn tells Doctor Caius: "He will clapper-claw thee rightly, Bully." He means he will be beaten thoroughly or soundly.

I have found more than 75 examples of Essex vocabulary in 20 of the plays, of which the preceding are but a small sample. They do, however, give an outline of the extent to which Shakespeare interlarded Essex words into the speech of lower, middle and upper class characters.

Essex grammar also appears in 18 of the Shakespeare plays. For example, in Essex, the article a is used redundantly before words to express quantity. In *As You Like It*, the wrestler Charles says of Duke Senior: "They say he is already in the forest of Arden, and a many merry men with him."

Kind and sort are treated as plurals and as having collective force — these, them, those, kind. In *King Lear*, Cornwall says: "These kind of knaves I know."

The use of adjectives as adverbs, especially when two adjectives are coupled, as in *As You Like It*, when Rosalind says: "I am more than common tall."

Either and neither are used with a plural verb. As in *Cymbeline*, where Guiderus says: "Pray you, fetch him hither. Theristes' body is as good as Ajax when neither are alive."

Personal pronouns, he, she, they, are used redundantly, as in *Henry IV, Part 1*, where King Henry IV says of himself: "The shipping king, he ambled up and down with shallow jesters."

Objectives such as him, her, them are used for their respective nominatives, as in *Cymbeline*, where the second son of Cymbeline says: "Say, where shall us lay him?"

Conversely, He, she and we are used for him, her, us, as in *Othello*, where Othello says to Emilia: "Yes, you have seen Cassio and she together."

Essex dialect makes no distinctions between the nominative ye and the objective you, as in *Julius Caesar*, when Antony tells Brutus: "I do beseech ye, if you bear me hard."

The relative pronouns as, that, and what are the usual forms for all genders, singular and plural, as in *Romeo and Juliet*, where Mercutio says: "Now he will sit under a medlar tree and wish his mistress were that kind of fruit as maids call medlars."

The auxiliary verb should is used with the infinitive as a substitute for the past tense of another verb. In "They tell me John should say," should say is merely the equivalent of said. Just as in the *Taming of the Shrew*, when Gremio says: "When the priest should ask if Katherine should be his wife, ay, by gogs woun, quote he, and swore so loud that all amazed the priest let fall the book."

An excellent instance of Essex pronunciation in Shakespeare is in *Hamlet*. For emphasis, the auxiliary verb will is pronounced ooll — "He ooll have it." Hamlet uses just this pronunciation when he says to Gertrude: "Zwounds, show me what thou'lt do. Woo't weep? Woo't fast? Woo't tear thyself? Woo't drink up eisel?" In this case, woo't is a contraction for wilt thou.

For the phrase want for, meaning in need of, the first record is found in Shakespeare, in *Timon of Athens*. Lucius says of Timon: "Fie, no, do not believe it! He cannot want for money."

The adverb being, meaning since, is used with or without as. In *Henry IV, Part 2*, the Chief Justice tells Falstaff: "Sir John, you loiter here too long, being you are to take soldiers up in counties as you go."

The use of like in the sense of as. In *Pericles*, Antiochus says: "As those wilt live, fly after, and like an arrow shot from a well-experienced archer hits the mark his eye doth level at."

In Essex, negatives are doubled, redoubled and multiplied. As in Shakespeare, in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Lance says: "Nay, that cannot be so neither." In *King John*, Bastard Falconbridge says: "This England never did, nor never shall, lie at the proud foot of a conqueror."

In Essex, the preposition "along of" for "owing to" is found in *Cymbeline*, where Cymbeline says: "O, she was naught; and long of her it was that we meet here so strangely."

All these examples were taken from the "Essex Dialect Dictionary," printed in 1920 and reprinted in 1923 and 1969. Its author was an Essex native named Edward Gepp, born in 1855, who graduated from Cambridge University with bachelor and master of arts degrees in 1878 and 1883. The Dictionary collates all references to Essex dialect contained in the English Dialect Dictionary, the New English Dictionary and other glossaries and dictionaries dating back to the Elizabethan period.

From the plays and characters that I've cited, you can see that every level of society used the Essex dialect in the Shakespeare plays. I believe this confirms my theory that the Essex dialect is a thread that was woven through the Shakespeare canon by a man who used the dialect as a matter of habit.

In conclusion, I propose that the man who wrote the plays of William Shakespeare was not from Warwickshire. He was a man who was born and raised in the county of Essex.

Copyright 1990 Gary Goldstein

\*\*\*\*\*

#### PROFESSOR SAMUEL SCHOENBAUM RECANTS

(From a column by Don Oldenburg in  
The Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1990)

"Sam Schoenbaum, who in his 1970 book 'Shakespeare's Lives,' referred to (anti-Stratfordian commentaries) as 'lunatic rubbish,' is omitting that description from the revised edition. A stalwart Stratfordian, he has since softened his judgment of those who pursue the controversy.

'I'm sorry I said that' recants the professor of Renaissance literature who directs the University of Maryland's Center for Renaissance and Baroque studies. It's just that he believes this whole thing is a waste of time and energy ...

As for Shakespeare's (i.e. Shakspeare's) personal effects, Schoenbaum dismisses the mystery. As much is known about Shakespeare (i.e., Shakspeare) as is known about his contemporaries" (Emphasis added).

In his *Shakespeare's Lives* Professor Schoenbaum also wrote:

A divine blessed with retentive memory and prodigious energy, (Reverend Thomas) Fuller enraptured throngs with his preachings and made money for the stationers by winning a large audience for his numerous publications, providing good counsel and encyclopedic information ... Fuller's crowning achievement is the *History of the Worthies of England* (1662) - 'his beloved book ... the darling of his soul' - 'the first attempt, assembled without the help of an amanuensis, at a dictionary of national biography. The book is notable for the author's avowed purpose to entertain as well as to inform. 'I confess the subject is but dull in itself,' he declares,

to tell the time and place of men's birth and deaths, their names, with the name and number of their books, and therefore the bare skeleton of Time, Place and Person must be fleshed with some pleasant passages. To this intent I have purposely interlaced (not as meat, but as condiment) many delightful stories...

To prepare the compilation Fuller travelled about the country - horseback riding was his sole exercise - garnering his materials: he consulted documents, looked at buildings and places, and interviewed local inhabitants and relatives of his worthies. Yet Fuller's sketch of Shakespeare (i.e., Shakspeare), the first attempt at a formal biography, is remarkably deficient in both meat and condiment.

Indeed, it hardly offers a bare skeleton. Fuller has little to report beyond the indisputably correct information that Shakespeare (i.e. Shakspeare) was born in Stratford. The year of the poet's death eludes him, as the blank space reserved for it in the text pathetically

testifies. Following lines laid down by Jonson, he instances Shakespeare as the poet who is born, not made: the naturally smooth diamond, unpolished by any learning. Where facts are unavailable, fancy fills the gap. Hence it is that in his concluding paragraph Fuller sees the two poets together in his mind's eye:

\* \* \*

Ed. Note: Given Reverend Fuller's "retentive memory," "prodigious energy," and extensive methods of research, the *tabula rasa* he presumably found out about Will. Shakspeare can only be recognized as provocative and, arguably, illuminating. In fact, the Reverend was born in 1608 (d.1661) and if Will. Shakspeare was the authentic author of the popular and acclaimed plays and poems, hundreds of persons who personally would have known him were living both in London and Stratford. Indeed, Ben Jonson did not die until 1637, Shakspeare's sister, Judith Quiney, not until 1662 and his granddaughter, Lady Bernard, not until 1670. Such comprehensively and factually informed resources were on hand, easily identified, and had no reason not to report about Shakspeare's education, interests, activities and idiosyncracies.

Later, and less experienced, biographers, such as Aubrey in the 1680s and Rowe in the 1690s, were deprived of those contemporary resources but claimed to find unidentified persons, who could not possibly have personally known Shakspeare, and extracted from them unreliable posthumous hearsay about his education, interests, activities and idiosyncracies which has been essentially relied on in the traditional biographies of Shakspeare.

Either Reverend Fuller did not tap any one of those available and trustworthy resources - which I think is incredible - or, which I suggest is most credible, he did have interviews with some of those resources who presented him with such bewildering and incongruous facts about Shakspeare that he sensed it would be most politic and prudent not to muddy the waters about Ben Jonson's "star of poets,"

To whom all scenes of Europe homage owe.  
He was not of an age, but for all time!

I also think that by conspicuously and inexplicably not inserting the date of Shakspeare's death - presumably as inscribed on the Stratford Monument - in the space reserved for it in his text, Reverend Fuller may have intended to send a significant and impelling message to posterity.

\*\*\*\*\*

## THE ORDER OF SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS

by  
Peter R. Moore

This is the fourth article in a series about the Sonnets. Its contention is that Sonnets 1 to 126, written to the Earl of Southampton, were published in the correct chronological order of composition in 1609 by Thomas Thorpe. A lesser contention is that Sonnets 127 to 152, written about the Dark Lady, are also in order, though they appear to have been penned before the midpoint of the first series. This article will also consider the apparent problem caused by Sonnet 104 with regard to the theory that Southampton was the friend of the first 126 sonnets. Some of the arguments are not new; in such cases, the material will be summarized and references will be provided for those who wish to pursue things further. My most important source is John Kerrigan's 1986 New Penguin edition of the Sonnets, which I have found to be the best single edition, and which first made me aware that the question of the order of the Sonnets could be attacked with objective arguments.

The first reason for believing that the Sonnets are correctly ordered is that a sonnet cycle was supposed to be ordered, with the individual sonnets being numbered. Thorpe was a quality publisher (see Kerrigan, p. 427), and he produced his volume of the Sonnets and "A Lover's Complaint" in a familiar format (see Kerrigan, p. 14). The simplest explanation for Thorpe's 1609 order is that he followed the author's order. One scholar, J.B. Leishman, wrote that only Shakespeare himself could have kept the Sonnets in order, as if they were written on 154 otherwise blank sheets of paper. But Shakespeare was writing within an established convention of numbered sonnets, and he may well have numbered 1 to 126 as he went along, and/or he may have written them sequentially in a notebook.

That Shakespeare numbered his sonnets as he wrote them is supported by an article in the Spring

1984 *Shakespeare Quarterly* by Rene Graziani, who argues that some of the sonnets take themes from their numbers. For instance, the week is divided into seven days, and Sonnet 7 is the first to describe the sun's daily journey across the sky. The clock divided the day into two periods of twelve hours, and Sonnet 12 begins "When I do count the clock that tells the time." The year is divided into fifty-two weeks, and Sonnet 52 mentions "the long year." The hour is divided into sixty minutes, and Sonnet 60 says "So do our minutes hasten to their end." The inexorable passage of time is, of course, an obsessive theme of the first 126 sonnets, which adds to the likelihood that these links are intentional. These and other possibilities suggested by Graziani are not conclusive, but amount at least to a highly plausible argument that Shakespeare numbered the Sonnets.

The next reason in favor of Thorpe's order is the existence of distinguishable groups within the Sonnets. Sonnets 1 to 17 urge the friend to get married; 27 and 28 deal with insomnia; 33 and 34 mention clouds masking the sun; 40, 41, and 42 describe the friend's seduction by the Dark Lady; 44 and 45 consider the four elements; 46 and 47 use the eye and heart as their theme; 50 and 51 concern riding a horse; 63 and 64 begin with the hand of Time; 67, 69, and 70 discuss some sins of the friend; 71 to 74 all anticipate the poet's death; 78 to 86 attack the Rival Poet; 87, 89, and 90 allude to separation of the poet from his friend; 88 to 90 all speak of a quarrel between the two; 93 picks up 92's theme of the possible falseness of the friend; 93 to 96 harp on the friend's sins; 97 and 98 specify the seasons of the separation; 100 to 102 apologize because the poet had written no sonnets for a time; 104 and 105 both play on the symbolic number three; 109 to 112 confess the poet's faults; 113 and 114 refer to the eye; 115 and 116 return to Time; 116 and 117 feature nautical imagery; 117, 119, and 120 defend against the friend's hate; and 123 and 124 again return to Time. These groups are obvious, but far more subtle links can be found between neighboring sonnets. Here it is necessary to put the Sonnets under a microscope, so to speak, and one can then discover a world invisible to the casual reader.

Consider, for example, the rhymes of Sonnets 36 to 39: *twain/remain* and *one/alone* are used as rhymes in 36 and 39; *spite/delight* is a rhyme in 36 and 37, while 38 rhymes *sight/delight*; *thee/me* is used in all four sonnets; and *give/live* crops up in both 37 and 39. These sonnets are not linked by theme, but are most certainly linked by rhymes. Kemigan gives a detailed discussion (pp. 8-9) of the minute but unmistakable links among 106 to 109, which are superficially unrelated, but we can actually begin earlier and continue further. Sonnet 100 ties to 101 as both address Shakespeare's muse and both apologize for a lapse of time; 102 and 103 also excuse the time lapse; 102 and 104 both refer back to the beginning of the friendship; 104 and 105 discuss three; 104 and 108 close with the same rhyme and both imply that the friend is aging; 106 and 107 both rhyme *time/rhyme* and both mention prophecies; 107 and 108 both make a rhyme on age; 109 returns to a lapse of time, like 100 to 103; 109 and 110 both speak of the poet wandering; 110 and 111 both apologize for the poet's dramatic career; and 110 to 112 all discuss the poet's disrepute. These sort of links can be found all through the first 126 sonnets; readers may try the game themselves or look at Stephen Booth's Yale edition of the Sonnets or his *Essay on Shakespeare's Sonnets*. It is, to put it mildly, difficult to see how such groupings and echoes could survive reordering.

We now turn from internal evidence to external by examining the sequential ties between the Sonnets and the life of Shakespeare's friend, the Earl of Southampton. When these two first met is unknown, but not later than 1593, the year Shakespeare dedicated *Venus and Adonis* to Southampton. Sonnets 1 to 17 strongly urge the friend to wed and produce sons, which can be linked to a very active campaign waged between 1590 and 1594 to get Southampton married. The second article in this series showed that Sonnets 78 to 100 can be neatly mated to Southampton's life between late 1597 and early 1599. The only proposed date and set of events that truly explains Sonnet 107 is 1603: the death of Queen Elizabeth, the coming of King James, the freeing of Southampton from the Tower, and the references to prophecies, fears of the uncertainty, joy, and the coming of peace (this last item alone disposes of earlier suggested dates). The second quatrain of Sonnet 111 can be plausibly linked to the trial of Sir Walter Raleigh in November 1603. The second article in this series established a perfectly plausible tie between Sonnet 122 and James' Accession Day tournament of 1604. Sonnet 126 closes the series, and the Earl of Oxford died in 1604, with about a week's notice to get his affairs in order. Everything fits in place.

We now turn to Sonnets 127 and 152 about the Dark Lady. In a sense, I am less concerned about the sequence of these sonnets, but still we find evidence of order. Internal evidence is again found in



groups. Sonnets 130, 131, and 132 all deal with blackness; Sonnets 133 and 134 both concern the Fair Youth; 135 and 136 pun obsessively on the word 'will'; 140, 141, and 142 all discuss the eye and heart; lines of 14 in 147 and 148 both denounce the Dark Lady; 149, 150, and 151 all speak of the Lady's hate or criticism of the poet. Rhyme links are found across as well as within these groups. For example, name/shame is a rhyme in 127, while shame/blame is used in 129; sounds/confounds is a rhyme in 128, while sound/ground is in 130; groan/alone makes a rhyme in both 131 and 133; face/place is found in 131, and face/grace is in 132. The foregoing list can be extended right across the Fair Lady Sonnets up to friend/friend (144), end/friend (145), spend/end (146, and friend/spend (149). (Incidentally, various scholars have from time to time sought to evict some of the sonnets from the cycle. The fifteen line Sonnet 99, the octosyllabic 145, and the religious 146 have all been questioned, but all possess rhyme links to their neighbors. Also, G.P.V. Akrigg in his valuable biography of Southampton argues that the couplet to Sonnet 96, which is identical to that of 36, does not belong and may have resulted from censorship. But that couplet's sort/report rhyme times to the sport/resort rhyme of lines 2 and 4 and to the sport/report rhyme of Sonnet 95.)

External evidence that both the Dark Lady and Fair Youth Sonnets are correctly ordered can be found by comparing the themes of some of the sonnets of these two groups. Sonnet 8 ties to 128 by their mutual references to music. Sonnet 21 links to 130 as both decry the exaggerated praise of beauty by other sonneteers. Sonnets 40 to 42 speak of the Youth's seduction by the Lady, as do 133 and 134. Sonnets 46 and 47 share the eye and heart theme of 140 to 142, and lines 7-8 of 142 concern the law of property, the principal metaphor of 46. Meanwhile, 141's mention of the five wits and five senses of man may be connected to 44 and 45's listing of the four humors of which man is composed. Sonnet 62 reminds of 146 in its concern with the sin of physical vanity. These links preserve order; an early Fair Youth sonnet matches and early Dark Lady sonnet, later Fair Youth sonnets tie to later Dark Lady sonnets -- no cross-cutting is found.

I have isolated and examined the rhyme cluster in all 154 sonnets, a cluster being an identical or similar rhyme used in neighboring sonnets. The results are too lengthy to be detailed here, but it can be shown that the clusters in the Dark Lady Sonnets can be tied in approximately correct order to rhyme clusters in Sonnets 9 to 52.

A final piece of evidence for the correctness of the order of the first 126 sonnets, as well as of the place of the Dark Lady Sonnets with regard to the first 126 is provided by MacD.P. Jackson (see Kerrigan, p. 430). Jackson counted the number of commas within the lines of each sonnet (as opposed to punctuation marks at the end of lines), and found that the number of internal commas (which yield evidence of syntactical complexity) was independent of the shifts of the two compositors who set up the 1609 edition of the Sonnets. The results are that Sonnets 1 to 25 have an average 2.8 internal punctuation marks per sonnet, Sonnets 26 to 50 average 4.7 per sonnet, Sonnets 51 to 75 average 4.9, Sonnets 76 to 100 average 5.5, Sonnets 101 to 126 average 5.4, and Sonnets 127 to 154 have 3.6 on average.

We have now seen considerable evidence that the original edition placed the Sonnets (within the two main groups) in the correct order, but let us contemplate the alternative (which is always a useful procedure). Suppose that Thomas Thorpe obtained the Sonnets in a bundle of 154 numbered sheets, decided (rightly or wrongly) that he has inherited a hodgepodge, and carefully created the present sequence by grouping the Sonnets by themes, placing all of the marriage sonnets at the beginning, all of those on the Dark Lady at the end, etc. In doing so, he would also have created the numerical themes noted by Graziani, the rhyme and other subtle word links noted by Kerrigan, Booth, and others, the ordered ties between the Sonnets and Southampton's life story, the ordered ties of themes and rhymes between the Fair Youth and Dark Lady groups, and the progression in internal punctuation noted by Jackson. I would regard such results as virtually impossible to obtain intentionally and astronomically unlikely to occur by accident. The type of evidence presented here is not capable of proving that every last sonnet is in its proper place, but I feel that it does place a large burden of proof on those who favor minor, much less major reordering. Also, we have seen tests that may establish that a given sonnet does belong where it is.

We will now turn to Sonnet 104, which proclaims that three years have passed since Shakespeare and his friend first met: "Three winters cold ... three summers' pride ... three beauteous springs ... Three April perfumes in three hot Junes burned/Since first I saw you fresh, which yet are green." This sonnet



French sonneteers exerted a strong influence on Shakespeare and his compatriots, and Pierre de Ronsard and Philippe Desportes observed the three year convention, which went back to Horace and was also used by Samuel Daniel. Ronsard and Desportes were the top French poets of the day and were widely imitated in England; Daniel (along with Sir Philip Sidney) was the model English sonneteer, and Horace was a towering presence in Renaissance literature. If these poets used a three year metaphor then it can be taken as an established convention. But would Shakespeare have found the convention useful?

Thus vainly thinking that she thinks me young  
Although I know my years be past the best,  
Outfacing faults in love with love's ill rest,  
But wherefore says my love that she is young?  
And wherefore say not I that I am old?  
O, love's best habit's in a soothing tongue,  
And age in love loves not to have years told.  
Therefore I'll lie with love, and love with me  
Since that our faults in love thus smothered be.  
(11. 5-14, 1599 version)

Shakespeare's willingness to try to ignore the passage of time is also found in the sonnets to Southampton. The earlier ones speak much of his friend's youth, but later sonnets (including 104) appear to acknowledge that he was aging: "Thou hast passed by the ambush of young days" (70, 9); "To me, fair friend, you never can be old ... Such *seems* your beauty still" (104, 1, 3); "y'have passed a hell of time" (120, 6). It is significant that Southampton was thought to be youthful longer than most people. He was lightly bearded through his twenties, and many saw him as a misguided youth at the time of his treason trial in 1601, despite his being a twenty-seven year old husband, father, and veteran of three campaigns. In fact, the tacit acknowledgement of aging found in the opening of 104 (see above) and in its closing (see below) make far more sense if written to the twenty-nine year old Southampton in late 1602 or early 1603, after his experience of marriage, fatherhood, war, rebellion, trial, and imprisonment than if written to the callow twenty-two year old of 1596.

12

For fear of which, hear this, thou age unbred:  
Ere you were bom was beauty's summer dead.  
(104, 9-14)

A completely different line of argument comes from Shakespeare's use of number symbols and wordplay (which were common to his age). Sonnet 105 deals with the concept of "three ... in one"; Sonnet 136 is concerned with unity and multiplicity (11. 7-9); "The Phoenix and the Turtle" discourses on unity and duality in a complex and fascinating way (11. 25-48). There is much play on 'three' in I, ii of *Love's Labour's Lost*, in which the clever Moth collapses "three years" into two words or one hour. That play also transforms the nine Worthies into three (V,ii, 485-97). Several sonnets as well as "The Phoenix and the Turtle" express the common belief that two lovers become one. So Shakespeare clearly believed that a larger number could be changed to a smaller. It should also be noted that three was a multiple symbol of importance as defining God's nature (three in one), as the male number (two was female), and as the trefoil was the symbol of hope and the herald of spring (which, by the way, Shakespeare called Southampton in Sonnet 1; see the OED for the meanings of the trefoil. Elizabethans also used 'thrice' to mean 'very' or 'completely,' as in phrases like 'thrice noble,' 'thrice happy,' or 'thrice famed' (*2 Henry VI*, III, ii, 157).

The Earl of Oxford shared the belief in number symbols, as testified to by the flourishes of his signature. For most of his life he used a subflourish consisting of a long horizontal slashed by seven short verticals (which I take as a tally mark for seventeen), and a suprafourish of four lower case i's (roman number four, ii). He dropped these after the death of Queen Elizabeth and switched to trefoil, a symbolic threesome, shortly after the likely date of composition of Sonnets 104 and 105.

When we combine Shakespeare's hatred of the passage of time, his determination to defeat time, his jokes about simply lying time away, the evidence that Southampton was aging, the prolific numerology of the age, the special status of the number three, and Shakespeare's tendency to alter larger numbers to smaller, and then ask whether Shakespeare would have taken advantage of an established sonnet convention that three years could be used to cover a longer time, then I think that the answer is obviously in the affirmative. As earlier in this article, it is useful to consider the alternative. If Sonnet 104 was indeed composed in 1603 or thereabouts, I believe that Shakespeare would have absolutely recoiled at the thought of writing: "Ten winters cold ... ten summers' pride ... ten beauteous springs ... Ten April perfumes in ten hot Junes burned,/Since first I saw you fresh, which yet are green."

\*\*\*\*\*

### STRATFORDIAN SELF-DELUSIONS

In the Introduction to his *The Life and Times of William Shakespeare* (Henry Holt, 1988), Oxford University's Professor Peter Levi asserts on p. xvii:

"It is an axiom of method that the facts of Shakespeare's (i.e., Shakspeare's) life ... must be established as firmly as possible and without wishful thinking before those facts can be related to his writings ... Many inspiring and misleading writers about Shakespeare (i.e., Shakspeare) impart to (the) characters and passages of (the) plays an experience of life they merely imagine, bearing conjecture on conjecture and cobweb on cobweb."

Examples of Professor Levi's method of establishing "facts" is illustrated on p. 31:

"If as seems likely ... "; "may well have been ... "; "Perhaps ... "; "had certainly left ... "; "probably never ... "; "is supposed ... "; "what makes the story likelier ... "; "may have been ... "; "there is no reason why ... "; "I think he ... "; and "It may be considered ... "

In his blurb on the cover of that book, Anthony Burgess affirms:

"What we have is documented fact, and plenty of it."

An example of plenty of "documented fact" is illustrated on p. 34:

"The one certain thing we know about Shakespeare's (i.e., Shakspeare's) youthful occupation is

that he read a great deal - he was an omnivorous reader. Where and when he learned, and in what order, we have no way of knowing, but at some time he learned a lot (of) Latin, learned French well, and I think some Italian later, attempted a study of law, and in general devoured whatever came to his hand."

\*\*\*\*\*

#### 1991 "TOP 25" SHAKESPEARE OXFORD CLUES

It is my opinion that more popular acceptance of the case for the 17th Earl of Oxford's authorship of the plays and sonnets of William Shakespeare is held back by the mountain of detail that must be mastered in order to make an informed judgment. Charlton Ogburn did a brilliant job in marshalling the principal known facts in support of the Earl's authorship of the Shakespeare plays and sonnets in one lucid volume, "The Mysterious Mr. Shakespeare." But this book runs to 892 pages and requires several readings before it can be comprehensively digested.

In order to sharpen the case for Edward de Vere, I propose to publish each year a list of the twenty five most persuasive clues linking him to the authorship of the Shakespeare plays and sonnets. Each of the twenty five clues will be supported by a maximum of two hundred and fifty words of documentation making the case for Oxford's authorship. Each candidate for the list will be judged both by itself and in company with the other clues as to its credibility in the eyes of an impartial viewer who has no more than a passing familiarity with the controversy over the Shakespeare authorship.

One of my 1991 candidates is: The Gad's hill robber date (Source, The Mysterious Wm. Shakespeare, by Charlton Ogburn).

The reader is invited to submit his or her candidates for the "Top 25" together with supporting arguments not exceeding two hundred and fifty words for each to:

Richard S. Clement  
2016 Mystic Bay Ct.  
Indianapolis, Ind. 46240

Submission of clue candidates need not be on the basis of originality by the submitter. Of course, sources of ideas supporting clues should be mentioned.

I will have the results printed with the Marcus Gheeraedts portrait of Edward de Vere on a glossy cover.

Richard Clement

Ed. note: I will make arrangements with Mr. Clement to have the printed "Top 25" mailed to members of the Shakespeare Oxford Society.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### RECENT AND FUTURE COLLOQUIES ON THE AUTHORSHIP QUESTION

§

*"Who was William Shakespeare?  
The Greatest Literary Detective Mystery  
Of All Time."*

On October 6, 1990 the Rollins College Alumni Association presented a lively discussion between Stratfordian Professor Sidney Homan, B.A., Princeton, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of English and Theater at the University of Florida and Oxfordian John B. Fisher, B.A., Harvard, Phi Beta Kappa, Rollins Alumni Lecturer in History and Literature.

Mr. Fisher reported:

"The Rollins College 'Elizabethan Evening' proved to be a very gratifying success. The occasion, scheduled for the college's largest auditorium, was sold out ten days before the event. With the fire marshal's permission, 80 more seats were brought in; more than 50 were, regrettably turned away at the door. How pleasing, and reassuring, such an interest in the subject!"

§

#### DAVID CROCKER COLLOQUIA

June 23, 1990

#### A. DEBATE

Shakspere, Shake-speare, Shakespeare

"Who Goes There"

"Paul Nelson - since his retirement from the Cleveland Clinic his interest has centered on the Shakespeare authorship question. Paul believes and will debate that the 17th Earl of Oxford, Edward de Vere (1550-1604), is the genius behind the Shakespearean poems and plays.

Fred Tyler - former attorney, presently active at the East Cleveland Theatre, President of The Hermit Club and on the board of directors of The Great Lakes Theatre Festival, formerly, The Shakespeare Festival, will debate that it was only William Shakespeare and none other that wrote the poems and plays.

Those volunteering as seconds for each debate should bring their own bandages, splints, and firearms."

Dr. Nelson reported that Shakspeare Oxford Society member, Rollin R. De Vere, was present and confessed he had not checked as to whether he was a descendant of "William Shakespeare" for fear he would find he was not.

§ Charles Vere, Earl of Burford, has accepted an invitation from The Council of the Friends of The Folger Shakespeare Library to give a talk at the Folger in Washington, D.C. on April 24, 1991. The Earl of Burford will also be the speaker at the annual dinner celebrating Edward de Vere's birthday - April 26, 1991 - in Cambridge, Mass.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### REPORT from the SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY ANNUAL CONFERENCE

DoubleTree Hotel - Pasadena, California - October 26-29, 1990

Over sixty people registered for the conference, and approximately 90 attended one or more of the events. About half were from the Southern California area, the other half being from many other states, and two from Canada.

The opening Banquet at BECKHAM PLACE, a superb Old English style restaurant, was attended by 70 who reveled in CHARLES CHAMPLIN's talk on "A Journalist Looks at Oxford" or "How Edward De Vere Changed My Life and Enabled Me to Judge the Floats at the Rose Parade." The banquet was also attended by the Earl of Oxford himself (portrayed by an actor who impersonates him frequently at Renaissance Fairs all over California, which enabled photo opportunities for the newspapers).

Saturday morning's private tour of the HUNTINGTON RESEARCH LIBRARY was an exceptional opportunity. Although the Galleries and Gardens are open to the public daily, the Research Library, which specializes in manuscripts prior to 1800, requires permits. Conference participants were privileged to see a display of early documents relating to Edward De Vere arranged for us and inspired by Ruth Miller's talk on "Love's Labour's Lost." The original documents included the marriage contract dated 1562 between 11 year old Edward De Vere and the sisters Elizabeth and Mary Hastings, signed by John De Vere. The Hastings Collection of 40,000 manuscripts was acquired by Huntington in 1927 and also contains 6 original letters by Edward De Vere concerning his unsuccessful attempt to obtain the tin mining patent during the 1590's. We saw two of these letters in De Vere's own hand, one of which contained the 'crown' signature.

Saturday afternoon SOS papers and speakers made a significant contribution to new areas of research enhancing the De Vere case. ROBERT TREASH from San Diego supported his talk "Getting Around Ben Johnson, Finally" with a myriad of examples of the use of 'monIment' vs 'monUment'

throughout the period as well as additional references relating the Avon River near Stratford-at-Bow close to London.

RUTH LOYD MILLER's talk "Oath Foresworn in Love's Labour's Lost" was a fascinating explanation of the story behind the line in that play — "Maria, Empress of my love" which she demonstrates refers to Mary Hastings' proposal of marriage from Ivan IV, Emperor of Muscovia, which was well known in the court circles. Mary refused the match and remained unmarried for her lifetime, receiving an annual annuity from her brother for her support. These events relate to DeVere's marriage contract to Mary which became void through Cecil's control of his ward, and so DeVere's apology in the play becomes evident.

GARY GOLDSTEIN came from New York to talk on "Shakespeare's Native Tongue" (see pp ).

Later that afternoon WARD ELLIOTT gave a presentation on "Computers and the Oxford Candidacy".

RICHARD ROE's talk on "An Italian Itinerary" was given Sunday morning with slides highlighting the geographical references to the opening line of "The Winter's Tale" in Act III, Scene I, and the phrase "Fertile the isle, the Temple much surpassing the common praise it bears." With remarkable detail, he was able to take previous references in the play and connect them to the exact points of their voyage by sea to Sicily, and around Sicily by horseback, ending with the identification of the Segesta Temple still to be found along the Roman road to Traponi. This will be part of Dick Roe's forthcoming book on Shakespeare in Italy.

Saturday evening's play reading of JOHN NASSIVERA's "All the Queen's Men" filled the Balcony Theater at the Pasadena Playhouse. In a fascinating relationship the scenes alternate between Elizabeth's court and the English department of a modern American college, with all actors playing double roles. A lively discussion followed the play with writer-producer John Nassivera.

Sunday evening conference participants traveled to the Globe Playhouse in Hollywood, which is a quarter-size replica of the original in London, built by Thad Taylor which puts on Shakespearean and other early dramas throughout the year. The group attended a reading of "Rape of Lucrece" and were treated to champagne by Thad Taylor.

Those who were able to stay on journeyed Monday morning to the Francis Bacon Library in Claremont which holds one of the largest collections in the country of Shakespeare authorship material.

The very competent committee for this exceptionally outstanding Annual Conference was composed of Barbara Crowley, chairman; Carol Sue Lipman, program; Jane Roe, facilities; and Josephine Wilde, registration and tickets.

At their Annual Meeting the Members of The Shakespeare Oxford Society unanimously adopted the revised By-Laws and elected the following Trustees who, in turn, at their Annual Meeting elected the officers as listed:

John L. Price, Chair of Board	Dr. Paul A. Nelson, Treasurer	Barbara Crowley, Program
Elisabeth Sears, President	Morse Johnson, Ed. of Newsletter	Dorothy Travers-Davies, Program
Russell desCognets, Vice Pres.	Victor Crichton, Membership Chair	Isabel Holden, Program
Charles Boyle, 2nd Vice Pres.	Gary Goldstein, Publicity	Jane Roe, Program
John H. Louthier, Secretary	Trudy Atkins, Program	Dr. Michael Steinbach

\*\*\*\*\*

#### JOIN SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY AND RECEIVE QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

The purpose of The Shakespeare Oxford Society is to document and establish Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford (1550-1604), as the universally recognized author of the works of William Shakespeare. Each Newsletter carries articles which impart a wide range of corroborating information and commentary.

Student: \$10.00

Annual Dues Regular: \$25.00

Sustaining \$50.00 or more

1. Dues and requests for membership information to:  
Victor Crichton  
207 W. 106th St., Apt. 10-D  
New York, NY 10025

2. Submit materials for publication in the Newsletter to:  
Morse Johnson, Editor  
Suite #819, 105 West 4th St.  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202