



**THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY**

**NEWSLETTERS**

**1993**

# *The Shakespeare Oxford Society*

Cathedral Station, P.O. Box 0550, New York, N.Y. 10025-0550

Morse Johnson, Editor



A review of "The Friendly Shakespeare" by Norrie Epstein  
(Viking Penguin, 1993, 530 pages, \$22.50)

by Richard F. Whalen

In her racy book on Shakespeare, Norrie Epstein says, "What I wanted to convey was the real (emphaaia in original) Shakespeare, not the academic, the watered-down or the air-brushed one..." Oxfordians may be forgiven for finding a double meaning in her words - a double meaning worthy of her subject, the master of wordplay. By one reading she means to convey the real Shakespeare who is lively, accassible, unburdened by academic cant and highly rewarding. That's the main message of her book. By another reading, however, she may mean to convey the real identity of Shakeapeare aa Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford.

Although she believes that the anti-Stratfordiana have more aupportera than ever, ahe does not embrace them wholeheartedly. Their argumenta, she writes, often involve complex conspiracies and passions that some would call obsessions. "...And if the question of authorship is mentioned in academic circles - which it rarely is - it's usually with a tone of complacent derision that dismissea the anti-Stratfordians as literary paranoiacs searching for a mystery whera none axists."

When it comes to contrasting the arguments for Will Shakspere and for Oxford, however, Epstein votes for Oxford. She uses the term "very persuasive" to describe the major reasons why some people believe Shakespeare's works were written by someone else. She lists 16 reasons, all familiar to Oxfordians, and devotes a full page to reproduction of Will Shakspere'a signatures, daacribed as "laborious scrawls". In presenting the case for the man from Stratford she lists 18 pointa, but characterizes them simply as "some of the major arguments" in his favor. Her conclusion: "In short, there is no solid evidence for attributing the works to the man whose name they now bear."

Oxfordians, she says, "have built up an enormous case...", and she lists what she calls "some of the more compelling arguments". Oxfordian readers will immediately see ways of making the eight arguments even more compelling and adding to them. Then follows a transcript interview with Charlton Ogburn, described as an eloquent spokesman for Oxford. Even traditional academics, she says, "acknowledge grudging admiration" for his book, "The Mysterious William Shakespeare: The Myth and the Reality".

Epstein's title says it all: "The Friendly Shakespeare: A Thoroughly Painless Guide to the Best of the Bard." The book's rambunctious eye-catching design reinforces the message. Chaptars are short and punchy; one is six lines long. Photos of scenes from the playa, cartoon-like drawings and a variety of typefaces and headlines enliven the appaarance of the text. The cover illustration of Shakespeare is inspired by the First Folio portrait, but is modernized to look more like a Madison Avenue adman in Elizabethan ruff. This book is not for solemn academics, but for the uninitiated who

might even have had their first experience of Shakespeare on television or in the movie theater.

The short sub-chapters - more than 100 - cover subjects such as transvestite theater and boy actors, the Globe excavation, the sanitized Shakespeare, swordplay and dueling, sonnet boom, the fool in history, great moments in Bardolatry, and spoofs, offshoots, parodies and adaptations. Most of the book is devoted to quick, breezy introductions to the major plays: "What to Look for in Hamlet", or Macbeth, or As You Like It, etc. They are useful, entertaining and sometimes irreverent.

Besides offering a wealth of mini-essays on all aspects of Shakespeare, Epstein has also collected some marvelously spunky and funky quotations:

"The trouble with Shakespeare is that you never get to sit down unless you are a king." - George S. Kaufman, the playwright.

"Will a dab of Shakespeare daintily perfume my wit or just sound like the literary belching of a compulsive nerd? - Prof. Gary Taylor of Brandeis University.

"If you get Shakespeare wrong, you get the Elizabethan Age wrong." - Charles Vere Lord Burford, a descendant of Oxford.

Epstein may have pulled off a minor best-seller. The New York Times gave her book a very positive review last December 15. The reviewer found some facts and assessments to quibble with, but concluded that "her discussions of the plays and sonnets are spirited, informative and provocative; her writing is direct, lucid and admirably free of pedantic cant... The uninitiated readers should finish it with an appreciation for Shakespeare's astonishing versatility, his alchemical use of language, his aching knowledge of the human heart... and with a desire to see (or at least read) his works themselves."

The reviewer makes only passing reference to "one fairly long section" on the authorship question and chooses to mention only the candidacy of Queen Elizabeth I as an example of Shakespearean "anecdotes, gossip and trivia" found in the book. Oxfordians might suggest that the reviewer buried the news.

Prof. Samuel Schoenbaum wrote a most generous review to "The Friendly Shakespeare" in the Washington Post, a review that will probably turn up in other newspapers through syndication. Epstein's fairly long section (20 pages) on the authorship question, however, was ignored by Schoenbaum, even though he has probably spent more time on Will Shakspeare's biography and the authorship question than has any other establishment academician in recent history. Perhaps the authorship question is getting too hot to handle.

Schoenbaum does note that Epstein interviewed "that redoubtable anti-Stratfordian, Charlton Ogburn", but declines further comment and makes no critique of her presentation of the case for Oxford.

He acknowledges that even professional scholars like himself will profit from the book, even though it is designed for the uninitiated. His general conclusion: "Shakespeare remains friendly on the stage, in the study and in the pages of 'The Friendly Shakespeare'".

Other reviews, including those in newspapers in Orlando, Florida, and Grosse Pointe, Michigan, have been quite favorable. A random check of a few bookstores shows that the book is being stocked and should be readily available almost everywhere.

A leading textbook supplier to schools, The Writing Company, already displays "The Friendly Shakespeare" in its 1993 catalog of 47 pages of books, tapes, videos, filmstrips, disks, posters, etc. on Shakespeare. The book is described prominently on page 3 as "sure to please reluctant students as well as scholars..."

The display ad is opposite the Stratfordian works of Schoenbaum, Dennis Kay and Northrup Frye. But the cover illustration is much superior. The appearance of "The Friendly Shakespeare" in the catalog follows by just a few months a letter the Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter Editor sent to them noting that none of their books, etc. provides an exposition by scholars who reject the attribution to the Stratford man. Now one does.

Epstein was a lecturer on literature at the University of California for six years. While there, she met Carol Sue Lipman of the Shakespeare Authorship Roundtable, who provided information and ideas. She also credits Ruth Loyd Miller for help on the case for Oxford. Epstein is now a lecturer at Goucher College, where she is conducting classes in Dickens and Victorian literature.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### "In Defense of Edith Duffey: Which Nowell Tutored Oxford?"

Honest research deserves its rewards. Edith Duffey's "correction" in the last Newsletter of the historical confusion over Lawrence Nowell was a refreshing and courageous statement of an error of historical tradition that apparently was intrinsic to her hypothesis linking Nowell, Lambard, Oxford, and the play Edmund Ironsides. Citing R. M. Warnicke (English Language Notes XI, June 1974), Duffey concludes that because Nowell of Lichfield was a cousin to the antiquarian Nowell associated with Lambard, the Lichfield Nowell couldn't have shown the young De Vere Anglo-Saxon chronicles. But wait! To quote Warnicke:

It was undoubtedly the antiquary and not the Dean of Lichfield who was tutor in June of 1563 to Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford, then a ward of Sir William Cecil, principal secretary to the Queen. (ELN XI (4): p. 254)

That is, the very scholar separating the conflated Nowells explicitly re-connects Oxford to the antiquarian, not the Dean! Not only can Duffey reclaim her theory; the Oxfordian biography, in lieu of contradictory evidence, should be emended on the identity of his first tutor. Does conflation of names and identities ring a bell?

Andrew Hannas

\* \* \* \* \*

I regret to report that our enthusiastic, erudite and charming member - Marie A. Willis - has informed me that she has a recurrence of a malignant tumor which will limit her activities. Although she has 44 English friends whom she persuaded to buy Charlton Ogburn's The Mysterious William Shakespeare, she would also like to keep in touch with her Oxfordian American friends. Her address is 24 Welbeck Avenue, Highfield, Southampton, U.K. 902 ISU 0703 554533. (Tel. from America: 011-44-703-554533.)

"Flights of angels sing thee to thy rest"

(Excerpts from the obituary from Mr. Fowler's daughter, Mrs. Clara Mixter)

William Plumer Fowler died at the age of 92 on January 11, 1993 at his home in North Hampton, New Hampshire. He was a retired lawyer, poet and Shakespeare scholar, a graduate of Roxbury Latin School, Dartmouth College and Harvard Law School and a preeminent member of the Shakespeare Oxford Society. He was also a lifetime member and past president of the Appalachian Mountain Club of Boston, member and past president of the Shakespeare Club of Boston for 12 years, and a lifetime member of the Unitarian Universalist Association.

On a 1991 visit to my father, with Hank Whittemore and Lisa Risley-Aquizap, we were amazed at his ability to recall and recite Oxford's Sonnets. He gave complete explications as a follow-up and these included double-entendrea in Latin and French. He was indeed lucid! As we were departing, we expressed concern that we had tired him by staying too long. He retorted, "Oh no, I'm tough. When I was a young man, Sherman Adams and I walked a hundred miles of the Appalachian Trail in one 24 hour period, from midnight of one day to midnight the next."

On my most recent visit with him last October, William repeated once more his promise that we could have his remaining collection of Oxfordian books for the Shakespeare Oxford Society Library, as soon as it was established. His other Shakespeare books had been donated to the Concord, N.H. Public Library, but the library was not interested in the Oxford-oriented volumes. These latter include The 'Golding' Translation of The Metamorphoses, (the introduction of this particular edition of 1965 includes observations of interest to Oxford researchers by (Stratfordian) Professor J. Frederick Nims). Also, there are copies of Looney's Shakespeare Identified and other early Oxfordian books. William's secretary was present at the time and assured me that she would remember. On this last visit, William also gave me his remaining copies of The Phoenix and the Turtle autographed. These I am saving for the Shakespeare Oxford Library, which I hope will be established soon!

What a debt of gratitude the Shakespeare Oxford Society owes to William Fowler not only for his generosity in donating his books, but his tremendous efforts in Oxfordian scholarship. His Shakespeare Identified in the Letters of Edward de Vere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford (1986), a labor of many years of after-work study in his law office, is one of the greatest contributions to Oxfordian research and his monograph, The Phoenix and the Turtle (which also includes Dorothy Ogburn's Exegests), though brief, is equally important.

We will miss William, but we know that he had a wonderfully full and productive life. He had an education that included a solid background in Latin and Greek, as well as modern languages and law training which contributed to his clear understanding of several layers of meaning in Oxford's writings.

## Shake-speare Could Only Have Been a Pseudonym

by Morse Johnson

In his summary in The Shakespeare Newsletter (Fall '92) of the GTE Service Corporation's VisNet broadcast of a disputation by Stratfordian and Oxfordian participants on the Shakespeare authorship question, Stratfordian Professor Thomas Pendleton reported:

Very early in the discussion, (Stratfordian Gary) Taylor in effect predicted the nature of their interchange by insisting that the categorical assertions of Oxfordians would crumble under examination, but that disproving any one of them required concentration and time not likely to be available within this format... Taylor attempted to indicate something at least of the technical knowledge required to analyze and then rebut such claims by presenting information on how the exigencies of type-setting sometime required hyphenation (Shake-Speare) ....

These examples of "Shake-speare" categorically reveal that the hyphens could not have been required by exigencies of type-setting:

The name on 15 of the 32 editions of Shakespeare's plays, published before the First Folio, was spelled "William Shake-speare".

The opening couplet in Leonard Digges's eulogy in the First Folio (1623):  
Shake-speare, at length, thy pious fellow give  
The world thy works; thy works, by which, outlive

Of a certainty, these hyphens were not inserted by happenstance and could only have been intentional and meaningful. Charlton Ogburn has pointed out in his The Mysterious William Shakespeare that,

the coincidence would be startling if the leading dramatist of our civilization had actually been born with the name Shakespeare. Hasti-vibrans, the Spear-shaker, was the sobriquet of Pallas Athena, who was said to have sprung from the brow of Zeus fully armed and brandishing a spear. And Pallas Athena was the patron goddess of Athens, home of the theatre, while in Rome the guild of poets and dramatists met in the Temple of Pallas. 'The spear of Pallas shake', says a verse in a collection of Shakespeare's poems of 1640.

.....  
'Shake-speare' is clearly in the category of those whom Mistress Overdone's tapster names in Measure for Measure as being in jail... "young master Deep-vow, and master Copper-spur, and master Starvelackey..." this is to say, it is a symbolic, not an actual name. Only two kinds of names are hyphenated in English usage: Family names that combine two names each of which is itself a family name, as Burne-Jones, Trevor-Roper, ...in such cases both names are capitalized. 'Shake-speare' is manifestly not of this order.

.....  
No one claims that the hyphenated 'Shakespeare' was chosen by the author as his pseudonym; it was not on the two recorded occasions on which he used the name by which we know him. In signing the dedications of the two long narrative poems he did not hyphenate it. It was used by others who, in hyphenating the name can only have been showing that they recognized Shakespeare as a pseudonym - and the fact that not all

did so is irrelevant. They would have no reason to hyphenate the name other than to identify Shakespeare as a pseudonym. Unless a Stratfordian can provide a sensible alternative, both the names "Shakespeare" and "Shake-speare" are indisputably pseudonyms. Since Stratford's Shakspeare obviously would not have used Shakespeare or Shake-speare, the pseudonym comouflaged someone else.

#### Addendum

From The History of the Worthies of England (1662) by Thomas Fuller:

"William Shakespeare was born at Stratford on Avon in this County, in whom three eminent Poets may seem in some sort to be compounded.

1. Martial in the Warlike sound of his Sur-name (whence some may conjecture him of a Military extraction,) Hasti-vibrans, or Shakes-speare.

2. Ovid, the most naturall and witty of all Poets, and hence it was that Queen Elizabeth, coming into a Grammar-School, made this extemporary verse,

'Persius a Crab-staff, Bawdy Martial,  
Ovid a fine Wag.'

3. Plautus, who was an exact Comaedian, yet never any Scholar, as our Shake-speare (if alive) would confess himself. Adde to all these, that though his Genius generally was jocular, and inclining him to festivity, yet he could (when so disposed) be solemn and serious, as appears by his Tragedies, so that Heraclitus himself (I mean if secret and unseen) might afford to smile at his Comedies, they were so merry, and Democritus scarce forbear to sigh at his Tragedies they were so mournfull.... [in the two following paragraphs the name is spelled "Shake-spear"]. "

"Heraclitus was a Greek philosopher. He held that the only reality is change and that permanence is an illusion. All things carry with them their opposites, and therefore being and not being are in everything and the only real state is one of transition..." (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language - 1975).

\* \* \* \* \*

"Something's in the air"

Two members of the Shakespeare Oxford Society had articles on Oxford published in two major in-flight magazines in the same month last December. Scott Smith of Thousand Oaks, California provided readers of Delta's SKY magazine with a solid, straight-forward introduction to the case for Oxford. He quoted Charlton Ogburn and the editor of this Newsletter. Lawrence Wells of Oxford, Mississippi, wrote the lead article for AA's AMERICAN WAY magazine. He provided an entertaining and informative update on the mood in Stratford and Hedingham these days. As Charlton Ogburn said upon hearing about the simultaneous in-flight articles: "Something's in the air."

If you want a copy of one or both, please write Shakespeare Oxford Society, Suite #819, 105 West 4th Street, Cincinnati, OH, 45202 and enclose a No. 10 self-addressed and stamped (29¢) envelope.

## THE PLAY'S THE THING, BUT IS IT MR. SHAKESPEARE'S?

by James Gill

(New Orleans Times Picayune)

To the humble scribbler, literary giants can be a source of great discouragement.

That a mere 24-year-old should have written "Pickwick" to take an obvious example, is a major slap in the face for the world's sging hacks. But then so are all works of genius, none more so, to be evsn more obvious, than the plays of the Bard.

Those plays can bring despair to the heart not just because of their transcendent depth and beauty, but because William Shakespeare of Stratford on Avon could not have written them without the aid of some supernatural force. And that is dirty pool.

Or, more likely, the plays were the work of another hand, ss, of course, has been suspected for ages, Francis Bacon and Christopher Marlowe being among the principal candidates suggested as the true author. In fact, as Charlton Ogburn's axhaustive and just-reissued book, "The Mysterious William Shakespeare" persuasively argues, the evidence points to Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford.

Ancient though the controversy is, the quest for the facts about the authorship of the plays remains the best detective story you could ever wish to read.

There are those who say that the play's the thing and it matters not who wielded the pen, but this is poor stuff, a preference for ignorance over understanding.

When Dickens wrote "Pickwick", mere youth though he was, he was already experienced in the ways of politics and the law, for instance. The comic gusto of the prose may have been heaven-sent, but the raw materials were drawn straight from life. So it is with all artists except, we are asked to believe, in the case of Shakespeare.

The orthodox account suggests that major magic must have been at work. A man from the local grammar school in a dull 16th century burg materialized in London to write peerless verse that demonstrates a familiarity, apparently acquired through osmosis, with foreign tongues and literature, ancient and modern, topography of Europe, the manners and conventions of royal courts, politics, warfare, the law and seafaring, among other things.

Contemporary records show that Shakespeare, married at 18 and a father of three soon after that, was a rather grasping Stratford businessman, who left no books or letters on his death. None of the other literary figures of the time appeared to know him, highly esteemed though the Shakespearean canon was. That Shakespeare was a nom de plume seems to have been an open secret.

Shakespeare's death was unremarked and six signatures on legal documents are all that survives in his hand. Those signatures are not what you would expect from the world's greatest dramatist, Shakespeare never having once managed to get to the end of his name before casting aside the pen. His parents, wife and children were illiterate.

The Oxfordian case was first put forward in England 62 years ago, and has been pooh-poohed by academe ever since. The orthodox view is that the playwright, mentioned as an actor in contemporary records, picked up his

remarkable technical knowledge and intellectual distinction by treading the Elizabethan boards and that none of his manuscripts survive because they were not considered important at the time.

To suggest that the putative author of these plays could be indifferent to their fate, not even mentioning them in his will, is a proposition so stupid that it could only be believed in a university. Scribblers know it to be impossible.

Events in the plays, in fact, repeatedly mirror things that are known to have happened to the Earl of Oxford, whose father-in-law, Lord Burghley, is unmistakably satirized in the character of Polonius. Oxford, who published highly regarded verse under his own name as a youth, was indeed a well traveled and learned man. The plays are informed by a markedly aristocratic attitude.

Theatrical types were "lewd fellows" in the parlance of the time, and no aristocrat would dare to be known as a playwright for the commercial stage. But Oxford is known to have been fascinated by the drama anyway, and no doubt want slumming with actors. A Stratford businessman could have acknowledged authorship of the plays, but not an earl who was one of Elizabeth I's court favorites. He would need someone else's name.

Oxford's forebear, the 13th Earl, fought for the Lancastrian cause against Richard III, which might explain the unalloyed evil of the humpback in the Shakespere play. The Richard III Society, which is out to rehabilitate Richard and rescue him from the calumny of the Shakespeare play, would seem to have a common cause with the Ogburn faction. So far, Ogburn says, they have not got together.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dear Mr. Johnson:

On New Year's Day, while I was reading the second edition of The Mysterious William Shakespeare in my living room, I was called into the TV room by my brother-in-law, who was watching the Rose Bowl parade. Knowing of my interest in the Shakespeare-Oxford controversy, he wanted me to see one of the floats as it passed by on the screen.

What should I see but a large, Sphinx-like image of that "stupider face", that "puddin-headed William", that "pudding-faced effigy" sailing by on my TV screen. Yes, the Delta Airlines entry in the 1993 Rose Bowl Parade was a flower-formed reproduction of Droeshout's engraving of our old friend, Shakspeare!

But that's not all. As the float passed by and the camera focused on the side of its face, there was very clearly a line of demarcation formed in the flowers between the front of the face and the side of the neck. There's no other way to say it but the face of Old Will was represented as a mask! It was almost as if the designers of the float had called in Charlton Ogburn, Jr. as a consultant. Even my brother-in-law commented that the face appeared to be a mask.

Little instances like this indicate that, slowly but surely, the tide is turning in our favor!

Gary L. Livacari, D.D.S.

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

The Mysterious William Shakespeare: The Myth & The Reality, by Charlton Ogburn.  
Second Edition, Fourth Printing. E.P.M. Publications, Inc., Box 490, McLean,  
Virginia, 22101-0490. Ph. 800-289-2339.

The traditional view of the world's greatest plays as the work of an uneducated glover's son, grain-dealer, and putative actor/play-broker from provincial Stratford-upon-Avon has been challenged sharply and cogently in recent years (and, for that matter, at least as far back as the 18th century), but 1984 saw the first publication of Mr. Ogburn's great work, which confirmed the true author as Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford. One direct consequence of The Mysterious William Shakespeare's appearance was the 1987 Shakespeare authorship trial in moot court at Washington, D.C.'s American University, presided over by three sitting justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. (Two of the three justices have since registered either near-total conversion to the Oxford side of the controversy or great scepticism towards the traditional view of the authorship, while yet another of their colleagues has now joined them in dissenting from the Stratfordian orthodoxy.)

The Mysterious William Shakespeare's newly augmented second edition is surely a "must" purchase for new and veteran Oxfordish campaigners. Mr. Ogburn's book raises and answers convincingly the great and small questions readers most need answered in this "battle of the Bard", among them: Why is Shakespeare ushered into his career as a published playwright by the praise of his contemporary Francis Meres (1598), then ushered out of it (after his death) by Ben Jonson's laudatory verses in the 1623 First Folio—with almost nothing written in all the intervening years to reflect his undoubted high standing in the public eye and among his fellow writers? Why did poet John Davies praise him as "our English Terence"? Why did Shakespeare, almost alone among great English writers, fail to pay poetic tribute to Queen Elizabeth upon her passing in 1603—or to the artistic young Prince Henry upon his untimely death in 1612? Who was the 17th Earl of Oxford, and why would such a nobleman as he have failed to acknowledge writing the Shakespeare plays? Who was the English schoolmaster who first discovered the real William Shakespeare by combing the great plays for clues to their author's background? How many of "Shakespeare's" personal characteristics are matched by Oxford's? (All of them, it transpires; and those, uniquely.) Why is Greene's Groatsworth of Wit an unreliable source of information about either the real playwright or the Stratford imposter?

The book earned for him the high praise of critics such as Clifton Fadiman, Joseph Sobran, Charles Champlin, and David McCullough. The twelve changes or additions of substance I noticed (one of them a slightly expanded list of citations at the back of the book) represent no mean feat on the part of the author, editors and typographers, since the book's pagination is very nearly the same as before.

There is, moreover, a genuine indication of advances in Oxfordian research over just eight years. Among the de Vere champions freshly quoted or cited are illustrious Oxfordian scholars Ruth Loyd Miller, Elisabeth Sears, and (for the first time within such a book, I believe) Peter R. Moore, Richard P. Roe, and Nina Green. Perhaps I can tantalize prospective buyers of the second edition by hinting about some of the information they'll encounter:

1) a likely topical link between a Shakespeare comedy and an edict of Queen Elizabeth; 2) a possible locale for the near-shipwreck in The Tempest; 3) insight into who probably composed the inscription for the Stratford monument to "Shakespeare"; 4) a passage in a contemporary document indicating the probable supply source for the money that went into the royal Exchequer to pay Lord Oxford's mysterious 1000-pound annuity. In addition to these and other items, readers will see Ralph Waldo Emerson quoted at slightly greater length in one instance, in order to bring home his true depth of disbelief in the traditional Shakespeare.

I mustn't mislead, however; these additions, while furnishing one good reason to buy Mr. Ogburn's new edition, are not at all lengthy. They are indicative of the new gleam given The Mysterious William Shakespeare's latest incarnation—it seems much better bound than in the previous Dodd, Mead edition. The jacket illustration, too (by talented Don K. Rogers), is a great improvement upon the original. (Was the artist inspired—in his depiction of a Droeshout "Shakespeare" portrait cracking eggshell-like to reveal a Gheeraedt's portrait of Oxford—by the Shakespeare Oxford Society's recent transparency, which superimposes the same Droeshout picture over the "Welbeck" portrayal of Lord Oxford? The chief reason to buy the book as it now stands is simple: it is now, as it was then, a great and exciting word of scholarship and genuine literary detective work. We have reason to celebrate The Mysterious William Shakespeare's new edition; as before, The Mysterious William Shakespeare is an indispensable aid to researchers of the Shakespeare authorship controversy and an obligatory purchase for school and public libraries.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### ELIZABETHAN REVIEW UPDATE

Since the December flyer was sent out to members, The Elizabethan Review has attracted numerous inquiries and articles, more than 160 subscriptions, as well as three additional Editorial Board members. These include Father Francis Edwards, S.J., London; Professor of English, Anne Pluto, Lesley College, Boston; and Dr. L.L. Ware, Lincoln's Inn, London. They join Professors Felicia Londre and Ernest Ferlita, SJ, Warren Hope, Ph.D., and Charles Vere, Earl of Burford.

Contributions to the first issue include articles by Professor of Art Bette Talvacchia (Univ. of Conn.) on Gulio Romano and The Winter's Tale; Dr. Warren Hope on the poet, Sir John Davies, and his relation to Shakespeare; Justice John Paul Stevens on the use of law in weighing evidence in the Shakespeare authorship issue; Peter Moore on the typographical use of hyphenation in spelling Shakespeare's name in Elizabethan times; a letter by Sir Francis Bacon; and book reviews by Roger Stritmatter and Charles Vere of Shakespeare's Personality and The Shakespeare Controversy, respectively.

The second issue of The Elizabethan Review will include articles by the Reverend Francis Edwards on the Elizabethan Secret Service, Gerald Downs on John Heywood, and Charles Vere on the psychology of feudalism in the Shakespeare canon, among others.

When the first issue appears in April, more than 750 copies will be mailed to those libraries that are members of the Folger Shakespeare Library and Modern Language Association Journal in order to expand the Review's base of subscribers.

Those interested in writing for or subscribing to The Elizabethan Review may do so by submitting their articles or letters to The Elizabethan Review, attn. Gary Goldstein, 123-60 83 Avenue, Suite 11-0, Kew Gardens, NY, 11415. Individual subscriptions are \$30.00 annually; institutional subscriptions are \$45.00 annually. Checks should be made out to The Elizabethan Review.

A review of THE SHAKESPEARE CONTROVERSY\*

by Gary Goldstein

In addition to its more traditional intellectual virtues, the book under review constitutes a major contribution to Shakespeare studies because it provides readers with an historical perspective of the subject under discussion; is extensively researched and efficiently organized; and is written with clarity and elegance. Moreover, The Shakespeare Controversy offers teachers a 75-page chronological and annotated bibliography, which will go far in contributing toward a balanced curriculum on the Shakespeare authorship issue in the future.

The authors address the volatile issue of "Who Wrote Shakespeare?" by starting at the beginning, in the 18th Century, when the first doubters of the identity of William Shakespeare began making themselves heard. By providing summaries and analyses of the most significant arguments of these anti-Stratfordians over the past two centuries, Hope and Holston carefully present the best evidence against the traditional case for authorship of the Shakespeare plays.

Their strategy enables the reader to evaluate for himself how a wide variety of amateur and professional scholars have approached the issue of authorship, and to judge the validity of these arguments on their own.

The book is divided into chapters devoted to one or more scholars, beginning with Delia Bacon, and followed by chapters on Whitman and Twain; Ignatius Donnelly; Henry James; George Greenwood, Samuel Butler, and Frank Harris; a chapter examining recent claims to the Shakespeare laurels made on behalf of Marlowe, Rutland, and Derby; and two concluding chapters on the hypothesis that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, was the author of the plays traditionally ascribed to William Shakespeare.

Others will find the extensive and critically selective bibliography an invaluable storehouse of new information. In addition, the authors have included listings of Shakespeare associations around the world and those libraries in the U.S. and England which maintain Shakespeare collections and books on the authorship question.

(Editor's Note: p. 230 address for the Shakespeare Oxford Society is incorrect. It should be: Cathedral Station-Box 0550, New York, N.Y. 10025.)

\*By Warren Hope and Kim Holston (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Co. Publishers, 1992)

\* \* \* \* \*

POSSIBLE LINK BETWEEN 1623 FOLIO AND DE VERE

I recently read the following: "There are several curious crown watermarks in the 1623 edition of Shakespeare in the British Museum." (Secrets of Rennes-le-Chateau, L. and P. Fanthorpe, p. 95)

Assuming that this statement is true, (1) Has anyone seen these watermarks? (2) If so, do they bear any resemblance to Edward de Vere's pre-1603 "crown" signature? This might prove to be an interesting link between the Folio and de Vere.

Any information that members can provide would be greatly appreciated.

Linda McLatchie  
330 Cedar Street  
Ashland, MA 01721

## THE STELLA COVER-UP

by Peter R. Moore

If "William Shakespeare" was, as many of us believe, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, one implication seems inescapable: Oxford's contemporaries — courtiers, writers, and theater people — must have maintained a remarkable conspiracy of silence. We can go further. The silence must have been maintained well into the next generation, long after Oxford was dead.

At first glance, this seems implausible. And orthodox Stratfordians scoff at the idea of so extensive a cover-up. As one of them put it, the required conspiracy is so large that it is difficult to see who was left to be deceived.

But anyone familiar with human history or modern American society knows that some things are not discussed in public, and that open conspiracies of silence are common events. The number of examples — political, military, or social — that could be cited is endless. We might begin with the motto of the New York Times, "All the News That's Fit to Print", which clearly implies that some news is not fit to print. American journalists have often suppressed what they knew about the sex lives of politicians they reported on — though we may well ask whether this amounts to a "cover-up" or is simply a matter of respecting privacy. When issues of decorum are at stake, it can be misleading to think of suppression purely in terms of sinister "conspiracies". Thomas Bowdler became infamous for producing a censored edition of Shakespeare in 1807, but it was discovered in 1966 that Bowdler's sister Henrietta was really responsible for ridding the Bard of ribaldry. The motive behind the Bowdler cover-up was a simple matter of sexual modesty. If Henrietta admitted reading and understanding the bawdy parts of Shakespeare that she excised, then she could no longer be a decent woman, and so her physician brother pretended to be the editor.

But a cover-up far more relevant to the Shakespeare authorship question occurred in Elizabethan England, spread to the English colonies in America, and continued into the twentieth century.

Sir Philip Sidney wrote his sonnet sequence, Astrophel and Stella, around 1582 and circulated it in manuscript. It was published in 1591, five years after his death, and became an immediate and much-imitated best seller.

"Stella" was Penelope Devereux, Lady Rich. Various writers covertly but unmistakably alluded to this identity, but nobody directly said so in print until 1691, a full century after the sequence was published. What is interesting for our purpose is that the Stella cover-up (to call it that) involved the same society, the same mores, and even the same literary genres and stratagems as the conspiracy of silence Oxfordians posit in the case of "William Shakespeare". It offers a convincing reply to the Stratfordian gibe that such a conspiracy is too far-fetched to be believed.

Most of the literary history in my article comes from Hoyt H. Hudson's forty page essay, "Penelope Devereux as Sidney's Stella", the Huntington Library Bulletin, No. 7 April 1935, which I recommend to all readers. I can only give a summary of Hudson's arguments, but will add a few items of which he was unaware. Readers might also consult W. A. Ringler's Sidney's Poems, p. 435-48, Roger Howell's Sir Philip Sidney, The Shepherd Knight, pp. 181-82, and Sylvia Freedman's excellent 1983 biography, Poor Penelope, Lady Penelope Rich, An Elizabethan Woman.

Even though much of the story he tells may be imaginary, Sidney's sonnets do not describe a disembodied poet in love with an abstract woman. That

Sidney is Astrophel is clearly indicated by, among other things: Sonnet 30's reference to his father's rule in Ireland as the Queen's Lord Deputy; by Sonnet 41's description of a 1581 tournament; and by the closing line of Sonnet 65, "Thou bear'st the arrow, I the arrow-head", an arrowhead being the sole device on the Sidney coat of arms. Stella's identity is made clear for initiates by Sidney's puns on the word 'rich' in Sonnets 24, 35, and 37; by references to her unhappy marriage in several sonnets; by praise of her black eyes and curly golden hair, which were echoed by other poets and which may be seen in her surviving portrait; and by Sonnet 13's mention of her coat of arms as "roses gules ... borne in silver field". The Devereux shield was white, with a horizontal orange stripe across the middle, above which were three orange disks in a horizontal line. But in the language of sixteenth century heraldry (the Devereux arms were much older) white and silver were considered identical: both were described by the French word argent, or silver. Orange is not one of the allowed colors of heraldry, being a "stain", and so a herald who sees orange on a shield will write it down as gules (red). So Sidney is quite justified in naming the three disks on the Devereux shield as roses, gules on silver.

My disquisition on heraldry is necessary because neither Hudson, Ringler, nor any other authority that I know explains how Sonnet 13's red and silver equate to orange and white. The latter colors of the Devereux Earls and Essex were well enough known that Francis Beaumont could mention them, without further identification, to Ben Jonson in the verse letter which asks to "let slip ... scholarship,/And from all learning keep these lines as clear/As Shakespeare's best are," etc. Beaumont goes on to discuss a man in misery "in white and orange tawny on his back at Windsor", a reference to the scandalous 1613 divorce of Lady Rich's nephew, the third Earl of Essex.

In order to assess the implications of the Stella cover-up, we need to examine the principals. Sidney died in 1586, immediately becoming a cult figure of astonishing dimensions: the perfect English, Christian, Renaissance knight, virtually the Protestant Saint George. Sidney's sonnets to Stella are extremely chaste; he woos her, and, taking her by surprise on one occasion, manages to steal a kiss, but she is true to her husband. Sidney's incredible cult lasted through the seventeenth century. It flagged a bit in the eighteenth, but revived mightily in the Victorian age.

Lady Rich's reputation went the other way. Beautiful and highly educated, she was shoved into an arranged marriage with the dull and detestable Lord Rich in 1581 when she was only 18. While bearing her husband five children in nine years, she managed to be active in society and politics, and in time became a patron of poets.

In 1590 she took as her lover the dashing Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, by whom she had six more children. Her husband acquiesced in her adultery, being in awe of her brother, the Earl of Essex. After the latter's execution in 1601, Lord Rich cast his wife out. Meanwhile, Mountjoy had replaced Essex as commander in Ireland and was methodically destroying the rebellion that had cost Essex his reputation. When King James came to the throne in 1603, Mountjoy returned from Ireland as a hero, and Lady Rich moved in with him as his wife. Mountjoy and Lady Rich had both supported the cause of James, and he made them favored courtiers, promoting both, and seemingly indifferent to their blatant adultery. Mountjoy became Earl of Devonshire; Lady Rich, daughter of a junior earl and wife of a junior baron, was given precedence of all barons' wives and almost all earls' daughters.

In 1605 Lord Rich sued for divorce, and Lady Rich confessed to committing adultery with a stranger. Lord Rich wanted a new wife, and Lady Rich and

Devonshire wanted to marry and legitimize their children. Divorce was granted, but remarriage was forbidden, and legitimizing the children was out of the question. King James was infuriated by the divorce proceedings, banished Lady Rich from his court, and reprimanded Devonshire. The two lovers made an illegal marriage and continued to live as husband and wife until Devonshire died in April 1606. Lady Rich died in July 1607 and was buried in a London church without any marking on her grave. The register simply recorded the burial of "A Lady Devaraux".

James had no objection to adultery among his nobles. But he did expect them to maintain appearances, and was enraged when one of them publicly admitted her offense. After her divorce Lady Rich was regarded as a notorious woman. But that made it all the more important to prevent her name from contaminating the cult of Sir Philip Sidney.

Enough evidence survives to anatomize the cover-up of the 1590s. The three unauthorized editions of Astrophel and Stella that came out in 1591 omitted Sonnet 37, the poem that most clearly says that Stella's name is Rich, while a key line in Sonnet 35 was reworded to make the name less apparent (see Hudson, p. 92). One of these editions included ten songs that are part of the cycle, but cut from one a passage in which Stella confesses her love for Astrophel, and cut from another Astrophel's anticipation of kissing Stella (Ringler, p. 448). This could have been the work of the publishers, but more likely reflected the manuscripts they had obtained. Sonnet 37, the correct text of 35, and the full text of all ten songs were provided in the 1598 folio edition of Sidney's works that was published by his sister, the Countess of Pembroke. In other words, the Countess, who idolized her brother, saw no need to censor his works to hide Stella's identity. No one up to that point had publicly named Stella, and if the Countess assumed that the cover-up would continue — well, continue it did.

In 1595 Edmund Spenser published a batch of poems in praise of Sidney entitled "Astrophel". Two of the "Astrophel" poems clearly imply that Stella was Sidney's wife, which seems like a deliberate deception. But Spenser's poem says that Stella died of grief immediately following Astrophel's death. Sidney's widow, Frances Walsingham, had by then remarried, becoming the Countess of Essex, and Spenser's "Astrophel" is dedicated to her. Spenser was obviously creating a pleasant fiction, and as Hudson points out (p. 121), no one even pretended to believe that Stella was Sidney's wife until 1655. Further, Spenser's "Astrophel" puns several times on the word "rich" and describes Stella's hair as yellow; Frances Walsingham was a brunette. One of the "Astrophel" poems, by Matthew Roydon, provides the only further comment on the matter, saying to Stella: "Sweet saints! it is no sin nor blame, / To love a man of virtuous name."

Meanwhile, as Hudson shows, a number of other poets glanced at the relationship, usually in poems or dedications to Lady Rich. For example, Gervase Markham dedicated a work to Lady Rich and her sister in 1597, which concluded that if the two ladies approved his writing, then his pen would be "stellified" (Hudson, p. 96). Or, in 1603 Matthew Gwynn wrote a sonnet in her honor saying that "HE" praised Lady Rich, followed by ten compliments lifted verbatim from Sidney's sonnets to Stella. As Ringler notes (p. 436), five out of seven dedications to Lady Rich written between 1594 and 1606 found a way to hint unmistakably at her being Sidney's Stella, without, of course, deliberately saying so.

The cover-up evolved during the following decades and generations, but the central taboo remained. After Lady Rich's divorce, public compliments virtually ceased and private slurs on her character multiplied, but her rank

sheltered her from public attack long after her death. For example, an obscene epitaph penned shortly after she died was published in 1640, but with her name removed. As the generation that knew her in life died off, the attacks subsided, and the fact that she was Stella was gradually forgotten.

It may seem remarkable that her name was protected through the 1640s, a decade of civil war during which pamphleteers of all persuasions freely labelled the characters and families of their enemies. But here Lady Rich enjoyed posthumous good luck: thanks in part to her adultery, she had, on both sides of the strife, allies with an interest in sparing her reputation.

Lady Rich's oldest legitimate son had become the Earl of Warwick, Lord High Admiral of England and a leading figure among the Parliamentary forces opposing King Charles. Her other legitimate son was the Earl of Holland, a powerful politician who kept changing sides, until Parliament settled things by beheading him in 1649. Lady Rich's oldest illegitimate son was the Earl of Newport, a general fighting for the King.

Other families might also have taken umbrage at full disclosure of the story of Astrophel and Stella. Sidney, a moderate Puritan, was a hero to both sides, and his widow's children had a stake in his reputation, if only to deny that he wronged their mother by loving Lady Rich during his marriage negotiations. Frances Walsingham's older son was the Earl of Essex (he was also Lady Rich's nephew), a leading Parliamentary general, while her younger son was the Marquess of Clanricard, one of the King's strongest supporters in Ireland. Frances Walsingham's daughter by her Irish husband was the Marchioness of Winchester, a heroine of the Royalist cause in England. Another man who might have taken offense was the Countess of Pembroke's son, Sidney's nephew and godson, the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, a political supporter of the Parliament. Lastly there was Sidney's brother's son, the Earl of Leicester, the then head of the House of Sidney. He was disaffected from the King but wouldn't oppose him, so he stayed neutral, while his son and heir, Viscount Lisle, was active in support of Parliament.

Hudson's article does not make clear when the first public attack was made on Lady Rich's character. He cites only Clarendon's massive History of the Rebellion, written in the 1670s and published thirty years later, which implies she was immoral without actually saying that she committed adultery, a thing she had admitted in open court in 1605.

Other seventeenth century discussions of Lady Rich's offense are instructive. The Jesuit Father John Gerard attempted to convert her during his years in the Catholic underground in England, but was foiled by Devonshire. After his return to the Continent in 1606, Gerard wrote a Latin account of his missionary work, intended for confidential use within the Jesuit order. It was published in 1870. He described his dealings with Lady Rich and the scandal of her affair with Devonshire, but named neither of them. She is called a "sister to the Earl of Essex"; Devonshire is identified as the conqueror of Ireland. Lady Rich and Lord Devonshire were openly named and their scandal was discussed by a contemporary historian, Robert Johnston, but his Latin account was published in the Netherlands in 1655. Archbishop George Abbot wrote a lengthy essay on political and religious affairs in 1627 which was published in 1659. Abbot has a paragraph on the scandal, but calls the participants "the Earl of D" and "the Lady R". Peter Heylyn published a biography of Archbishop William Laud in 1668; Laud had been Devonshire's chaplain in 1605 and conducted the illegal marriage of the two lovers. Heylyn does name names, but the whole point of his account is that Lady Rich's 1581 marriage was improper, hence she and Devonshire

could rightfully wed.

From the time Sidney died through the late seventeenth century, biographical books and articles kept appearing, none of which mentioned Penelope, Lady Rich. These included an inspiring account of Sidney's last days, written by George Gifford, a clergyman who attended at his bedside. Gifford wrote that Sidney was insufficiently sure of salvation, but then God delivered him: "There came to my remembrance a vanity wherein I had taken delight, whereof I had not rid myself. But I rid myself of it, and presently my joy and comfort returned within a few hours." In 1964, Jean Robertson found a manuscript version of Gifford's memoir, and discovered that between these two sentences was a third which had been deleted from the published versions: "It was my Lady Rich."

In 1638 Anne Bradstreet of Massachusetts, a distant cousin of Sidney's, wrote a poem in his praise which was published in London in 1650. The poem mentions their kinship, describes Stella and mildly condemns her, but insists that her love for Sidney was not adulterous. Bradstreet died in 1677, and her poems were republished in Boston in 1678; the reference to kinship to Sidney had been removed as had been the attack on Stella. The revised version cites Spenser's claim that Stella was Sidney's wife.

In 1691 Anthony A. Wood published Athenae Oxoniensis, which included a simple, unsupported statement that Stella was "the Lady Rich". This assertion was not treated as a scandalous revelation, it was simply a few words in a large book, and it was ignored. Not until the mid-nineteenth century was the literary and social history of Shakespeare's England sufficiently reconstructed in detail for scholars to begin building the case for Lady Rich as Stella. But a new obstacle arose to complicate objective scholarship.

The letters of John Chamberlain were published from 1848 to 1861, providing a mine of information on Shakespeare's era. One letter described the death of the Earl of Devonshire, and stated that his will provided for only three of his alleged five surviving children by Lady Rich. The clear implication was that Devonshire was not the father of the other two, which was widely believed in the last century. The matter was not cleared up until Devonshire's will was unearthed. It provided quite generously for all five of his children. Sylvia Freadman's book also shows that Lady Rich's two sets of children did not overlap, as had previously been believed. She broke off marital relations with Rich before taking up with Blount. The false belief that Lady Rich mingled her husband and lover, and was not even faithful to the letter, caused her to seem more wicked than ever. To many Victorians and some post-Victorians, Lady Rich's scarlet sins absolutely proved that the saintly Sidney could have had nothing to do with her.

In 1934 Professor James Purcell published a book purporting to prove that Lady Rich was not Stella. That provoked Hoyt Hudson's forty page response, which crushed Purcell (he withdrew and revised his book), and has been considered the definitive article on the subject ever since. Subsequent research has strengthened Hudson's arguments.

But one more group continued to hold out: overly zealous professors of English literature of the school called the New Criticism (now obsolete), a powerful force in academia in the early and mid twentieth century. The New Criticism insists that a poem "stands alone" and must be examined without regard to any background -- historical, cultural, or linguistic. There is something to be said for this approach, if it is not carried to excess. There is no reason why a Lit professor needs to study the Battle of Balaklava in order to appreciate Tennyson's "The Charge of the Light Brigade". But

we would surely be astonished if the professor heatedly insisted there had been no such battle.

Some of the New Criticism professors felt that verse was polluted if its background was analyzed, or, for that matter, if it was even admitted to exist. Judging by the quotations from Purcell that are given by Hudson, the former was motivated by New Criticism. My own copy of Sidney is the 1969 Sir Philip Sidney, Selected Prose and Poetry, edited by Robert Kimbrough of the University of Wisconsin. Kimbrough's introduction to Astrophel and Stella complains that "scholars have fastened on partial and inconclusive evidence to identify Stella as Penelope Devereux Rich", which Kimbrough dismisses as an "extraliterary controversy" which would prevent us from "open[ing] our ears to ... some of the finest music achieved by English poetry."

We can now characterize the Stella cover-up. That Lady Rich was Sidney's Stella was known to many people, including courtiers and poets. There appears to have been no active attempt to suppress the truth. Indeed, Spenser's 1595 pretense that Stella was Sidney's widow was intended to be taken as a fiction, while Sidney's sister's 1598 edition of Astrophel and Stella strengthened the identification. Meanwhile, from 1591 to 1619 various writers (Hudson cites about fifteen) published works that made the identification in a manner that was covert but perfectly clear to those in the know. These writers meant to compliment Lady Rich for the honor of inspiring Sidney's sonnets, but decorum required that the compliments be veiled. Presumably the truth was discussed in private. Vested interests in the reputations of Sidney and Lady Rich kept the truth from being uttered openly until exactly a century after Sidney's sonnets were first published. By then the matter was stale and uninteresting; there was no follow-up. Not until the mid nineteenth century did scholars begin to assemble the various pieces of evidence. But they still met with decades of opposition from defenders of the cult of Sir Philip Sidney, who were eventually joined by certain English professors of the New Criticism school.

Sexual propriety was the simplest motive behind the Stella cover-up, as, in a different way, it was the motive for the Bowdler cover-up. Sidney's poetical niece, Lady Mary Wroth, had two illegitimate children by her cousin the Earl of Pembroke (Sidney's nephew), a matter that was managed so discreetly that it escaped notice until the twentieth century. And sex probably had something to do with the cover-up of the story behind Shakespeare's Sonnets, which make Sidney's seem positively tame. Of course, other factors presumably affected Shakespeare's works, such as the stigma of print, which kept all of Sidney's works in manuscript until after his death.

The Stella cover-up offers remarkable parallels to what we infer concerning Oxford and Shakespeare. It should become our standard response to sneers about conspiracy theories.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dear Mr. Johnson:

21 December 1992

A short note to inform you of the CD "Joyne Hands: Music of Thomas Morley" (Virgin Classics Limited, 1991). Track 29 is "My Lord of Oxenford's maske" (anonymous). Good enough. But note the words in the booklet concerning "Our bonny boots could toote it" by Morley (1557-1602):

"'Bonny boots' is the colourful pseudonym of a mysterious but intriguing Elizabethan court figure, a favourite of Queen Elizabeth who was known especially for his dancing prowess."

Now who could that be?

Vero nihil verius,

Tom Boyce

While preparing for the GTE VisNet East videoconference on the Shakespeare authorship in September, John C. Mucci, its director, was told by Deborah Bacon, a participant in the program, that Peregrine Bertie, Baron Willoughby D'Eresby, a brother-in-law of the 17th Earl of Oxford's, left a record of the guests at a state dinner during his mission to the Danish king at Elsinore that contained the names Rosenkranz and Guildenstern. (The mission was one from which he returned in 1582.) Acting on this extraordinary report, Mucci engaged a researcher to look into the matter at the British Library and heard from her that there is indeed a collection of Willoughby's writings at the Library and that some of these refer to his travels in Denmark, including a list of "Nobilissimi ad Generosi, Regni Daniae Incliti et Senatores" (Cotton MS Titus C VII) and that among the Nobilissimi are Petrus Guildenstern de Thim (second name down), Georgius Rosenkranz de Rosenholm (fifth name down) and Axellius Guildenstern de Lingby (17th name down). Fully appreciating the enormous importance of this document, Mucci paid \$40 for a copy, and this we have now received from him. We cannot but wonder how the Stratfordians are going to discount this stunning intelligence.

Meanwhile, there had appeared in Gourmet magazine for August 1992 an article on Denmark by a contributing editor, Geri Trotta, who reported that in 1586 a troupe of English actors had performed at the Castle of Kronborg at Elsinore. Replying by telephone to our letter seeking further information, Ms. Trotta said that among the actors was Will Kempe and referred us for additional details to Mrs. Lillian Hess of the Scandinavian Tourist Agency in New York whose husband, she explained, is a scholar of the period. Unfortunately, Mrs. Hess did not respond to our letter setting forth rather fully our reasons for wishing to know all we could about the visit of the English troupe to Kronborg.

*Nobilissimi ac Generosi Regni Daniae  
Incliti Consiliarii et Senatores.*

*Nicolaus Haas, de Tzavij. R. M. Cancellarius.  
Petrus Guldenstern, de Thim. Regni Marchallus.  
Petrus Münch, de Estivatsgaardt. Regni Admirallus.  
Georgius Liche, de Offergaardt. Egles Aulicus.  
Georgius Rosenkranz, de Rosenholm. Secunda R. M. Palatij.  
Bjorno Andree, de Stenolt.  
Hylarius Grubbe, de Lystrup. Regni Cancellarius.  
Christophorus Walckendorff, de Glorup. Tresaurarius.  
Stenno Brabe, de Knidstrup.  
Georgius Svanum, de Thille.  
Mandragus Persberg, de Hagedid.  
Christophorus Bürggravius. Baro de Dona.  
Ericus Flardonberg, de Mattesup.  
Hacquinus Wlfstandt, de Heckeberg.  
Andreas Bingius, de Smidstrup.  
Henricus Bolonijs, de Spilthrup.  
Axellus Guldenstern, de Lingby.  
Corvinius Welfert, de Ness.  
Absolon Gøic, de Kielstrup.  
Jacob Esfeldt, de Vejborrig.  
Henricus Brabe de Widskiele.  
Breida Rantonijs, de Rantonijs.  
Christianus Sebele, de Filling.  
Albericus Fries, de Harritshier.*

I wrote the following letter to 43 distinguished Stratfordian scholars in 17 states, Canada and England:

Dear.....

August 14, 1992

Stratfordian Gilas E. Dawson, one-time author of books and manuscripts at the Shakespeare Folger Library, was sued for libel: Barrell v. Dawson, #2698-48 U.S. District Court, D.C. (1947). In his pre-trial deposition Dr. Dawson admitted he could not refer to a single fact which verified Will. Shakspeare of Stratford as the dramatist "William Shakaspeara".

Oxfordian Richard Bentley, one-time President of the Chicago Bar Association and Editor of the American Bar Association Journal, wrote in Shakespeare Cross-Examination (American Bar Association 1961):

"During Will. Shakspeare's entire life...not one of his contemporaries ever referred to him personally as a writer. The only references to "William Shakespeare" were to writings with which that name was connected, and none referred otharwiasa personally to a writer of that name. Will. Shakspeare lived unknown as a literary man and died unnoticed."

Impartial Justice Wilberforce presided in the case of In Re Hopkins' Will Trusts (Chancery, June 16, 17, July 8, 1964) 3 All England Reports 46 (1964) in which the question of the authorship of the works of "William Shakespaare" was directly at issue. He found that the Shakespearean authorities who testified on behalf of the authorahip of Will. Shakspeare did not present any fact that Will. Shakspeare was identified by any of his contemporaries as the dramatist "William Shakespeare".

As the Editor of the Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter, I am, for a forthcoming article, writing to you, and a number of other respected, traditional Shakespearean scholars, to respond to the following request motivated by the concurring perceptions of Dawson, Bentley and Wilberforce:

If there is any fact during Will. Shakspera's lifetime which conclusively proves that he was the dramatist "William Shakespeare", please specifically authenticate it on the enclosed sheet and mail in the self-addressed envelope. If you do not respond, I will assume you do not know of any such fact.

I will much appreciate your cooperation.

Morse Johnson

As of March 1, 1993, I have received only the following replies:.

Professor Thomas G. Bishop:

"There are no facts, only interpretations - fact is produced by the interpreter from a set of possible 'facts' according with that interpreters' presumption. Since you presume Oxford to be the author, you will tend to find 'facts' showing his authorship. In short, your game is a fixed one. Sorry - I'm not playing."

Professor Thomas Pendleton:

"I decline to respond."

Professor S. Schoenbaum:

"Thank you for your letter of 14 August. Currently I am on sick leave..... However, my most recent book Shakespeare Lives: New Edition (Oxford, 1991) will probably have some interest for you."

## CHAIRMAN'S CORNER

Betty Sears informs me that our membership will soon reach seven hundred. I predict we will pass the thousand member barrier before 1995! The growth of the Society during the past five years has been tremendous. Our membership roster in 1988 numbered exactly 140. We are nearly five times that number today. As a result of this precipitous growth, we are automating our accounting and record keeping functions. Len Deming, a member of our Board of Trustees, has generously agreed to assist our Membership Chairman Victor Crichton and our Treasurer, Dr. Paul Nelson, by making available to the Society the state of the art equipment in his law offices in Nashua New Hampshire. And better yet, Jill Ross, Len's para-legal administrative assistant offered to handle the computer programming involved. This is going to lighten the burdens on Paul Nelson and Victor Crichton, who have bravely been facing the problems of our burgeoning membership without the help of sophisticated office technology. To accomplish this technological advance, we are changing the official address of the society to Len Deming's offices.

Len and Jill are also handling the accounting for Lord Burford's 1993 Speaking Tour. Trudy Atkins is handling the booking from her office in Greensboro, North Carolina. They have a small brochure and sample press releases available for those who are trying to arrange platforms for Lord Burford in their areas. A call to Trudy Atkins at: (919) 454-3516 will get you immediate action.

Annual Dues are the Society's indispensable fiscal engine. All members recently received notices which indicated whether the recipient has or has not paid dues for 1993. Will those who have not, PLEASE DO.

Annual Oxford Banquet will be held Friday evening, April 30, 1993 at the Harvard Faculty Club. Make reservations through Charles Boyle, 208A Washington St., Somerville, Ma. 02143 (617-776-7782).

### JOIN SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY AND RECEIVE QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

The purpose of the Shakespeare Oxford Society is to document and establish Edward deVere, 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.

### DUES

Student \$15.00

Annual Regular \$35.00

Sustaining \$50 or more

Dues and requests for membership information to:

Shakespeare Oxford Society, First Bldg., 71 Spit Brook Rd. #107, Nashua N.H. 03060  
Tel. (603) 888-1453 - Fax (603) 888-5411

Submit materials for publication in the Newsletter to:

Morse Johnson, Suite #819, 105 W. 4th Street, Cincinnati, Oh. 45202

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

\* \* \* \* \*

# *The Shakespeare Oxford Society*

Cathedral Station, P.O. Box 0550, New York, N.Y. 10025-0550

Morse Johnson, Editor



## GABRIEL HARVEY AND THE GENESIS OF

### "WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE"

by

Andrew Hannas

In attempts to explain the choice of the name "William Shakespeare" subscribed in print to the dedicatory epistles to Henry Wriothesley for Venus and Adonis (1593) and Lucrece (1594), most Oxfordians draw attention to the description of Edward de Vere in 1578 by the then-fellow at Cambridge, Gabriel Harvey: "Thy countenance shakes spears." Harvey's occasion was a royal progress to Cambridge pausing at Audley End in Essex: in addition to De Vere, Harvey delivered encomiums to the Queen, Lord Burghley, the Earl of Leicester, Sir Christopher Hatton, and Philip Sidney. As Harvey's oft-cited utterance is by no means inconsequential in the genesis of the appellation "William Shakespeare", and as Harvey's words were actually made in Latin rather than English (the translation above is B. M. Ward's, the Oxfordian biographer, and potentially open to scrutiny for an Oxfordian bias -- see appendix), I decided to consult Harvey's actual Latin as well as Latin-English dictionaries of the day for possible further gleanings on the description. I share my findings:

Harvey's description occurred in a 168-line poem composed in dactylic hexameter verses which he styled an Apostrophe ad eundem (Apostrophe to the same man, i.e. De Vere), printed in Gratulationis Valdinensis Liber Quartus (The Fourth Book of Walden Rejoicing), London, 1578, in September. The Latin words in question end line 40 and begin line 41:

. . . vultus  
Tela vibrat . . .

The initial problem is simply whether or not Harvey's words, vultus/Tela vibrat, would have reasonably enough borne Ward's ideation. A 20th-century study of Harvey's encomiums, for example, renders the words "your glance shoots arrows", rather unsuggestive of "shakes spears" - see end note, Appendix. While modern dictionaries such as the Oxford Latin Dictionary treat all senses of the words thoroughly, they lack the weight of contemporary 16th-century signification and hence interpretation not just by Harvey but by his audience as well. Fortunately, such 16th-century lexicographical commentary does exist in the form of a well-established tradition of Latin-to-English dictionaries, chiefly those of Thomas Elyot before 1550 and Thomas Cooper, his successor, whose Latin-English dictionaries of 1565, 1573, 1584 and 1587 became "standard authority" according to DeWitt Starnes, the eminent scholar (Robert Estienne's Influence on Lexicography, Texas, 1963, p. 104).

The title page in which Gabriel Harvey printed his 168-line poem  
in which he styled an Apostrophe ad eundem  
(Apostrophe to the same man, i.e. De Vere),  
printed in Gratulationis Valdicensis Liber Quartus  
(The Fourth Book of Walden Rejoicing),  
London, 1578, in September.



H.iii.

To cite Cooper's Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae (Thesaurus of the Roman and British Tongue), 1565 and 1573:

Vultus-- A countenaunce or cheere: a looke: a visage.

Telum-- All thinge that may be throwen with the hande, be it stone, wood, or Iron: a darte: an arrow: a quarrell [i.e., metal arrowhead]. A weapon to fight with: a swoorde.

Vibro-- To shake a thyng: to make a thing to shake or quaver: to brandish.

Thomas Thomas, 1587, in his Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae (Dictionary of the Latin and English Tongue), follows Cooper closely; thus, during the period in question, the 1560s through the 1580s, the academic significations of vultus/Tela vibrat were fairly standard. But what of Ward's rendition?

While "countenance shakes" for vultus ... vibrat is quite accurate, fairness demands that his "spears" for Tela is a bit of an Oxfordian liberty, since Harvey could have used a form of hasta—"a speare, forke, or iaveling" (Cooper) — to signify specifically spears. So, why Tela? I suspect Harvey has made a deliberate and greatly reverberating pun, but first to return to vultus..:

In the Dictionary of Thomas Elyot, 1538 and 1559, the Latin words are rendered essentially as in Cooper/Thomas. However, the word vultus is printed twice, i.e., given two separate entries. Above the entry rendered "countynaunca or chiere" one sees:

Vultus, of olde wryters is taken for wylle,  
a Volendo.

Vultus, vultus, & vultum, countynaunce or chiere.

That is, vultus (from the verb volo and its gerund volendo), carried the sense of will in addition to countenance! Granted, by 1578 the use may have been a trifle obscure, but Harvey was a master of the obscure. Thus, a perfectly permissible translation of vultus ... vibrat is "(thy) will shakes". (Elyot's use of "wryters" in his definition is tantalizing as a reference to earlier poets.) Now to the Tela.

As treated thus far, tela is taken as the accusative plural of the neuter noun, telum. The e is long, the a short, hence Tela for metrical conformity to the dactylic foot. Similarly, vultus is treated as the nominative singular of the masculine noun, vultus. That is, vultus is the subject, tela the direct object, of the verb vibrat. (If the grammatical tedium rings of the sort parodied in Love's Labour's Lost, bear in mind the notorious pedantry of Harvey. The points are key in appreciating the word-play.) Again, as treated thus far, vultus/Tela vibrat could be rendered, on the basis of 16th-century lexicography, as:

(Thy) countenance shakes "missiles",

or even

(Thy) will shakes "missiles",

where "missiles" is the most generic equivalent I can enlist, avoiding "spears", for the idea of "all things that may be throwne with the hand." I am surmising that Harvey chose Tela (missiles) as a weakened form of "spears" because he had in mind another word Tela, metrically identical but quite different from telum-as-thing-thrown. This other word tela is a noun in the feminine, nominative, singular, defined in Thomas:

Tela--A web of cloth: also any enterprise, busines, or worke.

Here Tela would become the subject of vibrat:

(Thy) web/enterprise shakes,

with, in turn, vultus now shifting to the accusative plural (the genitive singular is possible, but I think less likely) as the direct object of vibrat:

(Thy) enterprise shakes countenances/wills.

Thus, I suspect that Harvey chose the less precise tela for hastas (spears) because of the double-sense created: vultus/Tela vibrat is both "(Thy) countenance/will shakes missiles/spears" and "(Thy) enterprise/web shakes countenances/wills."

And what is implied by De Vere's "web" or "enterprise"? Here more of Harvey's context becomes important, though no doubt the "cloth", strange and stylish, of De Vere would have turned many a countenance .... Harvey's context is more literary.

The persistent rhetoric of Harvey's address urges:

calamum, Memorande, pusillum / ... Abijce:  
O Noteworthy one, throw away the petty pen: (21-23)

Harvey would turn Oxford's "petty pen" (calamum pusillum) to arts more martial, a diminution of literary activities clearly not to be taken at face value, as in lines 5-13 Harvey has lauded Oxford's English and Latin poetry and his Latin epistle prefacing Clerk's translation of Castiglione's Courtier, 1572. Harvey's duplex posturing invites a double-edged interpretation. Charlton Ogburn, Jr. offers a plausible scenario in which De Vere actually put Harvey up to persuading the Queen and Burghley to permit him to engage in military office (The Mystericus William Shakespeare, pp. 597-598); but Harvey, increasingly drifting toward the Sidney literary circle that would keep close rein on public display of letters, just as plausibly might have been pandering to Burghley, Chancellor of Cambridge, in the latter's move to curtail De Vere's literary endeavors. What of such endeavors?

In a very peculiar expression just two lines before the vultus/Tela vibrat, Harvey may have exposed the more subtle context of De Vere's "enterprise" that could "shake wills" of others. The Latin is:

Minerva / In dextra latitat:

rendered by Ward as:

Minerva strengthens thy right hand,

where "strengthens" translates the verb latitat. Yet latitat does not by any lexical evidence mean "strengthens": a frequentative or repetitive form of lateo (cf. latent), which Cooper defines, "to lye hydde; to be secrete: to be unknown", the far more accurate translation is:

Minerva lies hidden in (your) right hand:

Here, I suggest, Harvey signals De Vere's "enterprise", which he will further depict ten words later with vultus/Tela vibrat. Moreover, the latter instantly looks over its own shoulder to Minerva, Latin for Athena, whose epithet "Pallas" the scholar-printer Henri Estienne explained in his Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (Geneva, 1572):

dicitur enim  $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\varsigma$  quasi Vibratrix dea. & quidem  
hastae vibratrix, utpote bellicosa. (III.29.D.1-2)

for Pallas is said (to be) like a brandisher goddess.  
and indeed a brandisher of the spear, inasmuch (as she  
is) warlike. (My translation)

Harvey could, in simple fashion, be remarking only on De Vere's neglected martial pursuits, in line with Mars and Bellona, the Roman war deities invoked in lines 38-40. But those deities, and for that matter vultus/Tela vibrat, do little in their obvious contexts to parallel the notion that "Minerva lies hidden", since Harvey's images seem infused in and emanating from De Vere's totality, making a war-like image of Minerva that is hidden rather puzzling. I suggest, instead or in addition, that Harvey chose Minerva latitat to connect De Vere to the goddess' role as patroness of the arts, especially of drama, and that Minerva is in large sense the Tela, the "enterprise", that "lies hidden" in his right (? pen) hand. De Vere's Minervan enterprise, spear-shaking patron of drama, is not so much martial frustration as unacknowledged theatrical involvement, and it is this activity—surely as a dramatist as well as patron—that could shake others' wills. De Vere's dramatic enterprise was the popular stage, whose boards would shake as the very projection of his will.

To recapitulate, before final observations: Ward's "Thy countenance shakes spears", while stretching Tela (things thrown by hand) a permissible bit into "spears" (usually hastas), actually missed the signification of vultus as "will", such that "thy will shakes spears" already stands as a more telling rendition than hitherto has been appreciated. Additionally, the admittedly tortuous but linguistically and contextually valid Harveian inversion yielding "Thy enterprise shakes wills" reverberates on the preceding "Minerva lies hidden in your right hand" in such a way as to connect De Vere's spear-shaking will with a theatrical enterprise that, even though unacknowledged, is stirring the populace.

All of the foregoing ideation, which a preferment-seeking academic sort such as Gabriel Harvey could publish in 1578, should be enough to locate the genesis of "William Shakespeare" much earlier than the years of the 1590s. Was, that is, the name "William Shakespeare" occasioned by events of those

later years merely, or had the cognomen with all its ramifying associations been "lurking hidden" for some fifteen years before its debut in print? I would venture that Harvey's Latin plays on De Vere's alter ego not just as a spear-shaking and stage-shaking young dramatist but also as a personage linked instantly to the name of "Will" even in the 1570s. If "Willie", for example, in the August Eclogue of Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar, 1579, is as most Oxfordians believe an allusion to De Vere as a poet-rival to Sidney (and Sidney, Spenser and Harvey were well-acquainted in 1579), then the sobriquet must have been in circulation long enough to prompt Spenser's use. How could Edward De Vere have acquired the nickname?

To my knowledge (I readily defer to previous thoughts along these lines; the Ogburns, for example, in This Star of England, p. 175, trace "will" via 'well' and 'spring' to Ver or Vere), the very obvious and oh-so ironic linkage of "Will" and Edward De Vere to his guardian and surrogate-father, William Cecil, has not been advanced as an origin of "William" Shakespeare. The practice of calling children whose given names are different from their (grand)parents' by their parents' given names is not uncommon; with De Vere, from age twelve the ward of William Cecil (28 years his senior), those familiar with the pair could not have failed to notice the developing antipathy between the two, the headstrong yet powerless youth more titled than the prudent yet power-hungry and less-titled elder. Inevitably, observers must have hit upon a wry but apt 'young Will' to designate an adolescent Edward De Vere as the 'son' of William Cecil. I would be surprised if this association had not already been afloat by the 1565-67 years, when Harvey and De Vere apparently grew acquainted at Cambridge. Such an appellation, 'young Will' or later just 'Will', would not have been especially pleasing to De Vere, as it would remind him of Cecil's control of his aspirations and rights, intellectual and material. How De Vere reacted to Harvey's "vultus"--not to mention to Spenser's "Willie" within the year--no doubt would have depended on the degree of 'good' as opposed to 'ill' will he perceived in the words. I suspect that De Vere somewhat ruefully realized that once the likes of Harvey and Spenser had picked up on 'Will' and 'spear-shaking', he could do precious little to protest. Better to accept the irony and appreciate the potentially rich pen-name, one that, however, could only be played as a master stroke--and preferably in a context Cecil would understand. De Vere also would have filed away Harvey's epithet for Cecil, "Polus", sounded half a dozen times in his 1578 toast to Cecil, literally of course referring to the central pole or axis on which the earth turns, but for an ear tuned to the Greek of Plato also the name of the blustering, sycophantic protege of the sophist Gorgias, whom Socrates mocks in the Gorgias much the way Hamlet does Polonius (literally "colt" in Greek, polos punned on polios, "gray", also befitting Cecil). "William Shakespeare" would be saved for use as a 'pointed' message to Cecil that their clash of wills and enterprises could be aired for all to see if the stakes warranted.

The puzzle remains, of course, as to why the long narrative poems of 1593 and 1594 became the vehicles for the unveiling of "William Shakespeare". The scenarios are as numerous as the curious mind can envision. Given, however, the multiplex levels of signification in the works (especially in Venus and Adonis), the choice of the name, I suggest, likewise was multi-layered both in its significations (known to some, baffling to others) and in its decision to be used. I doubt that "William Shakespeare" was used simply because of the presence (?) of a provincial actor (?) with a

phonetically similar name, though such coincidence may have been a contributing factor. Rather, I surmise that "William Shakespeare" was prompted by 1) its long-standing associations with De Vere; 2) a 'familial' dispute involving De Vere, Cecil, and Southampton; and 3) an emergent or precipitating event that forced De Vere's hand. Such linguistic association with De Vere has been the focus of this article; of the familial context for the name, this observer cannot avoid positing a connection to the marriage-negotiations then afoot between Southampton, Cecil's ward, and Elizabeth, De Vere's eldest daughter. The young earl eventually bought his way out of the match, for 5,000. The role, if any, played by Venus and Adonis or Lucrece in such a costly extrication from the plan (Cecil's), usually has been seen as supporting the marriage. For those who know their Ovidian context of incest in Metamorphoses Book X, precisely the opposite may have been the poem's message to Southampton. Any dedicatee reading the poem would have been most squeamish, especially given the disaster befalling Adonis as he fails to heed the warning not to hunt the boar.

The precipitating event, whatever the pathways to the choice, was, I suggest, the death of Marlowe just one month after the entry of Venus and Adonis into the Stationers' Register, sans author (entered in April of 1593). "William Shakespeare" seems to me a move to steer clear of the explosive political stakes that an association with Marlowe had knowingly or unwittingly brought. As with so many of the latter's alliances and intrigues, Marlowe's literary and personal relationship with De Vere is problematic at best. Of all the poets in De Vere's sphere, however, Marlowe certainly was the most Ovidian in terms of 'sources'. Even if Venus and Adonis were intended to be printed with no author's name, it very likely would have been seen as Marlowe's work -- to Southampton's scandal. Thus, a name had to be attached to the work, one that the intended audience would 'get' though a general audience would not, serving De Vere's purpose yet disassociating such purpose from the Marlowe affairs. If a provincial actor's name and presence were enlisted as a screen, so be it. Propping up a Shaxper at least would not incur those kinds of liabilities, though by 1596-7 the ruse brought its own set of headaches, including no small degree of authorial embarrassment and chagrin. Harvey himself must have derived a measure of glee at the vicissitudes of his prophetic encomium.

#### Appendix

Harvey's Apostrophe ad eundem, lines 38-43:

Virtus fronte habitat: Mars occupat ora; Minerva  
 In dextra latitat: Bellona in corpore regnat:  
 Martius ardor inest; scintillant lumina: vultus  
 Tela vibrat: quis non redivivum iuret Achillem?  
 O age, magne Comes, spes est virtutis alenda  
 Ista tibi;

A translation (clearly lacking the poetic gift):

Valour dwells on brow: Mars seizes the mouth: Minerva

In right hand lies hid; Bellona in body reigns:  
Warlike heat's within; eyes spark: countenance  
Missiles shakes: who would not swear Achilles reborn?  
O act, great Earl, your hope of heroism must be fed  
By you;

Ward's translation (The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, London, 1928, pp. 157-8):

Courage animates thy brow, Mars lives in thy tongue,  
Minerva strengthens thy right hand, Bellona reigns in  
thy body, within thee burns the fire of Mars. Thine  
eyes flash fire, thy countenance shakes a\* spear; who  
would not swear that Achilles had come to life again?

\*Actually, of course, Ward has a spear where the Latin is plural. Such difference could be seen as additional Oxfordian bias.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### 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.

#### DUES

Student \$15.00

Annual Regular \$35.00

Sustaining \$50 or more

Dues and requests for membership information to:

Shakespeare Oxford Society, First Bldg., 71 Spit Brook Rd. #107, Nashua, N.H.  
Tel. (603) 888-1453 - Fax (603) 888-5411

03060

Submit materials for publication in the Newsletter to:

Morse Johnson, Suite #819, 105 W. 4th St., Cincinnati, Oh. 45202

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

# The Shakespeare Oxford Society

First Bldg., 71 Spit Brook Rd., #107, Nashua, N.H. 03060

Morse Johnson, Editor

RECEIVED  
SPRING 1993  
VOLUME 29, NO. 2A



A QUINTESSENCE OF DUST:  
AN INTERIM REPORT ON THE MARGINALIA OF THE GENEVA BIBLE  
OF EDWARD DE VERE, THE SEVENTEENTH EARL OF OXFORD,  
OWNED BY THE FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY

## PRECIS

The following report summarizes the results of a nine-month study of the underlined verses and marginal notations of the Geneva Bible (1570) of Edward de Vere, the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, owned by the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C.. The Bible, first examined by the author in January 1992, was included in the Folger's Collection of Fine Bindings from February - September 1992. First purchased by Henry Clay Folger in 1925, five years after the publication of John Thomas Looney's pathbreaking study "Shakespeare" Identified in Edward de Vere, the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, the Bible has not been examined by any scholar prepared to evaluate the possible historical significance of the underlinings of more than one thousand verses by a sixteenth century annotator almost certain to have been the original owner, Edward de Vere.'

Folger curators responsible for cataloging marginal notations of historic significance, unaware of the annotations until brought to their attention in January 1992, expressed surprise and great interest on learning of the nature of the annotations.'

The present report draws on the more than two centuries of serious scholarly study of Shakespeare's compositional technique — the means by which, as Greenwood puts it, "the great magician turns all that he touches into purest gold" (1908, 96) — and the Biblical knowledge. Particular emphasis is laid on the significance of Walter Whiter's pathbreaking but rarely studied 1794 essay on Shakespeare's mental associations as well as on several more recent studies of Shakespeare's biblical references: Richmond

This conclusion is offered on the basis of the following considerations: 1) The reliability of the Folger's provenance information determining de Vere's original ownership; 2) the principal investigator's familiarity with de Vere's holograph as attested in publications Amphlett (1955), Fowler (1986), and Miller (1988). Efforts to verify comparison of the holograph and ink composition through expert testimony, delayed due to the Fine Binding Exhibit, are currently being undertaken.

Special collections curator Dr. Nati Krivatsky, who mounted the fine bindings exhibit and has subsequently retired from the Folger Staff, registered surprise and enthusiasm when shown several examples of the evidence included in the present report tying the annotations to Shakespeare. Dr. Laetitia Yeandle, curator of rare manuscripts, asked about the need to test the ink to pin down the date of the annotations, expressed her opinion that the inks used by the annotator were unlikely to be other than 16th century. Nevertheless, ink testing will undoubtedly be required.

Noble's classic, Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge (1935), which set the scholarly standard for organization, precision and classification; Peter Milward's comprehensive study of Lear, Macbeth, Othello, and Hamlet, Biblical Influences in Shakespeare's Great Tragedies (1987); and two books by Naseeb Shaheen which, following Noble's footsteps, carefully outline a large number -- though, as we shall see, certainly not all -- of the Biblical references in two genres of plays: Biblical References in Shakespeare's Tragedies (1987) and Biblical References in Shakespeare's History Plays (1989).

As this list makes apparent, much of the important work in studies of Shakespeare's biblical references has taken place within the last five years and much remains to be discovered. Richmond Noble pessimistically described the status of research in 1935:

Mistakes in attribution have frequently occurred, sometimes with far-reaching results. Since Shakespeare is not available for examination we may ascribe to him allusions to books he had no intention of making, and also he may have utilized those selfsame books on occasions that have escaped our notice. Our inquiry in the nature of an Inquest of Documents, where the principal witness is not available for personal interrogation and where all the evidence is contained in existing documents to which it is impossible to add anything.

(1935 24, italics added)

The study shows that of the one thousand verses marked and underlined in the Earl of Oxford's Geneva Bible, as many as two-hundred, or one-fifth, demonstrate a definite, probable, or possible influence in the Shakespeare canon. Over eighty of these verses, as well as some sixteen psalms, are attributed as Shakespeare references to the Bible in the studies published by Noble, Milward and Shaheen. The remaining one-hundred and twenty verses, only a small portion of which (not more than 20%) fall into the category "possible", are attributed to Shakespeare on the strength of the present study. This distribution of evidence is highly significant. The verses which are already evident in the literature anchor the present study in a tradition of scholarship which, proceeding on the assumptions of Noble, working in the absence of any documentary evidence, has succeeded in isolating and describing a large number of Shakespeare's biblical references. The new verses added by the present study highlight the heuristic value of the Oxfordian thesis as well as providing an independent confirmation of the premise on which the study depends.

The principal investigator holds a masters degree with honors from the New School for Social Research (1988). A teaching associate in the Departments of Comparative Literature and English at the University of Massachusetts, he is preparing a PhD dissertation on the manuscript of the anonymous Elizabethan history play, Thomas of Woodstock. He has studied and lectured on the history of the Shakespearean authorship controversy for three years.

Portions of the material included in this Report are featured in General Telephone's 1992 Interactive Video Teleconference on Shakespearean authorship. The first public presentation of the material was made October 17, 1992 in Cleveland, Ohio, at the Seventeenth Annual Conference of the Shakespeare-Oxford Society of America. The author addressed the Shakespeare Authorship Roundtable in Santa Monica, Ca. January 16, 1993. Dr. Anne Pluto (PhD, english), Shakespeare professor at Leslie College in Boston, will co-author two articles based on the material supplied in the Report.

## A REVIEW OF RECENT STRATFORDIAN BIOGRAPHIES

By Richard F. Whalen

Few of the world's great writers left such a blank slate for their biographers as did the glove maker's of Stratford-on-Avon who turned up in London and somehow achieved posthumous fame as the poet/dramatist William Shakespeare. And few, if any, have had more biographers. The contrast between the breadth of artistry of the poems and plays and the man's mysteriously mundane life has led scores of the most eminent scholars to try to match the documented life-record to the genius displayed in the works of Shakespeare. It hasn't been easy.

No less than six new biographies or books strongly biographical have been published recently. All are aimed at the general reader. Each of the six puts its own twist on the never-ending search for the Bard of Avon. And two more take the search a step farther: One provides a survey of the many biographies; the other is an update of that Stratfordian phenomenon, "Shakespeare's Lives" by Prof. Samuel Schoenbaum.

Two of the new books are standard biographies that blithely accept the lack of historical evidence and go on to imagine what it must have been like. Dennis Kay begins his 400-page biography "Shakespeare" (Morrow) with a jolt: "This is not a biography in the conventional sense, primarily because the evidence that usually underpins biography - diaries, journals, letters - simply does not exist." Undeterred, Kay states his intention to provide a biographical narrative in the context of the age along with a study of Shakespeare's writings. "Context of the age" is the usual escape hatch for Stratfordian biographers.

Not surprisingly, Kay, a lecturer at Oxford, must resort to the stock phrases of Bard biography: "There's a fair chance he..." "We can safely assume..." and "Let us imagine..." But soon the reader is deep into interpretations of all the plays, with barely a paragraph here and there to lend a touch of biography. As Kay says, "It is unfortunate but true that we know least about him when his writing career is at its peak." How true.

Another in the long line of Stratfordian biographers is Prof. Russell Fraser, whose "Shakespeare: The Later Years" completes his two-volume biography (Columbia University Press). Fraser writes for "the literate reader, in or out of academia, supposing that he/she exists." The wry sarcasm is typical. Fraser savors the paradoxical and provocative: Hamlet is not autobiographical. The Tempest is not his swan song. And the life-record of the poet/dramatist reveals a central paradox: "The greater life's impact on Shakespeare, the less the plays announce it." Oxfordians understand the truth behind that observation.

In spite of the paradox, Fraser "means to run the life and work together, clarifying one in terms of the other." (Context of the age, again.) The result is a conflation of his own erudite imagination and the few known facts of Will Shakspeare's life in the theater. Shakespeare, says Fraser, "self-effacing, kept his head down". He certainly did.

Early on, Fraser promises to steer clear of the staple phrases of Shakespearean biography such as "doubtless he" and "it may well have been". Inevitably, he reneges on his promise and resorts to "probably" and "likely" when needed. A peculiar feature is a liberal sprinkling throughout of short Shakespeare quotes, usually only a word or two, yet duly footnoted.

In "Young Shakespeare", his first volume, he notes that there is no record of young Will's schooling, but provides almost a dozen full pages

on what it must have been like. Gently, imperceptibly and insidiously, conjecture merges into certainty: "Putting away foolishness, Shakespeare at seven addressed himself to Latin grammar." There is no footnote for it.

Echoing Ben Jonson's jealous observation that Shakespeare "wants art", Fraser observes (twice) that Shakespeare "lacks definition". And it's certainly true of this free-wheeling biography. Will Shakspeare, the boy of Stratford and man of London, seems to grow smaller and smaller as the landscape around him gets more complex, more detailed and more lavish. At the end the reader is left with the impression of a solitary, enigmatic figure, standing forlornly stage-center, dwarfed by the elaborate sets and about to disappear altogether into the overwhelming scenery.

Fraser's explanation: "Definition" was his gift to others, leaving "little room for the indigenous man, 'I, William Shakespeare.'" Whatever that means.

Readers of Peter Thomson's new book "Shakespeare's Professional Career" (Cambridge Univ. Press) may feel like suing him for false advertising. Thomson, a professor of drama at Exeter University, provides no information at all about Shakespeare's professional career. (Possibly because there isn't any.) In his first sentence he says this is a book "about Shakespeare's job". But it's not.

Despite chapter titles such as "Establishing a Career", and "Servant to the King", Thomson has nothing to say about Shakespeare. Instead, he goes on at length about patronage, the Stanley family, touring companies, the theaters (at great length) and acting companies (at even greater length). Like Prof. Fraser, Thomson appreciates "Shakespeare's ability to keep his head down". Coincidence?

An almost-up-to-date list of Stratfordian biographies in the 20th century can be found in Prof. Joseph Rosenblum's "Shakespeare: An Annotated Bibliography" (Salem Press), which describes 17 biographies, ranging from Joseph Quincy Adams's 1923 life to Prof. Schoenbaum's latest three books.

Prof. Rosenblum provides 50-word descriptions of the books he has selected as "those works that students of Shakespeare are most likely to encounter and need", and pity the poor student. There are more than a thousand books, grouped by subject.

Occasionally, an introduction to Shakespeare's works includes a biography that goes beyond the perfunctory. "The Complete Works of Shakespeare" (HarperCollins), edited by Prof. David Bevington, opens with a 150,000-word account of his life, the times, the theater and the works themselves that alone is worth the price of admission. The introduction and texts in this fourth edition, just published, benefit from the scholarship of an advisory board of no less than 46 English professors. It may be one of the most judicious, sober and effective of the Stratfordian biographies.

If Fraser's style is florid baroque, Bevington's is spare classical. He makes it clear where fact ends and tradition begins. Like Fraser, Bevington cannot avoid dropping in the usual qualifiers, such as "presumably" and "probably", to bridge the gaps between hard facts. Despite this necessary hedging, he considers the information we have on Shakespeare to be "both adequate and plausible". Unfortunately, the portrait of William Shakespeare that emerges does not even approach being adequate or plausible. The poet/dramatist continues to elude definition.

"The Friendly Shakespeare" (Viking) by Prof. Norrie Epstein (reviewed in the previous issue) is intended for the uninitiated and even for those who might find Shakespeare first on film and television. Her sub-title says it all: "A Thoroughly Painless Guide to the Best of the Bard". The book

is a smorgasbord of Shakespeareana presented in bite-sized, easily digested but nourishing tid-bits. It's a Book of the Month Club selection.

For her biography, Epstein contrasts the case for the Bard of Avon with that for Oxford, whom she recognizes as the leading candidate. The evidence for Oxford, she says, is very persuasive.

Irwin Matus is another biographer for whom Shakespeare is "elusive". In "Shakespeare: The Living Record", (St. Martin's Press) Matus leaves behind the meager record of Stratford and London to track the actor/dramatist on the road with the acting companies. The records, however, are missing, which presents major difficulties. Nevertheless, Matus takes the reader on a tour of the highways, byways and towns where the acting companies may have visited or performed. Not much happens.

The introduction is supplied by Prof. Schoenbaum, a long-standing friend. Schoenbaum gently warns "the knowledgeable" that they may "now and then draw startled breath", presumably at Matus's unorthodox interpretations, but he also promises that they will be pleasurably informed.

Matus's recent excursion in the media was in October 1991 when he tried to uphold the Stratfordian argument against Tom Bethell in the Atlantic magazine. He has expanded his article into a book due from Continuum in September. The title: "Shakespeare, in Fact".

Prof. Schoenbaum himself has issued a revised edition of "Shakespeare's Lives" (Oxford University Press), in which he surveys with biting wit and debatable wisdom the life-record, the legends and the major biographies. He asks that his book be viewed as "a novel species of Shakespearean biography, with the protagonist gradually emerging from the mists of ignorance and misconception, to be seen through a succession of different eyes and from constantly shifting vantage points." As might be expected, the protagonist remains elusive. The mists are too thick.

Endowed with a caustic wit, Schoenbaum uses lofty sarcasm to make his points and is a master of the end-of-paragraph put-down, e.g., "So much for certainties." He is cautious on several points, however, relegating Nicholas Rowe, often accorded dubious status as the first true biographer, to the chapter on legends. So much for Rowe.

After an amusing chapter on David Garrick's Stratford Jubilee in 1769, which put Stratford-on-Avon on the tourist map and launched "The Shakespeare Industry", Schoenbaum plunges into the two centuries of scholars, editors, biographers, popularizers, encyclopedists, frauds, forgers, heretics and deviants who tried to make sense out of the meager facts of Will Shakspeare's life. This immersion may be more than the average reader needs or wants, but even skipping and skimming has its rewards, for the work contains gems of fascinating anecdotes.

The great Edmund Malone, the first comprehensive editor and biographer of Will Shakspeare, whitewashed the painted bust in the Stratford church, thinking he was restoring it to its original stone color. It was several generations before he was forgiven.

James Halliwell-Phillipps stole documents from libraries but was still the greatest of the 19th century Shakespearean biographers. He also added his wife's name to his own to assure an inheritance. Samuel Butler and Oscar Wilde argued that Shakespeare was gay. William-Henry Ireland and J. Payne Collier forged Shakespeare documents while making major contributions to Shakespearean scholarship. Such was scholarship.

Frank Harris, an immigrant shoeshine boy and cattle rustler who became a magazine editor and author, is described by Schoenbaum as a "liar, libertine and blackmailer", and a "scoundrel" to boot. No scholar, but a "literary

charlatan", Harris was a successful popularizer who, Schoenbaum concedes, brought Shakespeare alive for thousands of readers at whatever the cost in truth and scholarship. Even "literary charlatans" have their uses.

These and other nuggets from Schoenbaum's lifetime of academic scholarship enliven what can be, for the most part, a repetitive recital of various biographers' various views on Will Shakspeare's father, the validity of the deer-poaching incident, his theater connections, The Dark Lady of the Sonnets, and sundry other matters. The truth, whatever it may be, begins to blur under the assault of divers opinions from three centuries of experts.

For Oxfordians, Prof. Schoenbaum's epilogue is quite provocative. After lamenting the lack of "an authoritative Life conceived in the modern spirit," Schoenbaum adds a curiously melancholy conclusion to his lengthy study of all the major Stratfordian biographies:

"Perhaps we should despair of ever bridging the vertiginous expanse between the sublimity of the subject and mundane inconsequence of the documentary record."

Amen to that.

\* \* \* \* \*

This epitaph engraved on the Stratford Monument installed (circa 1622) in the Stratford Trinity Church is, as far as we know, the first public mention of the death of William Shakespeare (1616). It is on the wall near but not contiguous to a gravemarker on the floor which is nameless and has no vital statistics and covers the remains of Will. Shakspeare whom tradition claims wrote the works of Shakespeare:

JUDIO PYLIUM, GENIO SOCRATEM, ARTE MARONEM:  
TERRA TEGIT, POPVLVS MARET OLYMPVS HABET\*  
STAY PASSENGER, WHY GOEST THOU BY SO FAST?  
READ, IF THOU CANST, WHOM ENVIOUS DEATH HATH PLAST  
WITHIN THIS MONUMENT SHAKSPEARE: WITH WHOME,  
QUICK NATURE DIED: WHOSE NAME DOTH DECK THIS TOMBE.  
FAR MORE THAN COST: SIEH ALL YT HE HATH WRIT,  
LEAVES LIVING ART, BUT PAGE, TO SERVE HIS WITT.

A number of respected traditional biographers of William Shakespeare only report that there is an epitaph on the Monument and some of those only provide a translation of the Latin couplet, most of the others, however, only quote the epitaph and a very few of them make a few short and footnote comments.

It is obvious that those Stratfordian biographers find it imperative to avoid having to explain embarrassing questions that epitaph would inspire even in high school students:

Why was Shakspeare not identified as either a dramatist or actor? Why was Shakspeare presumably buried in two graves? Did the eulogist, after stating that Shakspeare was placed in this monument redundantly point out that the name of Shakspeare "doth deck this tombe" in order to compare it to the nearby nameless gravemarker? Did the eulogist sense that mirth - "read, if thou canst" - embellishes the epitaph? What is the meaning of "far more than cost"? Did the author of Hamlet et. al. only have "witt"?

\*A Nestor in wisdom, a Socrates in intellect, a Virgil in art:  
The earth encloses, the people mourn, Olympus holds.

Dear Morser:

October 29, 1992

Recently, you suggested in a letter to the membership that the authorship issue will not be resolved until we address the scholarship of the Stratfordian community. You called for examples of "contrivances and evasions" that have and continue to be used to support the Stratford William as the author of the plays.

In this regard, I believe that perhaps the most damage has been done by that venerable institution - the Folger Library.

You must realize that the "Folger Library" editions of the Shakespeare plays first appeared in 1960 and have since become the edition of choice for most high schools in North America. These editions of the plays are not only extremely inexpensive but they are also highly accessible and available to the general reader.

A quick survey of the books will reveal that all of the plays in this series come with the same background information on the author, the publication of the plays, the Shakespeare theatre, and references for further Reading.

What is most revealing about the nature of the Stratfordian position are the statements that occur in the information on the author. (Remember that this same information is found in every single edition of the plays in the "Folger Library Edition".) The section intended to provide information on the author is seven and a half pages long. However, it is not till well into the third page that any details are given about the Stratford William. The first several pages are filled with bitter vitriol against Anti-Stratfordians. Here is but a sampling of these comments:

"To those acquainted with the history of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, it is incredible that anyone should be so naive or ignorant as to doubt the reality of Shakespeare as the author of the plays that bear his name."

Is this not the most blatant misuse of name calling you have ever read in a work that is purportedly aimed at students and the general reading public?

We all know why people engaged in an argument/discussion resort to name calling. They do so when they want us to form a judgment or opinion without examining the evidence. Name calling is a rhetorical device designed to stop the thinking process. It gets us to react emotionally instead of logically by appealing to hatred and fear. Politicians do it all the time and it ain't pretty. It is especially unattractive when "scholars" engage in this practice. It should also be stated that debaters resort to name calling when they have run out of ideas or support for their position.

Can you imagine how much discussion would be shut down by a statement such as the one quoted above? What student or member of the general reading public would dare question the authorship and risk being lumped in with the "naive" and the "ignorant"?

The name calling continues:

"Yet so much nonsense has been written about other "candidates" for the plays that it is well to remind readers that no credible evidence that would stand up in a court of law has ever been adduced to prove either that Shakespeare did not write his plays or that anyone else wrote them."

To students, teachers and the general public, the Folger Library represents the most authoritative voice on matters dealing with Shakespeare. How much useful inquiry and dialogue has been shut down by the Folger's indictment of anything anti-Stratfordian as being "nonsense"?

To continue:

"All the theories offered for the authorship of Francis Bacon, the Earl of Derby, the Earl of Oxford, the Earl of Hertford, Christopher Marlowe, and a score of other candidates are mere conjectures spun from the active imaginations of persons who confuse hypotheses and conjecture with evidence."

Naive, ignorant writers of nonsense and no confused over-imaginative hypothesizers. Will this list ever end?

There is more and unfortunately there is worse. One day an intellectual reckoning will come and the one statement that the Folger will surely regret is the following:

"The obvious reputation of Shakespeare as early as 1598 makes the effort to prove him a myth one of the most absurd in the history of human perversity."

How can one comment on such a statement? Is this not the ultimate in intellectual bankruptcy? To accuse the opposition in a debate of being absurd is one thing, but perverse? Methinks the Folger doth protect too much.

Yes there is more - much more and don't forget that these editions are intended for both the general reading public and for high school students of Shakespeare.

"The anti-Shakespeareans talk darkly about a plot of vested interests to maintain the authorship of Shakespeare. Nobody has any vested interest in Shakespeare, but every scholar is intareated in the truth and in the quality of evidence advanced by special pleaders who set forth hypotheses in places of facts."

Add paranoia and lobbyism to the list of offenses charged to the anti-Stratfordians. Does this statement not also suggest that anti-Stratfordians are disinterested in truth? What does this make us?

Is it not also notable that the opposition are referred to as being "anti-Shakespeareans"? Would this not be read as being against Shakespeare? That's almost as bad as being anti-apple pie and anti-mom! Let's continue with the diatribe:

"The anti-Shakespeareans base their arguments upon a few simple premises, all of them false. These false premises are that Shakespeare was an unlettered yokel without any schooling, that nothing is known about Shakespeare and that only a noble lord or the equivalent in background could have written the plays...Most anti-Shakespeareans are naive and betray an obvious snobbery. The author of their favourite plays, they imply, must have had a college diploma framed and hung on his study wall, like the one in their dentist's office, and obviously so great a writer must have had a title or some equally significant evidence of exalted social background. They forget that genius has a way of cropping up in unexpected places and that none of the great creative writers of the world got his inspiration in a college or university course."

I think that a great many authors would take great exception to the last statement. This last excerpt adds a few more names to the invective against anti-Stratfordians. We are poor logicians and snobbish; we also suffer from memory loss.

What has been quoted above all occurs within the first three and a half pages. The remaining four pages need no comment. They contain the usual fare in presenting the Stratford William as the author of the Shakespeare plays.

The good news is that in the last year, the "New Folger Library Editions" have come out. All of the above material has been deleted and in its place is a more temperate statement in the concluding paragraph acknowledging that an authorship question exists:

"Perhaps in response to the disreputable Shakespeare of legend - or perhaps in response to the fragmentary, and for some, all-too-ordinary Shakespeare documented by surviving records - some people since the mid-nineteenth century have argued that William Shakespeare could not have written the plays that bear his name.

These persons have put forward some dozen names as more likely authors, among them Queen Elizabeth, Sir Francis Bacon, Edward de Vere (Earl of Oxford), and Christopher Marlowe. Such attempts to find what for these people is a more believable author of the plays, is a tribute to the regard in which the plays are held."

Now, have we come a long way, baby, or what??!! Is this not a clear indication of the kinds of changes that have been occurring in the Folger's attitude towards the authorship question? I think so.

Don Saliani

#### Addendum

In his REINVENTING SHAKESPEARE (Oxford U. Press 1991) Gary Taylor has carried on the baton from the Folger Library (pp. 210-211):

#### IN WHICH OUR HERO IS MISTAKEN FOR SOMEONE ELSE

The subject of Americans and the subject of women lead inevitably to Delia Bacon, who was both. In 1857 she published The Philosophy of the Plays of Shakspeare Unfolded, a 675-page book proposing that the works so long attributed to William Shakespeare had actually been written by Francis Bacon. The proposition attracted innumerable adherents, including literary giants like Mark Twain, Walt Whitman, and Henry James. Delia Bacon has been, in a way, more influential than any other Shakespearian. The one thing everyone knows about Shakespeare is that, according to some people, Shakespeare didn't write Shakespeare's plays.

The arguments put forward in defense of this hypothesis have never been persuasive by any logical, legal, historical, or rhetorical criteria. They have never persuaded specialists. Bacon's own defense of her theory, being almost impossible to read, was seldom read, and the details had little influence on subsequent discussion. People who agreed that Shakespeare did not write the plays could not agree on who did write them; Francis Bacon was soon competing with a slate of rival candidates. The entire discussion is ultimately pointless. The theory that Shakespeare did not write Shakespeare's works belongs to the class of propositions that have no meaning, because they cannot under any circumstances be disproved. Any evidence against Delia Bacon's theory could be dismissed as a deliberate blind, designed to conceal the identity of the true author. And even if opponents produced

decisive evidence against Bacon's claim, adherents could simply switch their allegiance to another candidate. Such theories are psychologically satisfying, because logically invulnerable; like all circular reasoning, they are immune to disproof. But a theory that could never be discredited cannot be credited. Nothing ventured, nothing said (underlining added).

Dr. W. H. Furness, the eminent American scholar, who was the father of the Editor of the Variorum Edition of Shakespeare's works, wrote in a letter (Oct. 29, 1866) to Nathaniel Holmes:

"I am one of the many who have never been able to bring the life of William Shakespeare and the plays of Shakespeare within planetary space of each other. Are there any two things in the world more incongruous?"

Henry James wrote in a letter (Aug. 26, 1903) to Violet Hunt:

"I am 'a sort of' haunted by the conviction that the divine William is the biggest and most successful fraud ever practised on a patient world. The more I turn him round and round the more he so affects me. But that is all - I am not pretending to treat the question or to carry it any further. It bristles with difficulties, and I can only express my general sense by saying that I find it almost as impossible to conceive that Bacon wrote the plays as to conceive that the man from Stratford, as we know the man from Stratford, did."

Mark Twain wrote in his IS SHAKESPEARE DEAD? (1909):

"You can trace the life histories of the whole of them [the world's celebrities] save one - far and away the most colossal prodigy of the entire accumulation - Shakespeare. About him you can find out nothing. Nothing of even the slightest importance. Nothing worth the trouble of stowing away in your memory. Nothing that even remotely indicates that he was ever anything more than a distinctly commonplace person...."

In his 1920 review of Looney's "SHAKESPEARE" IDENTIFIED Columbia U. Professor Frederick Tabor Cooper affirmed:

"Here at last is a sane, dignified, arresting contribution to the abused and sadly discredited Shakespeare controversy. It is one of the most ingenious pieces of minute, circumstantial evidence extant in literary criticism ... Every right-minded scholar who seriously cares for the welfare of letters in the bigger sense should face the problem that this book presents and argue it to a finish" (underlining added).

In his 1920 review of "SHAKESPEARE" IDENTIFIED in The Bookman, Edwin Bjorkman asserted:

"It is impossible to do justice to the wealth of evidence collected by Mr. Looney, or to the ingenuity displayed by him in its coordination ... the most remarkable aspect of his labors is that they affect not only the central problem of William Shakespeare's relation to the work named after him, but a whole series of literary enigmas that have puzzled every painstaking student of this period for nearly two hundred years. There is the problem of the lyrics excluded from the plays of Lyly, author of Euphues and private secretary to Oxford, on their first publication - one of which is practically identical with one of the lyrics in A Midsummer Night's Dream. There is the problem of

Shepherd Willie in Spenser's The Shepheard's Calendar, 1579 ... The peculiar thing is that all these problems seem to fall into place and form a consistent picture the moment you accept the theory of Oxford's connection with the Shakespearian plays ... Mr. Looney...has opened most promising vistas, and it is to be hoped his leads will be followed up. The days are past when a new Shakespearian theory can be laughed out of court ... We should be moved solely by a desire for truth, and nothing that may be helpful in finding it should be despised.

In a letter to Delia Bacon, Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote that,  
"You cannot maintain any side without shedding light on the first of all literary problems" (i.e. the Shakespeare authorship question).

C. Wayne Shore, Ph.D. by coincidence submitted the following which should embarrass Professor Taylor for his dogmatic affirmation which the editor has underlined:

"In The Art of Persuasion: A National Review Rhetoric for Writers, by Linda Bridges and William F. Rickenbacker (1991), there appears the following statement on page 130:

'For what it's worth, let us note in this place that we are persuaded by the Ogburn arguments that the works attributed to the bumpkin "Shakspeare" were from the hand of Edward de Vere.'

In his book, moreover, Professor Taylor wrote (p. 211), "....late in the eighteenth century James Wilmot had concluded that Bacon wrote (the) plays but found his own hypothesis so disconcerting that he never published it." On the other hand, in his Shakespeare's Lives S. Schoenbaum wrote that "Wilmot undertook a life of (Shakspeare) and in the Stratford environs set out in quest of information respecting the Bard (and) learned that (Shakspeare), the son of a butcher, could neither read nor write, was 'at best a Country clown at the time he went to seek his fortune in London, that he could never have had any school learning ...' ...It was all very puzzling. Wilmot examined many private collections of letters and documents, and discovered that none of the local gentry of Shakespeare's day seemed to have heard of the great man....

"Wilmot also searched diligently for (Shakspeare's) books...In vain, however, covered himself with the dust of every private bookcase within a radius of 50 miles. And why could not even a page or two of the many sheets in the poet's hand (over a quarter of a million, he calculated) be produced? Had the plays been the work of someone who wished for good reason to conceal his connections with them?...

"...Wilmot tracked down additional clues (all of which) led (him) to the astonishing conclusion that Bacon wrote Shakespeare (and) destroyed his manuscripts in order to conceal the fact that so exalted a personage had descended to the base art of playwriting...but Wilmot published nothing: he did not wish to offend his Stratford neighbors, who prided themselves fiercely on Shakespeare's association with the town" (underlining added).

(As a typical Stratfordian, Professor Taylor has fabricated "his own hypothesis" not only for which there is no corroborating evidence, but also documented repudiation.)

## CONGRATULATIONS TO RUSS DES COGNETS

Dear Russ des Cognets:

March 3, 1993

Thank you for including me on your list of people interested in the April Shakespeare Association of America meetings. Unfortunately, due to limitations of funds and also to many pressing obligations, as a student and a teacher at the University of Massachusetts, I will not be able to attend this event. I shall certainly be there in spirit, however.

I'd also like to extend my congratulations on your initiating such an inspired strategic maneuver. I detect some results of your efforts on the front page of the most recent SAA newsletter, shared with our local group by Isabel Holden. I am assessing how this progressive stance by the SAA leadership affects my plans to write a "Reply to Duke University's Prof. Annabell Patterson" which could be mailed this spring to Breadloaf Summer Session Graduates. Lord Burford and I will be conferring about this matter later in the week.

The Humanities division at the University of Massachusetts is honeycombed with crypto-Oxfordians.

Roger Stritmatter

Oxfordians found themselves outnumbered 50 to 1 at the 1993 meeting of the Shakespearean Assn. of America (SAA). Nonetheless, a number of useful conversations took place. Friends were made. Contacts were renewed. And the Oxfordians, most of them Trustees of the Shakespeare Oxford Society, learned a great deal about the Shakespeare academic establishment.

More than 500 Shakespeare professors attended the 3-day meeting in early April in Atlanta. Multiple, overlapping seminars and general sessions covered subjects from Shakespeare's Italy to Shakespeare and popular culture, to a high-tech demonstration of computer graphics using films of the plays.

"Shakespeare and the Construction of the Author" caught the attention of all the Oxfordians. It was apparently the only session that touched on the authorship question, although the subject came up briefly in at least one of the other seminars. The three speakers in the authorship session focused on the perception of the issue, rather than the substance of the evidence. Nevertheless, it was an open discussion that drew interesting questions and comments from the audience. Lord Burford, sitting front and center, questioned the wry skepticism that one of the speakers brought to the subject in his paper, "The Author's Two Bodies". Lord Burford was in Atlanta to deliver a lecture at the Atlanta Historical Society and was able to attend part of the SAA meeting.

The Trustees of the Shakespeare Oxford Society held a Trustee's meeting while they were together in Atlanta and, among other business, agreed that attendance at SAA meetings was worthwhile and that membership in SAA should be encouraged. It's estimated that about 15 or 20 Society members have joined the SAA so far. SAA dues range from \$20 to \$70, depending on a professor's salary, so whatever is reasonable should be reasonable. For membership forms, write to Nancy Hodge, executive director, SAA, at the English Department, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, 75275. The next SAA meeting will be in April 1994 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Close to a dozen society members are currently planning to attend again. (R. F. Whalen)

Ms. Rebecca Flynn  
Shakespeare Birthplace Trust  
Stratford-on-Avon CV 37 69W  
England

February 9, 1993

Dear Rebecca Flynn:

The Shakespeare Newsletter (Fall 1992), in reporting the GTE Service Corporation's VisNet, affirmed:

After presenting a drawing of the Stratford Monument from William Dugdale's 1656 Antiquities of Warwickshire which presumably shows Shakespeare holding a sack of grain, appropriate enough for a country burgess, rather than the writer's paper and pen one now sees - the argument is frequently made by Oxfordians, though, as Rebecca Flynn noted, Dugdale's drawings were often unreliable ...

Do you know that when the relative few inaccuracies occurred in Dugdale's works, the original drawings were supplied by the families concerned and not drawn by Dugdale? According to the Stratfordian Charlotte Stopes in her article in the Monthly Review (April 1904), the Stratford Monument was drawn by Dugdale and the engraving drawn by Hollar. Professor Schoenbaum in his Shakespeare's Lives points out that the engraving of the Monument "differs strikingly from the artifact we know.... - a mean-spirited tradesman rather than the Matchless Bard." If the original bust was the existing bust, it is beyond belief to think that Hollar would have drawn and Dugdale published a complete transformation and conspicuous parody of it. In fact, 19th century Dr. Whitaker reported that Dugdale's "scrupulous accuracy united with stubborn integrity" has elevated his Antiquities of Warwickshire "to the rank of legal evidence."

Do you know that in Rowe's Shakespeare's Works (1709) the engraving of the Monument is similar in all important respects to Dugdale's but not from the same block and that Dr. Thomas, who lived near Stratford, published a "revised and corrected" 2nd edition of Antiquities of Warwickshire (1730) and the engraving of the Monument is from the same block used in Dugdale's 1st edition?

You do, of course, know that there was no accurate depiction of the existing bust from its installation around 1622 until around 1747 and that the Trinity Church records report that the bust on the Monument was repaired and restored around 1747. Such reconstruction of limestone requires the use of mortar which would be permanently discernable. Since there is no such evidence, that reconstruction connotes the fabrication of a new bust.

Your comment reported in the above quotation in The Shakespeare Newsletter indisputably implied that Dugdale's 1656 engraving of the Stratford Monument is unreliable. Since such implication is inaccurate and misleading, you are certainly obligated to write letters acknowledging that your uncorroborated surmise was an outright error and that the existing bust is not the original bust, to: The Shakespeare Newsletter and The Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter.

I will print this letter and your response - deadline May 20, 1993 - in the Spring 1993 Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter June 20, 1993 to approximately 700 Members throughout 7 countries, including England.

Sincerely,  
Morse Johnson, Editor

(As a typical Stratfordian, Ms. Flynn did not respond to an embarrassing disclosure.)

## LORD BURFORD REACHES 15,000 WITH THE CASE FOR OXFORD

Two years ago Charles Vere, Lord Burford, a collateral descendant of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, began a nationwide speaking tour at the Folger Shakespeare Library in the nation's capitol. It was an auspicious tour that exceeded expectations. His address at the Folger marked the first by an Oxfordian at that traditional bastion of Stratfordian orthodoxy. A capacity audience of several hundred Shakespeareans listened attentively as Lord Burford made the case for Oxford. That address was followed by more than 125 appearances from coast to coast at universities, libraries, civic clubs, bar associations, Elizabethan societies and prep schools. A rough estimate of his total audience to date is put at about 15,000, and during those two years membership in the Shakespeare Oxford Society has more than doubled.

Members of the society have played a major role in organizing the tour. John Louthier of Oldsmar, Florida, was the inspiration for the tour and led the launch. Isabel Holden of Northampton, Massachusetts, secured Lord Burford's first appearance at the Folger. Since then, dozens of society members have assisted on the tour, sponsoring Lord Burford in their cities, coordinating the scheduling and providing publicity materials. This year, Trudy Atkins of Greensboro, North Carolina, is coordinating Lord Burford's appearances and providing guidance on bookings, logistics, and publicity for local sponsors.

Lord Burford has carried the Oxford banner with persuasive force, high style and easy humor. He's proven himself to be a dynamic and authoritative advocate, uses no notes in his lectures, enjoys the give and take with audiences and has engaged in several formal debates. At Washington University in St. Louis he debated Patrick Spottiswood, the director of education at the International Globe Center in London.

Lord Burford has appeared on many radio and TV programs, including the PBS Front Line program that explored the case for Oxford. The program was re-broadcast last December 22 in prime time nationwide. His speaking appearances have produced piles of clippings from local newspapers, including the Chicago Tribune and the Los Angeles Times.

His many university appearances included Boston University, the University of North Carolina-Greensboro, Purdue, Duke, Yale, Claremont and a dinner meeting at North House at Harvard, where he exchanged views with a Harvard lecturer in Shakespeare. Prof. Woodland Hastings of Harvard said Lord Burford's presentation "was impressive both in style and content; it certainly is appropriate for Harvard and other educational institutions to be open (and eager!) to entertain new or different ideas or interpretations."

Lord Burford has been especially effective in prep schools, where students and teachers alike are receptive to the idea that Oxford was the author Shakespeare. The chairman of the English department at Choate Rosemary Hall said: "Several students told me they thought it was one of the best lectures they had ever heard. They were impressed by Lord Burford's erudition and his articulate presentation."

Other major audiences included the Emory University Friends of the Library/Atlanta Historical Society meeting with 400 in attendance and the Strictly Shakespeare Society of Kansas City, with more than 400. Local sponsors have found that organizing a round of speaking engagements and debates or discussions with local Shakespeareans has been most rewarding. They make new contacts, enjoy making arrangements, generate publicity and new members, and secure a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities through state humanities councils. Trudy Atkins (919-454-3516), tour coordinator, is looking for sponsors now for fall and promises advice, guidance and a rewarding experience helping to spread the word.

## CHAIRMAN'S CORNER

It is with sadness that we must report the death on April 5th of Victor Crichton, Chairman of the Membership Committee. The membership of the Society more than tripled during his tenure. Victor was instrumental in securing the new membership pins. He was a serious Oxfordian scholar and collected an outstanding library. His interests were far ranging, but Oxford was his great love, and he was so certain of his ground that he would not admit that any controversy existed, nor waste his precious time arguing with Stratfordians. There were too many books to search out and collect; too much reading and thinking to be done. Life was too short to spend any of it trying to enlighten people with closed minds. Sooner or later the academics would get the message, but with or without them, Victor knew that the ultimate case for Oxford would be established and accepted. Victor didn't care a fig about what the establishment felt -- about anything. He was an apostle for the philosophy which defends the validity of A MAJORITY OF ONE. We Oxfordians will miss him very much.

John Simon, New York Magazine's vitriolic drama critic seems suddenly to have remembered a "previous engagement", for he backed out of what was shaping up to be an exciting debate with Lord Burford at the Players Club in April. Instead, Lord Burford gave an excellent address, seconded by a postscript from Joseph Sobran, and then the two fielded authorship questions from the large audience of theatre people assembled in "the house that Booth built". Several converts may have been made.

With the inspiration of Vice President Russ des Cognets and the able assistance of Trudy Atkins, the spring meeting of the Board of Trustees was held in conjunction with the Annual Conference of the Shakespeare Association of America in Atlanta. Russ and Trudy arranged for Lord Burford to give a lecture, for which they got tremendous publicity in the Atlanta Constitution. This feature article brought out a large crowd. Russ des Cognets' concept was to bring us closer to the current thinking of the Shakespearean academics, and to open a friendly, positive dialogue with our Stratfordian friends. We urge our membership to join the S.A.A. All of us are SHAKESPEAREANS. We just attend a different church. More about all this elsewhere in the Newsletter.

Trudy Atkins is doing an outstanding job in handling the bookings for Lord Burford, but she needs your help. The bookings which we have gotten over the past two years have come from YOU, not the academics! This is easily the most important project that our Society has ever undertaken. Trudy can set up the speaking engagements, once you have given her the leads. But she NEEDS YOUR INPUT! If you have ANY contacts with secondary schools, colleges or universities, English Speaking Unions, libraries, civic, fraternal or literary organizations, find out if they would be interested in having Lord Burford address their students or membership. If so, contact Trudy, and she will take it from there. We are already booking for next autumn and winter and into the spring of 1994. Trudy can be reached at: (919) 299-0419 (H); or at Southern Trade Publications, P.O. Box 18343, Greensboro, NC, 27419, (919) 454-3516. Lord Burford is converting heathens by the dozen, please do your bit to give him a hand!

Board Member Len Deming and his assistant, Jill Ross, are doing yeoman work in transferring all of the Society's membership and financial records to their computers. We are much indebted to them. Over and above the call of duty, and all that! And remember, the NEW OFFICIAL ADDRESS for the Society is now Len's office: 71 Spit Brook Road, Suite 107, Nashua, New Hampshire, 03060. The phone is: (603) 888-1453 and the FAX is 888-8411.

How about Gary Goldstein's first issue of "The Elizabethan Journal"? Congratulations to Gary and his fine editorial staff. An outstanding job well done -- the first pebbles of another Oxfordian avalanche. The word is getting out, in spite of such pathetic examples of academic stonewalling and intolerance of academic dissent as the recent exclusion of the Oxford page from the SNL. Yes, Virginia, the Keystone Kops are still alive and well and living in Academia!

The 1993 Annual Conference is now set for November 12-14 at the Omni Parker House, 60 School Street, Boston, MA, 02108; (617) 227-8600. Vice President Charles Boyle is Conference Chairman (617) 776-7782 and is the process of getting his committees in place and functioning. Mailings will be sent later. The Blue Boar Gifte Shoppe will be improved and expanded at this year's conference. Ralph Bota will be in charge, and remember that all items in stock may be ordered by mail. For a catalog, write Ralph Bota:

5707 Hampstead, Parma, Ohio 44129  
(216) 884-3695 evenings.

Members from England and Australia are already making plans to attend. Verily Anderson, along with her publisher, will be coming with copies of her book, "The de Veres of Castle Hedingham", just hot off the presses in October! Check with your travel agents to get the best deals on flights to Boston. Don't delay. Some great deals are frequently available if you book far enough in advance. Meantime, have a lovely Oxfordian summer!

Yea! Verily! Johnny Price, Chairman

#### **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.

#### **DUES**

Student \$15.00

Annual Regular \$35.00

Sustaining \$50 or more

#### **Dues and requests for membership information to:**

Shakespeare Oxford Society, First Bldg., 71 Spit Brook Rd., #107,  
Nashua, N.H., 03060. Tel. (603) 888-1453 - FAX. (603) 888-5411

#### **Submit materials for publication in the Newsletter to:**

Morse Johnson, Suite #819, 105 W. 4th St., Cincinnati, OH 45202

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

# *The Shakespeare Oxford Society*

First Bldg., 71 Spit Brook Rd., #107, Nashua, N.H. 03060

Morse Johnson, Editor



## EXCERPTS FROM G. G. GREENWOOD'S THE SHAKESPEARE PROBLEM RESTATED (1908)

From the Preface:

In a letter published in The Times of December 20th, 1901, Mr. Sidney Lee emptied all the vials of his wrath upon the heads of the unfortunate "Baconians". He assailed them with a wealth of derisive and denunciatory epithets which was really quite startling. Their theory was characterised as "foolish craze", "morbid psychology", "madhouse chatter". They were suffering from "epidemic disease" and were "unworthy of serious attention from any but professed students of intellectual aberration", etc., etc. This language, be it observed, was addressed not only to the propounders of cryptograms and ciphers, but to all believers in the Baconian theory, in any degree and in any form. Well, it is no part of my plan or intention to defend that theory, and Mr. Sidney Lee is certainly entitled to hold, and to express, his own opinion upon it. But, as friend Sneer would say, "Why so warm, Sir Fretful?"

. . . . .

The question is a matter of evidence and reasonable probability, Was Shakspeare the Playar identical with Shakespeare the Poet? It seems to me that that question must, on full consideration of the whole matter, be answered in the negative, and in this work I have endeavored to state some of the reasons which, as it seems to me, make for that conclusion. I am quite aware that by many it will be thought to be time and labour wasted. The High Priests of Literature will treat it with frigid and contemptuous silence. The College of Stratfordian Cardinals will at once put it in on the Index. The Grand Inquisitors - Inquisitress! - of the Temple by Avon's sacred stream will decree that it shall be burnt (metaphorically, at any rate) by the common hangman, and "The brilliant Young Man", who has, perhaps, bestowed half an hour to the subject, and therefore understands it in every detail, will, if he should condescend to notice it at all, see in it a grand opportunity for once more convulsing the world with his side-splitting original joke about "gammon of Bacon", or his famous paradox that "There is no Learning but Ignorance". Meanwhile, from the Professors of "Morbid Psychology", those of them, at least, who are interested in homes for feeble-minded patients, I shall, no doubt, receive offers, on very reasonable terms, of board and lodging for the rest of my natural life. Yet I am sanguine enough to hope that by some open-minded and impartial readers the following chapters may be found to be not altogether devoid of interest, nor, possibly, of instruction. To such a reader, then, I venture to offer this work. "Cum tabulis animi censoris aucti honesti", and by "honesti" I mean one who is fair and honourable, and does not allow his reason and his judgment to be obscured by prejudice - still less by petulance and ill-temper. I think he will at least admit that there is such a thing as a "Shakespeare Problem".\*

\*As I have said above, every "Life of Shakespeare" is, for the most part, built upon hypothesis, and rather a work of imagination than of true biography. Unfortunately, many Shakespearean biographers and critics, not content with giving full rein to their imagination, resort to methods which in every other case than Shakespeare's would be condemned as inconsistent with the rules of common honesty.

From the text:

We have already seen that, according to eminent Shakespearean experts, Love's Labour's Lost was composed in 1588-9, The Comedy of Errors in 1589-91, A Midsummer Night's Dream in 1590-1, Romeo and Juliet in 1591-3, and The Two Gentlemen in 1590-2. We have seen, too, that Venus and Adonis, "the first heir of my invention", was composed at any rate before 1593, and some critics (Professor Baynes among them) maintain that it had been written before Shakspeare left Stratford - an assumption in which Sir Theodore Martin sees no improbability.

Now, putting aside for the moment the other plays above-mentioned, and fixing our attention only on Love's Labour's Lost and Venus and Adonis (which the reader who has not already done so should "read, mark, learn and inwardly digest"), how is it possible to conceive that these works, which proclaim in every line that their author was a cultured and courtly aristocrat, were composed by William Shakspeare of Stratford?

I know, of course, what the answer of the Stratfordian will be. He will ingeminate "Genius! Genius!" Has not Sir Theodore Martin written that the difficulty has arisen with "certain people to whom the ways of genius are a stumbling block"? Of Sir Theodore Martin I can only write in terms of unfeigned respect, and I regret that he should have entertained such contempt for those who would examine the claims of genius rather strictly when it is appealed to as a Thaumaturgus. It is as if he had written, "These poor people, - these poor dolts, - they cannot understand the ways of genius. 'But we are Spirits of another sort!'" Well, if by "Genius" is meant the Genius of the Arabian Nights who can bring into being an Aladdin's Palace by a mere word, then no doubt Genius can do all that these complacent critics claim for it. But if human genius be intended, then I venture to think that they have greatly misconceived the functions and potentialities of genius, and that, for all their fancied superiority, they will haply be found to be but wise in their own conceits. Genius may give the power of acquiring knowledge, but genius is not knowledge. Genius never taught a man to conjugate Τύττω who had never had a lesson in Greek nor seen a Greek grammar....

And though genius may prompt one to sing sweetly without much knowledge, it would require not genius but divine inspiration to enable a young provincial apprentice, who had passed through call-boy to play-actor, and who had but picked up a few crumbs of education at the Stratford Free School (where by the way he had, it would seem, given no indications of genius whatever) - in a word, Shakspeare as we know him to have been - not only to wake to ecstasy the living lyre, but to write of all things under heaven as never man wrote before or since. "All the commentators on Shakespeare," writes Mr. Ellacombe, "are agreed that he was the most wonderfully many-sided writer that the world has yet seen. Every art and science are more or less noticed by him so far as they were known in his day, every business and profession are more or less accurately described; and so it has come to pass that, though the main circumstances of his life are pretty well known, yet the students of every art and science, and the members of every business and profession, have delighted to claim him as their fellow-labourer. Books have been written at various times by various writers which have proved (to the complete satisfaction of the writers) that he was a soldier, a sailor, a lawyer, an astronomer, a physician, a divine, a printer, an actor, a courtier, a sportsman, an angler, and I know not what else beside.".... We know, too, that he is so accurate in his

topographical details that books have been written to prove that he had visited not only Scotland but also Germany and Italy.

But genius alone cannot do all this. Genius is a gift of nature, but nature alone never yet gave knowledge and culture. The diamond is a natural product, but, however fine its quality, it will not sparkle like the Koh-i-nur unless it be subjected to the process of cutting at the hands of a skilful artificer. No; the genius of Shakespeare was genius in conjunction with wide reading, and the best culture that the age could provide. "Genius," writes Mr. Edwards, "will do wonders with material once gathered, but genius does not provide or originate facts on which to work. No man ever became learned out of his own consciousness. The verdict of mankind, based on all experience, is that knowledge comes neither by inspiration nor accident, and that there is no royal or other than the common road to learning."....

"Mr. Colaridge," as Judge Webb writes, "has endowed the young man who came up from Strstford with a super-human genius, and undoubtedly, if we assume the young man to have been the author of the plays, we must grant him the possession of a genius which, making allowance for poetic licence, we may describe as superhuman. But, unfortunately, in the absence of evidence that the young man possessed a superhuman genius, we have no right to assume that he was the author of the plays, and most assuredly he had given no signs of the possession of a superhuman genius while he remained at Strstford. Enthusiasts more ultrafidian than Mr. Coleridge have carried the theory of superhuman genius into a theory of actual inspiration. Admitting his humble origin, his defective education, his mean employments, and his want of all opportunities of culture, they have venerated him as a miraculous birth of time, to whom the whole world of being was revealed by a sort of apocalyptic vision, and who was endowed with the gift of tongues by a species of Pentecostal fire. This is Shakesperiolatry run mad.

When we venerate Shakespeare, we venerate him not as a miracle, but as a man; and the ordinary laws of nature are not suspended in the case of extraordinary men. It is here that the difficulty of the Shakespearean lies. Though poetry, as Bacon says, is a plant that cometh of the lust of the earth, the intuitions of genius cannot supply a knowledge of material facts.

To the same effect Dr. Eliza: "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 either by experience or must be imparted by others. Dr. Johnson very correctly observes that 'Shakespeare, however favoured by nature, could impart only what he had learned.'" The writer then goes on to speak of Shakespeare's extraordinary knowledge of certain "positive facts respecting Italy", to which I will refer later on.

Sir Theodore Martin, in order, I suppose, to assist those poor people to whom the ways of genius are a stumbling-block, cites certain cases which he appears to consider analogous to that of Shakespeare. "Kindred manifestations of genius in man as lowly born, and as little favoured in point of education as he, of which biographical records furnish countless instances." Among these he names "Leonardo da Vinci, the illegitimate son of a common notary; Marlowe, the son of a shoemaker; Ben Jonson, posthumous son of a clergyman, but brought up by a bricklayer stepfather; Burns, the son of a small farmer; Keats, an apothecary's apprentice, and the son of a livery-stable keeper."

This really seems to me to display an ignoratio elanchi much greater

than that of Dr. Johnson when he kicked a large stone in order to refute Berkeley. It shows, in my humble judgment, that the writer had not the faintest conception of the real difficulties of the problem which he affects to decide in such a light and airy manner. Let us briefly consider the examples which he would have us look upon as "kindred manifestations". We will take Marlowe first. "Marlowe, the son of a shoemaker," says Sir Theodore, as though that were quite sufficient to make the case analogous to that of Shakespeare. Yes, Marlowe's father was, certainly, a member of the Shoemakers' and Tanners' Guild of Canterbury. He was also clerk of St. Mary's, and married the daughter of the rector of St. Peter's. His son Christopher, the poet, was educated at the famous King's School, of Canterbury, where he gained an Exhibition. Thence he proceeded to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1583, and M.A. in 1587. He studied the classics with enthusiasm, and, amongst other things, it may be mentioned that he translated Ovid's Amores into English heroic verse, though the translation was not published till after his death. Would Sir Theodore, who is so familiar with the ways of genius, really have us think - does he himself think - that there is an analogy between this case and that of Shakespeare, if Shakespeare and Shakespeare are to be looked upon as identical? Where is the difficulty in reconciling Marlowe's works with his birth and education? There is, of course, none whatever.

Next take the case of Ben Jonson. On this I need not expatiate, because we have already considered his education at the best school that existed in England in his time, where he became, moreover, the special protégé of the great and learned Camden. "During the years he spent at Westminster," wrote John Addington Symonds, "we must imagine him absorbing all the new learning of the Greeks and Romans which England had derived from Italian humanism, drinking in knowledge at every sense, and, after books were cast aside, indulging his leisure in studying the humours of the town which lay around him. . . This raw observant boy, his head crammed with Tacitus and Livy, Aristophanes and Thucydides, sallied forth from the class-room, when the hours of study were over, into the slums of suburban London, lounged around the water-stairs of the Thames, threaded the purlieus of Cheap and Smithfield, and drank with prentices and boxed with porters, learned the slang of the streets, and picked up insensibly that inexhaustible repertory of contemporary manners which makes his comedies our most prolific source of information on the life of London in the sixteenth century." Thus Westminster and London made him what he was, but it may be added that he "finished his education," by the military service which he saw and the experience which he gained in the Low Countries.

Here, again, where does the analogy come in? Sir Theodore would seem to find it in the fact that Jonson's mother married a master mason or bricklayer. Never was greater nonsense. Jonson's stepfather did his duty well by the poet that was to be, for "he put his little stepson Benjamin to school, providing for the first stage of a training which was destined to produce one of the wisest scholars and most learned poets whom English annals can boast." As to the stories of his working with a trowel in one hand and a Horace in the other, they are mere inventions. Mr. Symonds dismisses them with contempt. No; everything is plain in Jonson's case, as in Marlowe's. Jonson had just the kind of education and training which was calculated to give his genius the power to produce those fruits which it did produce. Sir Theodore must try again.

Take, then, the case of Burns, "the son of a small farmer." Here

is, indeed, an instructive comparison for our purpose. It will not much assist Sir Theodore, but none could be better to illustrate the argument. If ever man was born with poetic genius it was the Ayrshire ploughman, and scanty enough was the schooling he received. Happily, however, he was born in a land where there has long been an enthusiasm for education which the Southron would do well to imitate. So the young Burns was taught by his father, and taught at the Dalrymple parish school. Then he was handed over to John Murdoch, who gave him some training both in English and French. We hear of his reading, while still a boy, the *Life of Hannibal* and the *Life of Wallace*, Locke's famous *Essay*, Pope's *Homer*, the *Spectator*, Smollett, Allan Ramsay, Ferguson, and other works. In French he reads *Telemaque*, and picks up a little Latin. A little later he reads Thomson, Shenstone, *Tristram Shandy*, the *Man of Feeling*, Ossian, etc., and he studies surveying under the schoolmaster of Kirkoswald. Not a very great literary equipment certainly, but he is fortunate in his inheritance of a traditional lyric literature, which he makes the material of his immortal songs. And what was the poetic output? There is the point. 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 and brises 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. "He is only insipid when he tries to adopt the conventional English of his time," says a writer in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. When he essayed to write in metropolitan English, says Principal Shairp, "he was seldom more than a third-rate - common, clever versifier." 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 lifelike manner with foreign countries as to lead readers to suppose that he must have paid a visit to their shores; had he discussed divine philosophies 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.

"But in the case of Robert Burns, this heaven-born genius did not set him straightway on so lofty a pinnacle that he could circumspect the past and forecast the future, or guide his untaught pen to write of Troy and Egypt, of Athens and Cyprus, or to reproduce the very counterfeit civilizations and manners of nations born and buried and passed into history a thousand years before he had been begotten ... of the most unusual and hidden details of forgotten politics and commercial customs, such as, for instance, the exceptional usage of a certain trade in Mitylene, the anomalous status of a Moorish mercenary in command of a Venetian army, of a savage queen of Britain led captive by Rome, or a thane of Scotland under one of its primitive kings, - matters of curious and occult research for antiquaries or dilettanti to dig out of old romances or treatises or statues, rather than for historians to trestle or of schools to teach! In the case of Robert Burns we are content not to ask too much even of genius. Let us be content if the genius of Robert Burns could glorify the goodwives' fables of his wonted fireside and set in aureole the homeliest cipher of his vicinage, until a field-mouse became a poem or a milkmaid a Venus!

It were unreasonable to demand that this genius, this fire from heaven, at once and on the instant invest a letterless peasant-lad with all the love and law which the ages behind him had shut up in clasped books and buried and forgotten, - with all the learning that the past had gathered into great tomes and piled away in libraries." And yet Shakespeare who did all this might with greater truth than Burns be described as a letterless peasant-lad - that is, if Shakspeare be Shakespeare!

What, then, of John Keats, whom Sir Theodore, in order to belittle his origin as much as possible, describes as an apothecary's apprentice and the son of a livery-stable keeper? Well, it is true that his father did keep a livery-stable, but both his parents are known to have been, as they were described by one who knew them, "people of no everyday character." At the age of eight John Keats was put to a school of excellent repute kept by John Clarke at Enfield, where he secured the friendship of the master's son, John Cowden Clarke, not unknown to fame, who was usher in the school. After three or four years we learn that the boy Keats could hardly be torn from his books, that he won all the literature prizes at the school; and that during play hours he devoured all he could lay hands on of literary criticism and especially of classical mythology. He received a good education in Latin, French, and general history. He studied English literature, and especially the Elizabethan dramatists and poets under the excellent direction of John Cowden Clarke. He became intimate with many men of letters, he made the acquaintance of Shelley, he became the close friend of Leigh Hunt. He was, it is true, for a time apprenticed to a surgeon, whom Sir Theodore Martin, for obvious reasons, prefers to call an apothecary, but unless we are to conclude that that fact constitutes an insuperable bar to poetic inspiration it is difficult to perceive its relevancy. It is true, also, that though he had not learned the Greek language, his genius enabled him to absorb the true Greek spirit from books about the old Hellenes, and from translations of their works such as Chapman's Homer. But to compare this possibility of genius with Shakespearean achievements (again supposing that Shakspeare = Shakespaare) would be about as sensible as to compare a conjuring trick with a miracle.

One great name still remains to be considered. It is the name of one who may, indeed, be fitly compared with Shakespaare, for, if we are to believe Mr. Sidney Colvin<sup>1</sup>, he was "the man whose genius has the best right to be called universal of any that have ever lived" - one to whom a recent biographer has deservedly applied Coleridge's description of Shakespeare - "the myriad-minded man". Sir Theodore Martin, still pursuing his depreciatory tactics, calls him "the illegitimate son of a common notary." Well, Leonardo da Vinci was certainly not born in wedlock, but unless Sir Theodore, who is so familiar with "the ways of genius", can assure us that great intellectual powers are never to be found in association with "the bend sinister", he has obtruded the epithet to no purpose. Leonardo's father, the so-called "common notary", was notary to the Signory of Florence, a landed proprietor, a man in excellent circumstances, and no mean position of life. The son, to whom our perverse and pernicious conventions would

<sup>1</sup> Morgan's Shakespearian Myth, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> In the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

affix the stigma of "illegitimacy", was at once acknowledged, and was brought up in his father's house. 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 beetles 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 patience 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, Pleyer Shakspeare, the easy-going, jovial boon-companion, writing currante 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? No analogy at all, but a sharp and most instructive contrast for which our thanks are due to Sir Theodore Martin. No, truly, we may ransack history where we will, from the dawn of civilisation to the present time, in the vain search for a parallel, but no parallel can be found. Sir Theodore Martin's supposed analogies prove upon examination merely to illustrate and enforce our argument, and to bring into stronger light the obstinate prejudice of those blind leaders of the blind who can deride counsel by such futilities. Even the case of Charles Dickens has been cited as affording some analogy to that of the supposed Shakspeare-Shakespeare, because, forsooth, Dickens during his boyhood was for a time employed at a blacking factory! The unhappy writer, who, of course, lectured us on our want of imagination and our utter inability to comprehend "the ways of genius", forgot that it was just those experiences of childhood and boyhood which supplied to the genius of Dickens the very pebulum upon which it thrived, and which enabled him to create and immortalise the characters of Oliver Twist and David Copperfield. Thus this critic actually cites those very circumstances which genius was able to use to its advantage, in order to impress upon us the marvellous results which genius may produce though working under every possible disadvantage! He points to the tools which genius has used for its work in order to fortify his contention that genius may produce the most stupendous of works with no tools at all! If this be wisdom, I can only say Malo cum Bacono errare!

<sup>1</sup> Verrocchio was a woodcarver and musician as well.

In addition to such professional and comprehensive anti-Stratfordian scholars as Greenwood, Looney, the Ogburns and the Millers, hundreds of distinguished men and women of letters have rejected - some of the most prominent listed in Column "A" - or seriously doubted - some of the most prominent in Column "B" - the Stratfordian attribution.

# "A"

Hamilton Basso (novelist, reviewed  
5 Stratfordian biographies in  
The New Yorker 4/18/50)  
Dartmouth Prof. Louis P. Benezet  
Richard Bentley (Pres. Chicago Ber  
Assn. and Ed. of American Bar  
Assn. Journal)  
Tom Bethel (syndicated columnist)  
U.S. Supreme Court Justice Harry  
M. Blackmun  
John Bright (Lord Rector of U. of  
Glasgow)  
John Buchan (novelist, historian  
& Chancellor of Edinburgh U.)  
Otto von Biemarck  
Charles Champlin (Arts Ed. of  
L.A. Times)  
Charles Cheplin  
Benjamin Disraeli  
Senator Paul Douglas (also Chicago  
U. Prof.)  
Daphne DuMaurier  
Cyrus Durgin (Drama critic of  
Boston Globe)  
Harvard Professor William Y.  
Elliott  
Clifton Fadiman  
Temple U. Prof. Bronson Feldman  
Sigmund Freud  
Daniel Frohman (famed producer of  
plays & theater historian)  
W.H. Furness (literary scholar and  
father of Ed. of the Variorum)  
John Galsworthy  
Charles DeCaulle  
Ecole de Hautes Etudes Prof. Louis  
J. Halle  
Leslie Howard

Henry James  
James Joyce  
David Lloyd Kreeger  
Helen Keller  
Louis Lapham (Ed. Harper's)  
College de France Prof. Abel LeFranc  
(one of 40 members of Academie  
des Incriptions et Belles  
Lettres)  
Harvard Law Prof. W. Barton Leach  
Clare Booth Luca  
Malcolm X  
David McCullough (prize winning  
historian)  
Vladimir Nabokov (also Prof. at both  
Wellesley College & Cornell U.)  
Paul Nitze  
Lord Palmerston  
Maxwell Parkins (eminent literary  
editor)  
Yale Prof. William Lyons Phelps  
U.S. Supreme Court Justice Lewis  
F. Powell  
Canon Gerald H. Rendall (Litt D.)  
Dr. Peter Sammartino (Founder &  
First Free. Ferleigh Dickinson U.)  
Lincoln Schuster (of Simon &  
Schuster)  
Joseph Sobran (syndicated columnist)  
Muriel Spark  
Day Thorpe (Literary ed.  
Washington Star)  
Mark Twain  
Philip Weld (Publisher Int'l N.Y.  
Herald Tribune)  
Orson Welles  
Walt Whitman  
John Creanleaf Whittier

# "B"

Harvard Prof. Crana Brinton  
Samuel Taylor Coleridge  
Charles Dickens  
Ralph Waldo Emerson  
Tyronne Guthrie  
Thomas Hardy

Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes  
N.Y.U. Prof. Sidney Hook  
James Russell Lowell  
U.S. Supreme Court Justice John Paul  
Stevens  
Oxford Prof. Hugh Trevor-Roper



CERTAIN EUROPEAN RESEARCHES INTO SHAKESPEARE'S  
FRENCH AND ITALIAN CONNECTIONS

by W. Ron Hess

In the 1910s, Abel Lefranc, a Belgian who was Professor at the College de France, researched Shakespeare's plays with reference to France and Italy. He published his findings in Sous le Masque de William Shakespeare (Payot & Cie, Paris, 1919). Lefranc's protegee, Georges Lambin, added to those findings in his own book Voyages de Shakespeare en France et en Italie (Librairie E. Droz, Geneva, 1962). I believe that Oxfordians who read French would profit from Lambin's work (Ruth Miller has a photocopy which she may be able to make available). Because I do not read French, I'm greatly indebted to SOS member Tal Wilson (of Bodega Bay, CA) for providing me with a copy of his perannal translation.

I am writing this article not only to introduce Oxfordians to Lambin's work, but also to score a novel point on behalf of the 17th Earl of Oxford in dating The Tempest early enough for Oxford to have contributed to or even authored it. For, as we will see, Lambin concluded that the best candidate for author of Shakespeare's works was Oxford's son-in-law, the 6th Earl of Derby. However, I believe that Tempest is an excellent example of how Oxford can fit as author just as well as his son-in-law, if not better. Even so, it may be necessary to concede that for inspiration Oxford depended on Derby's travel stories and observations, in addition to his own. Was that collaboration?

Lambin focused on five comedies: All's Well That Ends Well, Measure for Measure, The Tempest, Love's Labour's Lost, and Two Gentlemen From Verona, but he spills over into other plays such as Romeo and Juliet and A Midsummer Night's Dream. Lambin operated from a model he constructed that assumes these plays derive elements from rivalries, historic personalities, and events from the French civil wars of the period 1559 to 1598. As part of this model, he believed that Shakespeare derisively satirized the ruthless faction called the Catholic League (or Holy League) which was led by the pro-Spanish de Guise family and the even more ruthless dowager Queen, Catherine de Medici. France in Shakespeare's lifetime must have rivaled the English War of the Roses as meat for inspiration, and satirizations placed in a foreign land were much safer than those placed at home. Using the description of Richard Roe at last Fall's conference, young Shakespeare viewing France during the civil wars would have confronted "the delicate and volatile state of affairs between England and France, between Catholic and Protestant, between Guise and Valois, between Valois and Bourbon....Quite apart from the political intrigues, the romantic intrigues were in a tangle that made those in England seem sophomoric." One can see that the impression on a young Shakespeare must have been profound.

Lambin's model includes extremely credible historic partial analogies for many persons, places, and events in the plays mentioned. I was most struck by his discussions of analogies in Tempest. Virtually every character of Tempest, even characters not in the play but which are merely referred to, are supportive of Lambin's model. I briefly list extracts (and my own paraphrasings) of Lambin's far-ranging discussions.

Lambin believed that Tempest's Prospero was analogous to Francesco-Maria di Medici, the second Grand Duke of Tuscany, who ruled from 1574 to 1587. Francesco was allied to Philip II of Spain and to the Catholic League in France, and thus the "duke of Florence" referred to in All's Well would have been analogous to him too. Lambin pointed out that the Pope, upon conferring the title of Grand Duke to Francesco's father in 1568, gave him ascendancy over the surrounding Italian princea (so, Prospero could say about his ducal realm, "...at that time Through all the signories it was the first, And Prospero the prime duke").

Lambin noted that, like Prospero, Duke Francesco was intrigued by magical arts and neglected his duties, turning administration over to ministers and favorites while he spent his time living in his alchemist's laboratory. Lambin believed that Ariel's song "Full fathom five" mirrors the decorations on the walls and ceilings of Francesco's actual laboratory. He pointed out that Francesco's villas at Pratolino and Poggio had magical gardens with jets of water, aeolian harps suspended from tree branches, and were known for sweet fragrances (as in Tempest's "sounds and sweet airs, that give delight, and hurt not"). There were wild animal preserves, with an islet in the midst of an artificial lake, where Duke Francesco cultivated rare and exotic plants.

Only in our 20th century, Lambin pointed out, have Florentine archives produced a collection of Francesco's poems, revealing that he was "melancholy and taciturn" and "troubled by the idea of impending death:

'Futile to strive, a day, nay a brief hour  
Is our life's span, Existence  
Pushes the entire world toward the abyss.'

Lambin contrasted these lines with Prospero's "We are such stuff As dreams are made on, and our little life is rounded with a sleep." He cited more lines of Duke Francesco's, finding that many have striking correspondence to lines in Tempest, and concluded: "As to knowing where the English author could have learned of the unedited madrigals of this Italian prince and poet to enrich his Prospero, I estimate that it must have been in Florence itself."

Very intriguing were correspondences Lambin found between Sycorax the witch, referred to in Tempest, and Francesco's allegedly evil mistress Bianca Cappello. Lambin noted that Sycorax had been exiled from Algiers as had Bianca when banished from Venice under penalty of death. Lambin stated, "At each stage of her rapid rise, brutal deaths favored Bianca....In spite of the innocent splendor of her perfect face and the glowing gold of her hair...the Florentines hated this 'blue-eyed hag'" (Prospero described Sycorax as a "blear-eyed hag"). Lambin referred to sources which claim Bianca had her own laboratory where she practiced sorcery, concocted poisons, "gorged on newborns, and distilled from cadavers her 'beauty creams.'"

Lambin provided analogies for Stephano (the butler, who was an analog for Philip II of Spain), Trinculo (a fool analogous to the Duc de Mayenne, an ally of Philip II in France), and Caliban (the monster analogous to Antonio, Francesco's illegitimate son by Bianca, who was Legate in Italy for the King of Spain). Lambin then pointed out that Stephano announced to Caliban in Tempest, "Trinculo and thyself shall be viceroys." Another intriguing finding of Lambin was that Antonio, Prospero's usurping brother, was analogous to Francesco's brother, Cardinal Ferdinando. Lambin claims Ferdinando was present at Francesco's villa in Poggio when Francesco and Bianca died of "inexplicable afflictions" in 1587. Ferdinando then mounted

the Ducal throne "without opposition", obtained relief from his vows, and begat a son, Cosimo II. Lambin thought this explained Tempest's puzzling lapse in stating "...the Duke of Milan And his brave son."

Lambin argued that Tempest's Ferdinand was analogous to Henri de Bourbon, King of Navarre, leader of the Protestant-Huguenots, who in 1589 became Henri IV of France. He theorized that Ferdinand's betrothal to Miranda in The Tempest mirrors Henri IV's marriage to Maria de Medici in 1600 in Florence. Then at age 27, Marie had been orphaned on the death of her father, Duke Francesco. Note that Lambin stated Oxford's son-in-law, the 6th Earl of Derby, travelled to Italy in 1582-85, 1591, and 1600, but he stopped short of placing Derby at the wedding in Florence.

The most convincing coincidence which Lambin found was the feast of Juno in Act IV, Scene i of The Tempest. As he noted:

"On October 6, 1600, following the marriage by proxy of Henri IV to Marie de Medicis at the Pitti Palace in Florence, there was a great banquet at which tables covered with sweets and confections appeared and disappeared mysteriously, as they do in The Tempest before the famished seafarers...Then from the two ends of the hall, came a cloud in which, at one end, there was a lady seated in a chariot drawn by peacocks, representing Juno; on the other side, in another chariot pulled by horses, was one representing Minerva, who when the two met, sang hymns of praise to the Queen. On Sunday, there was to be a superb drama....Aside from the substitution of Ceres for Minerva in the play, in the 'Masque of Juno', The Tempest follows this program: hymns sung by two goddesses praising the fiancées, then to conclude, a pastoral."

Lambin pointed out that Henri IV was murdered in 1610, having failed to bring full tolerance for Huguenots, thus fulfilling Ferdinand's prediction in Tempest, "The sun will set before I will discharge What I must strive to do." Lambin thought this regicide and date are very important in the dating of Tempest.

Having presented samples of what Lambin found in using his model, I believe it's possible others can use it to advantage too. For instance, a point I've found which Lambin overlooked, is that Henri IV was forced by political considerations on several occasions to switch between Protestant and Catholic. I believe this is reflected in Prospero's description of Ferdinand, "A goodly person: he hath lost his fellows, And strays about to find them.... he's a traitor...so possessed with guilt." Without the connection afforded by Lambin's model, scholars have puzzled over the harshness with which Prospero treated Ferdinand in Tempest.

Additionally, I think Lambin failed to adequately use his model when he theorized about the date of the writing of Tempest, and this has direct bearing on who was the author. Partly because of Ferdinand's sunset speech, Lambin theorized Tempest was written (some might say edited or revised) shortly after the regicide of King James I on All Saint's Day 1611. This dating would be difficult for Oxfordians, because Oxford died in 1604. Of course, Charlton Ogburn is not the only Oxfordian to propose Oxford's son-in-law (or some other) as editor and reviser of Shakespeare's works after Oxford's death.

But, do Oxfordians really have cause for concern over Lambin's dating? Again, through my application of Lambin's model, and taking this dating issue one step further than Lambin did, I'm convinced there really is no problem here for Oxfordians.

Looking in the Encyclopedia Britannica, I found that Maria de Medici

returned with Henri IV to France, became disenchanted with Henri's many love affairs (which earned him the nickname "le Vert-Galant", which I take to mean "the dirty old man"), and began to surround herself with ultra-Catholic, pro-Spanish forces. She assisted these elements in opposing Henri's anti-Spanish, anti-Hapsburg policies and his attempts to win tolerance for Protestants in France. When Henri was assassinated in 1610, Marie's mourning was punctuated by her declaring herself regent over 9-year-old Louis XIII. By 1617 she had started her first of several downs and ups of power, later to involve the Cardinal Richelieu, first her pawn, then her nemesis (remember The Three Musketeers?). Always, Marie de Medici maneuvered against tolerance for Protestants and for her own power.

At first I found it hard to believe that Shakespeare in 1610-11 could have based the sweet Miranda of The Tempest on this Machiavellian harpy! However, if Shakespeare's basis was actually made around or shortly after 1600, before Marie's opposition to Henri IV's policies of tolerance had made itself widely known, it would be much more understandable that Marie would have been Shakespeare's Miranda. At that earlier time, Henri's marriage with Marie looked like an idyllic uniting of Protestant with Catholic to restore peace in France and Europe. Therefore, Lambin's model leads me to conclude that the basic plot layout and particularly the character of Miranda was conceived much earlier than 1610. Of the lines in Tempest, I believe that all but a few later modifications (such as insertion of Ferdinand's sunset line) had been completed shortly after 1600, when Marie's true nature was still obscure. This would have provided ample time for Oxford to participate in developing and/or authoring the original characters and plot of Tempest.

In conclusion, what are the ultimate ramifications of what Lambin has presented? He has clearly showed that The Tempest was not a straightforward tale of magic, intended to be presented before the common mob at the Globe Theater. It was certainly a meticulously deliberate comedy in which only the highest level of French and Italian society (and the few in English society who were familiar with the two) would recognize the jokes about French and Italian nobles. Although it is possible that Shakespeare might write gloomy sonnets for his private purgation, it is inconceivable to me that he could write The Tempest's jokes and jibes for his private entertainment alone, or for those incapable of understanding them. Shakespeare would have wanted to be present (like Hamlet observing the King's reaction at a play), to watch and listen for the dawning of recognition and laughter at the subtleties of his farce by his circle of urbane nobility. And, only an audience familiar with the French and Italian courts would be capable of that type of recognition.

As such, Lambin's model clearly leaves no room for the likes of Shakespeare, Marlowe, or Jonson, whose access to French and Italian courtly affairs must have been meager at best. However, it leaves plenty of room for claimants such as Oxford and Derby, whose access was indisputable.

Finally, Lambin gave us glimpses of two dynamics of Shakespeare with regard to The Tempest. The first dynamic was of one who conceived the plot and early scoring, which I've argued was accomplished shortly after 1600. The second was of one who revised, edited, and produced the play between 1610 and 1611. Lambin believed that the two dynamics were the same man, namely Oxford's son-in-law, Derby (and indeed, since Derby lived from 1561 to 1642, he may have collaborated in both dynamics). But, as I have tried to show, the first dynamic, the true genius of Shakespeare, could well have involved or have been Oxford.

## Two Giants of the Theater Speak Out

### WHO'S THE BARD?

(Letters from the People, St. Louis Post Dispatch 7/12/93)

Now that the great Shakespearean actor Sir John Gielgud has joined scholars and researchers in recognizing Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, as the true author of the canon, scholars worldwide are finding their work of a lifetime enhanced and many puzzling questions answered.

The delight of audiences now is to identify the dashing earl as he included characters based on himself in his plays (as of course all authors do). He is, as we now recognize, the witty "Benedick" to Queen Elizabeth's "Beatrice", but the main thrust of the play is the very real Jesuit plot. In it, Elizabeth's cousin, Henry Howard (the wicked "Don John") along with the earl of Arundel plotted to land Spanish and French forces on English soil, murder Elizabeth and seize the throne. Oxford exposed the plot to Elizabeth but was clapped into the Tower of London along with the conspirators.

Oxford used this "hero" part of the play as a metaphor for the situation in which false accusations were brought against him and where he was at first not believed but in the end exonerated and set free.

Theater patrons of the day would immediately have recognized the references to real-life people. Audiences demanded that their entertainment be witty, political satire. Now it is exciting to learn that these plays were part of the mainstream, and that they performed the same function as all other great literature in effecting social and political change.

Mildred B. Sexton,  
Chairman of the St. Louis Chapter  
Shakespeare Oxford Society  
Creve Coeur

### "spats with academics"

In her article in the Cleveland Plain Dealer (6/13/93) of an interview with Kenneth Branagh, the English actor and director, in New York on the day of his "Much Ado About Nothing" opened there, film critic Joanna Connors reported that he declared:

"I've often gotten into quite heated spats with academics," Branagh said, shaking his head. "I mean, if there is a more arrogant and bitchy world than the world of academia, you know, when it comes to Shakespeare, I've yet to come across it. They're very proprietary. But often they miss the fact that it is being presented in a different medium, and therefore there is, I am certain, a license to be taken. They resent or resist this enlivening of it."

While on the Johnny Carson television show talking about Shakespeare's "Henry V", Kenneth Branagh pointed out that many people believe that Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford, was the actual author.

## A New Yorker Reviewer Suggests a 'Closet Lord'

by Richard F. Whalen

Reports of Oxford's authorship have been turning up in literary publications ranging from a footnote in a book on rhetoric to a German magazine to a book review in the New Yorker magazine.

Wilfrid Sheed, a novelist and essayist, used a book review in the July 12 New Yorker to ask whether a lord might have written Shakespeare's works, although he never mentions Oxford by name. In his lengthy review of Shylock by John Gross, Sheed discusses "the twin mysteries of Shylock and Shakespeare, the opaque character and the impenetrable author, a whodunnit coupled with a whowroteit."

"If we even knew for sure that he was Shakespeare," Sheed writes, "the industry named after him would lose hundreds of jobs overnight. Was he in fact an outsider guessing what it was like to be a lord, or was he a closet lord who could summon up at will every slight he'd ever received or dreamed about and who knew from that what it felt like to be Iago or Black or Jewish or even hunchbacked?"

"An Englishman who manages to conceal his social class for four centuries has certainly earned the right to think of himself as a magician, but it's pertinent to John Gross's book to note that it was probably easier to work this trick in late-Tudor and early-Stuart England than at any time before or since.... It was a great time to be a con man or a playwright, and it's surely no accident that Christopher Marlowe, Ben Jonson, and Shakespeare constitute, in their different ways, three of the shadiest characters in the whole of literature."

Sheed then suggests that if we knew more about Shakespeare we'd know more about Shylock and be "spared the zany array of interpretations that make Gross's book so entertaining and cautionary." Shylock the book does not raise the authorship issue, so Sheed the reviewer appears to be well informed on the strength of the case for the 17th Earl of Oxford as the true author of Shakespeare's works. In his review, he takes no firm position. In fact, he suggests that since Will Shakspeare appeared to be a bit of a loan shark himself, he could appreciate how Shylock felt.

Charlton Ogburn has received word that Merkur, a major German literary magazine, published a long article on Oxford as the true author in its June issue. The article's author said he based much of it on the British edition of Ogburn's The Mysterious William Shakespeare: The Myth and the Reality, which he calls "an admirable book." He also said that a German publisher has commissioned a book on the authorship question.

The writer, Walter Klier of Innsbruck, told Ogburn that he was searching some records to see if he could find references to Oxford during his trip on the continent.

Reports about Oxford as Shakespeare range from major articles to obscure footnotes. As reported in this newsletter (Spring 1993) by C. Wayne Shore, The Art of Persuasion by Bridges and Rickenbacker includes one sentence in footnote No. 9 for Chapter 3. The footnote gives the reference for a passage quoted from Richard II as act 2 scene 1. The authors then add that they were persuaded by Ogburn's book that "the works attributed to the bumpkin 'Shakspeare' were from the hand of Edward de Vere." Nowhere else in the handbook on rhetoric is the authorship issue mentioned. The authors apparently wanted to go on record about their conviction, which has nothing to do with their book, and chose the lowly footnote reference to Shakespeare as the place to do so.

THE PIQUANT GENEALOGY OF SIR JOHN FALSTAFF?  
by Charlton Ogburn

Frank Dolen, of Ridgefield, Connecticut, an inquisitive and ingenious member of our Society, has put together two pieces of information from widely diverse sources to provocative and perhaps significant effect.

From A Life of William Shakespeare by Joseph Quincy Adams, Supervisor of Research at the Folger Shakespeare Library when the book was published in 1923, Mr. Dolen has culled the following:

"Shakespeare's gratification at the success of I and II Henry IV ... was marred by an unlucky accident. The name he originally gave to Falstaff was Sir John Oldcastle, taken directly from The Famous Victories [almost without a doubt an early play of Shakespeare/Oxford's]. There it had provoked no comment. But the extraordinary notoriety of the character as portrayed by Shakespeare seems to have led to resentment on the part of Henry Brooke, Lord Cobham, a lineal descendant of Sir John Oldcastle. Lord Cobham, we may suppose, made complaint" and "Shakespeare agreed to change the name of his comic hero. Casting about in his mind to find a new name, he stumbled [sic] upon Sir John Fastolfe, who figured as a coward in I Henry IV, a play he was then engaged in refurbishing [having, of course, written it himself to begin with]:

Here had the conquest fully been seal'd up  
If Sir John Fastolfe had not play'd the coward...."

Adams goes on to explain how the original name tended to remain fixed in the public's mind. "Thereupon, it would seem, Lord Cobham, or his friends, induced the Admiral's Company to produce a long, two-part play narrating to the people the 'true life' and martyrdom of the real Sir John Oldcastle. The task of composing the work was put into the hands of some of the best and most experienced dramatists," one being Anthony Munday, Oxford's secretary.

Mr. Dolen then moves to an obscure work entitled Shakespeareana Genealogica, by George Russell French, published by Macmillan in London and Cambridge in 1869 which explores the descent both of "the dramatis personae in Shakspeare's historial plays" and of "the Shakspeare and Arden families." In the section he sent us on Sir John Fastolfe, we learn that the knight, who lived from 1380 to 1459, performed heroic services for his country on the field of battle, notably with Henry V at Harfleur, the one "blot on his escutcheon" occurring during a defeat of the English by Joan of Arc when, as French observes, "'a Captain' asks [in Henry VI, Part 1]—

Whither away, Sir John Fastolfe, in such haste?  
Fastolfe: Whither away? to save myself by flight."

We read further that Sir John "endowed Magdalene College, Oxford, with the manor of Caldicot, co. Suffolk, and the tenement called the 'Boar's Head' in Southwark...; and the name of 'Edmund Fastolfe' appears on the roll of Agincourt, as a lance in the train of the Earl of Oxford."

"Maybe," Mr. Dolen remarks, "Shakespeare 'stumbled' across Fastolfe-Falstaff while browsing amongst the family records. I wonder if Fastolfe-Falstaff spent his leaves from the army eating and drinking in the bar at the Boar's Head in Southwark!"

## "Does it Matter?"

In his laudatory review of The Mysterious William Shakespeare: The Myth and the Reality by Charlton Ogburn (Virginia Lawyer, July 1993) John Edwards Harrison answers a customary question:

The book is really a 900-page detective story told by...Charlton Ogburn (who) has devoted himself since 1977 to ferreting out the truth...about who wrote some of the most famous works of the English language.

Does it matter? One could just as easily inquire if it matters who Jack the Ripper was, or 'what did President Nixon know and when did he know it?' If it is true that Shakespeare [i.e. Shakspeare] did not write all that has been attributed to him, then this is the biggest literary hoax in history. Every recent book on the Bard now asks the question, 'Who actually did the writing?' (This book) most authoritatively answers that question.

\* \* \* \* \*

## 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. Thus, a "trussell" is a penny-mold. Oxford's father, John de Vere, 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.

\* \* \* \* \*

## "IT IS PROBABLE..."

To the Encyclopedia Britannica:

The respective works of the immortal authors included in GREAT BOOKS OF THE WESTERN WORLD are in each instance preceded by a biography. Although brief, it must be assumed to represent the best scholarship then available. Unlike, however, a number of greats who died long before Shakespeare lived (such as Dante and Chaucer) and others who were his contemporaries (such as Montaigne and Cervantes) the biography for Shakespeare, excluding such statistics as birth, death, marriage, parents, children, and real estate acquisitions, contains only conjectures in 40 sentences with these phrases:

"it is probable"

"may have combined"

"according to one story"

"according to stage tradition"

"said to owe"

"apparently"

"may have been"

"seems to have been"

"presumably obtained"

"seems to have come"

"seems to have been"

"said to have"

"did not imply"

"it is likely"

"appears to have dealt"

"it seems likely"

"one tradition asserts"

"there are stories"

"appears to have been"

"seems to have returned"

"seems to have written"

Dear Mr. Johnson:

We do not think it unscholarly to use qualifying or tentative phrasing if the topic merits tentativeness, and we have no reason to assume that readers have found such a presentation troubling. As noted in The Cambridge History of English Literature (volume 5, page 166):

"No biography of Shakespeare, therefore, which deserves any confidence, has ever been constructed without a large infusion of the tell-tale words 'apparently', 'probably', 'there can be little doubt'; and no small infusion of the still more tell-tale 'perhaps', 'it would be natural', 'according to what was usual at the time' and so forth."

Lars Mahinske  
Editorial Assistant

\* \* \* \* \*

To Shakespeara Oxford Society Trustees and Members:

After our invigorating meeting with the Shakespeare Association of America (SAA) in Atlanta last April I've been wondering how to deal with their studious avoidance of our questions. They will not listen. Yet they are the gateway to all the college English Departments in the country. Joining the SAA is one vital step in influencing them but another might be to petition them. I wanted to circulate this idea around and get some reactions.

On the plus side this could be both a mobilizing political act and a useful tool in the public relations battle, where they have always enjoyed the High Ground. A petition published in papers and discussed as a news event has never been tried with this issue. The actual response of the SAA, even if they ignored it, is really secondary to the way it would embarrass them and empower us.

In numbers there is power. Once the core group of Oxfordians signed, we would have several hundred names, including many authors, jurists and scholars. Thousands more, including many other distinguished names, could follow.

I think a wide range of people, many of whom may not be avowed Oxfordians, would sign such a petition, which only seeks redress for an issue that involves academic freedom and intellectual honesty. All kinds of people will speak up for that.

Any comments? Let's see if this idea will work for presentation at the next SAA Convention in April '94. Below is a sample draft:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Shakespeare Association of America, in light of ongoing research, to actively engage in a comprehensive, objective and sustained investigation of the authorship of the Shakespeare Canon, particularly as it relates to the claim of Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford."

Charles Boyle  
208A Washington St.  
Somerville, MA 02143  
(617) 776-7782

## "Edmund Ironside"

In the June 1992 Newsletter, our esteemed Edith Duffey launched a corroborated hypothesis claiming that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, wrote the play "Edmund Ironside", including that Lawrence Nowell, Dean of Lichfield Cathedral, was a fine Latinist. His great love was Anglo-Saxon language and history. He owned several original chronicles and was an expert on Anglo-Saxon law. Oxford was 13 years old and Nowell recognized there was only a little Latin his pupil did not know. He therefore in all probability exposed some of those curious old chronicles with tales of heroes to Oxford.

Mrs. Duffey was later informed that Oxford's tutor had been a cousin of the Dean by the same name and exposed her alleged misstatement in the September 1992 Newsletter. Then, in the March 1993 Newsletter, Andrew Hannas confirmed that the tutor she originally identified was correct. Mrs. Duffey has now clarified the confusion:

"Thanks to Andrew Hannas for correcting my mistake as to which Lawrence Nowell was Oxford's tutor. Since the Spring Newsletter came out, however, I have received several queries, indicating continued confusion on the subject. Let me say quickly that Andrew Hannas was right, Oxford's tutor was NOT the Dean of Lichfield, as scholars have believed from the late 17th century to the present day. Oxford's tutor was the Dean's cousin, Lawrence Nowell of London who collected Anglo-Saxon chronicles and, together with John Lambarde, historian, and Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, spent much time studying them. Lambarde, who always gave his friends their titles when writing about them, never called this Nowell anything but "Mr. Noel my good friend." This Mr. Noel was a map-maker and we learned from his letter to Lord Burghley (1563), stating that he knew his services to Oxford would not much longer be needed, that he wanted to make maps of the wilderness in northern England.

It now seems rather absurd to imagine that the dean of any cathedral with all his pomp, ceremony and high offices, would yearn to tramp over rough, uncharted terrain making maps.

I am happy to suggest once again that Oxford's great love of English history may have begun under the tutelage of Mr. Noel of London.

Andrew Randall Barron has reaffirmed Oxford's authorship:

### An Ancient Echo a New Link?

Who wrote the play "Edmund Ironside"? Is it truly a lost play by William Shakespeare? Eric Sams, in his recent book, Shakespeare's Lost Play Edmund Ironside makes a good case for it. An outstanding case, in fact, in my opinion. Of course Sams is a convinced Stratfordian...

Now, is there anything to link Edward de Vere with "Edmund Ironside"? Maybe...

I read the play, carefully looking, as always, for the smoking gun. The definitive proof that would nail everything down. I couldn't find it. Which doesn't mean it isn't there.

What I did find was something minor. Something neither as deep as a well nor as wide as a church door. Still...

Could a smoking flower and an overcast sun be of interest? I guess it all depends on how you want to interpret things and how much weight you are ready to give to coincidence.

Let me put it this way. A common subject, or metaphor, or image maybe by itself doesn't prove anything. But what about two natural phenomena brought together in a special and unusual way to illustrate an observation about human nature. Would the common occurrence of that in Edward de Vere and in Shakespeare be of any importance? Make your own judgment.

First, "Edmund Ironside", Act 4, Scene 1...

"A sunshine day is quickly overcast.  
A springing bud is killed with a blast.  
I see my state is fickle and unsure  
There is nothing in this world can firmly dure."

I felt I had seen something similar in the early writings of Edward de Vere. But I didn't find it in the poems under his own name. Finally, then, I did find it. But in the volume title A Hundreth Sundrie Flowers. And this is it...

"I see no aight on earth, but it to Chaunge anclines:  
As little clouds oft overcast the brightest sunne that shines.  
No Flower is so fresh, but frost can it deface:  
No man so sure in an seate but he may leese his place."

The above appears on page 169 of Sundrie Flowers as reprinted by Ruth Loyd Miller and is signed Spreta tamen vivunt. That is obviously a pen name, a posy. For whom? Edward de Vere? Ruth Loyd Miller says it is, at least part of the time. Flowars was published in 1573, when de Vere was twenty-three years old.

I find it interesting because it is a simple, and yet complex unit of meaning. In each case you have the flower struck by frost and the sun covered by clouds, and these two examples in nature are then indicated as illustrations of the uncertainties in human status in society. What are the odds that two different writers would choose just those two examples and then draw the same conclusion from them? That is the question that needs to be addressed.

Of course, there is always the explanation that Shakespeare of Stratford "borrowed" it from de Vere. Which would again make our greatest writer something of a thief and plagiarist. Which he would have to be, were he William Shaksper to Stratford.

There are many common themes and images between the few known poems of Edward de Vere and Shakespeare. These have been masterfully pointed out by J. Thomas Looney and Ruth Loyd Miller.

This is one more. If you believe that Shakespeare wrote "Edmund Ironside" and that Spreta tamen vivunt was Edward de Vere. I would be interested in opinions and observations on the matter, editorial and from the readership.

---Randall Barron

"contradictory factual evidence is unearthed"

by Morse Johnson

In his article, "The Poacher Re-Visited" in The Shakespeare Newsletter (Spring 1993), Professor Frank W. Wadsworth reported that, "the years since (his 1958 publication of The Poacher from Stratford, A Partial Account of the Controversy Over the Authorship of Shakespeare's Plays) made me conscious of how little had changed and how frenetically alive the movement to disbar Shakespeare still is." In the Epilogue of The Poacher from Stratford Professor Wadsworth affirmed:

The reason we have for believing that William Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon [i.e., Will Shaksper] wrote the plays are the same reasons we have for believing any other historical event...We believe these things because, in the opinion of those best qualified to judge the historical evidence says they happened...That is why, until contradictory factual evidence is unearthed, there appears to be no valid reason to doubt the official records, the evidence of the title pages, the testimony of self-described friends and fellow writers, mean just what they appear to say - that William Shakespeare of Stratford was the author of the wonderful works that bear his name (underlining added).

From around 1588 to 1598 "William Shakespeare" had written at least 18 plays but there is no documentation thereof until 1598, for which Stratfordians have never provided a "valid reason" or even attempted to. Moreover, eleven of those plays were published, but not one of their title pages identified the author. If a publication carries no name, it is evidence that the author is anonymous. For what valid reason did "William Shakespeare" resort to anonymity as a playwright for approximately 10 years and how did he successfully accomplish it?

Charlton Ogburn added the following paragraph to the fourth printing of his The Mysterious William Shakespeare:

"The Elizabethans cannot have been oblivious to the qualities of the greatest of English writers that led John Dryden to call him 'divine', Carlyle 'the greatest of intellects' and Heinrich Heine 'a creator second only to God.' The first two publications adorned with the name "William Shakespeare", Venus and Adonis and Lucrece, were so popular that one printing after another was called for. Previously, writing of a play unmistakably Henry the Sixth, Part One, Thomas Nashe said that it had 'moved to tears... ten thousand spectators at least (at several times).' The first known mention of Shakespeare as a playwright declared him the best of the English for both comedy and tragedy and attested that 'The Muses would speak with Shakespeare's fine-filed phrase if they would speak English.' The most authoritative voice among these contemporaries proclaimed him the 'Soul of the age! The applause! delight! the wonder of our stage,' Britain's triumph who 'was not of an age but for all time' who 'so did take Eliza and our James' -- the latter having had seven of Shakespeare's plays presented in the aftermath of his coronation in 1604. Surely other writers, actors, university men, courtiers would have gone out of their way to make the acquaintance of such a man as Shakespeare was. How does it happen, then, that no one we know of reported during the years when he was alive ever to have met, seen or had any communication with a poet or dramatist named William Shakespeare and that the only three who ever wrote of knowing him did

so only years after his death, all in the First Folio, and then in ambivalent terms and without recalling a single personal detail about the immortal dramatist? Can there be any doubt that he was known under a different name, that the authorship was a dissimulated one and that "William Shakespeare" was a subterfuge?

In his "The Poacher Re-Visited", Professor Wadsworth, with his mind undoubtedly focused on anti-Stratfordians, posed this question:

Why is it, I wondered, that human beings seem so determined to reject any evidence which conflicts with what they want to believe?

Let me call to the Professor's attention that Oxfordians do not wonder why all of the hundreds of traditional biographies of Shakespeare in books and journals have rejected this anonymous epigram in Wits Recreation of 1640:

Shake-speare, we must be silent in our praise,  
'Cause our encomiums will but blast thy bays  
Which envy could not, that thou didst so well;  
Let thine own histories prove thy chronicle.

\* \* \* \* \*

**HELEN W. CYR  
(1926-1993)**

Helen W. Cyr, wife of the Shakespeare Oxford Society's former Executive Director, Gordon C. Cyr, and Secretary of the Society from 1973-1988, died suddenly at her Baltimore home on July 12, following a brave six-year battle with kidney failure, which she contracted in 1987.

Mrs. Cyr and her husband were appointed guardians of the Society by its late president, Richard C. Horne, Jr., who was in failing health. Following President Horne's death in 1976, they opened up the Society's governance to members, initiated annual conferences with guest lecturers and scholarly paper presentations, and established a friendly relationship with the Folger Library under the directorship of the late O.B. Hardison, Jr. Most of the conference arrangements were entirely handled by Mrs. Cyr, who for a long time combined the offices of secretary and treasurer.

Helen Cyr is author of two books on the Shakespearean authorship issue: Lexical Choices and Morphological Variables in the Shakespeare and Oxford Corpora (1983) and The Shakespeare Identity Crisis (1986), as well as many articles on word studies published in both the Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter and Louis Marder's Shakespeare Newsletter.

Mrs. Cyr brought to her Shakespeare/Oxford studies a scholarly rigor acquired at the University of California, Berkeley, where she received degrees in both music and librarianship. Following a career as teacher and librarian in Oakland, California, she was appointed in 1963 as Supervisor of Instructional Materials in the Oakland Public Schools. Upon her move to Baltimore in 1971, she became Head of the Audio-Visual Department of the Enoch Pratt Free Library. Mrs. Cyr is author of an important reference book, The Third World in Film and Video, the third edition of which was published in 1991. Upon her retirement in 1988, she became active with the Baltimore Film Forum, which presents the annual Baltimore International Film Forum. At the time of her passing, she was president of the Film Forum. This past year, despite her illness, she devoted much of her time to the Forum's 24th Independent Film and Video Makers Competition. The Forum's annual award to the best Maryland filmmaker is named the Helen Cyr Silver Reel Award.

FREEING SHAKESPEARE'S VOICE, The Actors Guide to Talking The Text  
by Kristin Linklater  
(Theater Communications Group, Inc, 355 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017, 1992)

Trustee Dom Saliani reports that Oxfordians should be made aware of FREEING SHAKESPEARE'S VOICE, and that the author does not reveal she was an Oxfordian until her last chapter. The following are a few excerpts from that chapter:

I cannot, in all conscience, end this book which trumpets so loudly and so often the word "Truth" without bowing my head and my knee in the direction of Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford. Whenever I say in public that I am 'an Oxfordian', I find myself either defensively jocular or in tears. Nothing in the Shakespeare establishment arouses so much ridicule and rancor as the suggestion that 'the man from Stratford' did not write the plays.... Converts to the Oxford theory are those who like to see the connection between a writer and his work. They not only are interested in knowing something about an author's life but find that the text is often clarified when the light of biographical detail is trained on obscure passages.

\* \* \* \* \*

GORDON C. CYR, former executive director of the Shakespeare Oxford Society (see elsewhere in this issue for the notice on the death of his wife, Helen W. Cyr), will hear the World Premiere of his Symphony No. 2 on April 14, 15 and 16, 1994 by the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra under the direction of David Zinman. Stephen Wigler, music reviewer for the Baltimore Sun, in his column of March 15, 1993 described Cyr's song cycle, From Whitman's "Drum-Taps" for baritone and chamber orchestra as "a powerful, passionate response to the powerful and passionate poems Whitman wrote in response to the horrors he experienced in the American Civil War." The reviewer further said that one of the songs was "an angry, haunted nocturne ... that challenged some of the best vocal settings of Britten or Shostakovich in its visceral, emotional power."

\* \* \* \* \*

#### IN MEMORIAM OF MARIE WILLIS

Since her condition had been diagnosed, our charming, brilliant and dedicated English Oxfordian, Marie Willis, was extremely courageous over the last months, but eventually died peacefully on August 6, 1993. She inspired and converted a large number of people over the years with her enthusiasm and wisdom about the Oxfordian attribution and will be sadly missed both in England and the United States.

## CHAIRMAN'S CORNER

As I contemplate the recent loss of dear and valued members of our Society, I realize the pressing need for those of us who are getting pretty far down the road to consider a bequest to the Society so as to ensure our continued participation and support after we have made our exits.

As new developments demand our Society's engagement in special projects and research, we find ourselves financially incapable of undertaking them. We are a volunteer society with only our dues to sustain us. We do not have a national headquarters office or a paid staff. We have done our best under the circumstances and we have accomplished a great deal.

But think what we could do if we had better financial means:

- Publishing and contributing Oxfordian books into schools and public libraries
- Establish a national office and archive
- Fund special research projects
- Scholarship assistance for young Oxfordians

All these and many more projects cry for action, and now is the time! But the financial means are not there. Your bequest could ultimately help to provide them.

You will be hearing more about bequests to the Society. And for those of you who may be in a position to offer present assistance to promising project opportunities, you will be hearing from us, too.

Trudy Atkins has been doing an outstanding job in booking speaking engagements for Lord Burford, but she needs the help of every Oxfordian in obtaining new venues for this fall, winter, next spring and into the fall and winter of 1994. As has been pointed out many times before, the general run of Academics are not going to open a can of worms voluntarily in the area of Shakespearean authorship.

So it is up to us - ALL OF US - to bear a hand. The Oxfordian message which Lord Burford is so successfully presenting to eager young minds across the country is by far the most important and successful project upon which your Society has ever embarked. We have accomplished so much, but there is so much more to do! Please, please! Give us a hand! And I don't mean applause. I mean, find us speaking engagements at your old schools, at your public libraries, at your civic, social, professional, or literary clubs. Just let Trudy know. She'll do the rest. But do it! Her address: 20 Forest Lake Circle, Greensboro, NC, 27407; phone: (919) 299-0419.

There may be some great transportation deals available now, so lock up your travel arrangements to Boston for the Annual Conference (Nov. 12 through 14) as early as possible to take advantage. Remember, conference activities run right through Sunday evening! Don't miss any of it!

See you in Boston!

Yea! Verily!  
Johnny Price, Chairman

Notice re By-Laws

The enclosed copies of revised By-Laws for the Society and original Charter and By-Laws for regional Chapters, all of which will be presented for confirmation on Saturday, Nov. 13, 1993 at the Annual Membership Meeting in the Omni Parker House Hotel, Boston, Mass. Their purpose is to keep the foundations of the Society flexible and compatible with future growth and strength. They were created by studying the best features of many successful non-profit organizations and, where applicable, adapting them for our own purposes. Read them carefully. If you have any suggestions, contact By-Laws Committee member, Richard Whalen: Avery Way, Box 1084, Truro, MA, 02666; (508) 349-2087.

Nota Bene: Members who wish to have a paper written at the Annual Meeting should mail a copy of that paper by Oct. 1, 1993 to Margaret Robson, 736 Waterway Dr., No. Palm Beach, Fla., 33408.

\* \* \* \* \*

**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.

**DUES**

Student \$15.00

Annual Regular \$35.00

Sustaining \$50 or more

**Dues and requests for membership information to:**

Shakespeare Oxford Society, First Bldg., 71 Spit Brook Rd., #107,  
Nashua, N.H., 03060. Tel. (603) 888-1453 - FAX. (603) 888-5411.

**Submit materials for publication in the Newsletter to:**

Morse Johnson, Suite #819, 105 W. 4th St., Cincinnati, OH 45202

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

# The Shakespeare Oxford Society

71 Spit Brook Rd., Ste. #107, Nashua, N.H. 03060

Morse Johnson, Editor

SUMMER 1993  
NEWSLETTER  
VOL. 29 NO. 3B



## A REALISTIC LOOK AT GROATS-WORTH OF WIT

by Winifred Frazer

Robert Greene's Groats-worth of Wit (1592), whether written by Greene or composed, as Warren Austin has deduced, by Henry Chettle, who admitted to having it printed, is crucial to the Stratfordian biography.<sup>1</sup> Ivor Brown (Shakespeare 1949), for example, greatly regretting the "gap" in Shakespeare's biography, welcomes Greene: "We have not a single documented fact about William Shakespeare between the baptism of his twins Hamnet and Judith at Stratford on February 2, 1585, and the publication of Robert Greene's Groats-worth of Wit in London in 1592." Brown fails to mention that the name "Shakespeare" does not appear in Groats-worth. Another biographer, A. L. Rowse (William Shakespeare 1964) welcomes Greene with even more warmth: "Suddenly, in September 1592, the obscurity in which we have been so long wandering, with Shakespeare, is illuminated by a flash of light: Robert Greene's attack on him." Without Greene, the Stratfordian is left with a long "gap" or "lost years", and no light to illuminate the "obscurity". J. Dover Wilson ("Malone and the Upstart Crow", Shakespeare Survey, 1951, VI, 61) is even more frank about the Stratfordian's dependence on Groats-worth and Chettle's Kind Hartes Dreame. "The bilious outburst of the one and the frank apology of the other give us our first glimpse of Shakespeare as a person; and almost our last, since we have nothing later about him so vividly focused. They are therefore biographically of capital importance."

Greene's Groats-worth is not, nor is Chettle's Kind Hartes Dreame, of "capital importance" to the biography of the Earl of Oxford, which stands with no "lost years" and with an abundance of documentation entirely without Groats-worth or Dreame.

I therefore suggest that Oxfordians look at Groats-worth as an Elizabethan might, with eyes unclouded by the convoluted speculations of the Stratfordians. Let us discover, no matter who wrote it, whether Groats-worth includes any references at all to Shakespeare or Shakspeare or the Earl of Oxford. Most of Groats-worth consists of an allegorical tale about a certain immoral Roberto, which seems to partly illustrate Robert Greene's own life and his ill-fated death — not accurately, however, according to Thomas Nashe, who called it "a scald trivial lying pamphlet", in which he, as a friend of Greene's, had no part. In an epilogue to the thirty-six page story of Roberto, Greene pens advice to his fellow playwrights. Greene writes: "To those Gentlemen his Quondam acquaintance, that spend their wits in making Plaies," complaining about the base actors, who have deserted him in his need, and advising three particular playwrights to beware of the perfidy of actors. His epithets for the playwrights are complimentary, for the actors derogatory. The first playwright (said by critics to be Christopher Marlowe) Greene admonishes to leave off disbelief and atheism and give "glory to the giver". The second, "young Juvenal, the biting Satyrst" (said by critics to be Thomas Nashe), he advises to "get not many enemies by bitter words", and the third, "no less deserving that the other two" (said by critics to be George Peele), he blames for depending "on so mean a stay" as the actor-apes, who accept the playwrights' bounty and desert them in their need.

Although he may be admonitory, Greene calls Marlowe, "thou famous gracer of Tragedians". He compliments Nashe as a "Sweet boy...well able to inveigh against vain men", and Peele as "in some things rarer" than the other two. It is hard to imagine why any of these playwrights, who are in general designated as "rare wits", and with "lives like lighted tapers", would complain to Chettle. It is even harder to imagine that, in the small London theatrical world, Chettle did not know the two who complained.

Greene furthermore enjoins his friends: "Base-mindad men all three of you, if by my miserie you be not warnd." He then reviles the actors with such epithets as "Puppets", "Anticks", "Apes", "peasants", "rude groomes", "paintad monsters", "buckram Gentlemen", "clinging burres", and "weak staies...as changeable in minds, as in many attyres". Most annoying of all to the repentent Greene is "an upstart Crow, beautified with our feathera". Of course it is the language of the playwright that makes this actor-crow into a beautiful peacock, "garnisht in our colours". Greene tells his fellow playwrights that this "Crow", like a wolf in sheep's clothing, has a "Tygers hart" under his "Players hyde". Worst of all, he adds his own speeches beyond what the playwright has given him, thinking that he can as well "bombast out a blanke verse as the best of you."

Even worse, as "Johannes factotum", this "Puppet" thinks he can shake up any scene by his jiggling and antics. Greene goes on to urge his fellow playwrights not to pen any more plays: "Let those Apes imitate your past excellence, and never more acquaint them with your admired inventions." Greene sees the battle between the creative playwrights and the exploiting actors as fierce and unending -- with an impassable no-man's land between. No one on the "rude groome" side can cross to the "rare wit" aide and no "rare wit" can be a "rude groome".

One might ask why Greene (or Chettle) sees such enmity between playwrights and actors. Greene is not unique. Richard Levin, in a well-documented essay on the relationship of the written text to the performed play, ("Performance-Critics vs. Close Readers in the Study of English Renaissance Drama", Modern Language Review 81 [1986]: 552) writes that when a dramatist spoke of actors in general, he was likely "to describe them as parasites who lived off his writings, without which they would be helpless." Thomas Nashe, for example, using imagery similar to Greene's in his epistle to Greene's Menaphon, refers to poets who "tricked up a company of taffaty fooles with their feathers".<sup>2</sup> Thomas Dekker, in Jests to Make You Merry (1607), writes of one "es proud as a Player that feedes on the fruite of divine poetry (as swine on Acorns.)" Levin notes that even poet John Donne in "Satyre II", defines a dramatist as one who "gives ideot actors meanes/ (Starving himselfe) to live by his labor'd scenes". Citing other instances, Levin concludes that practicing playwrights "apparently felt they were engaged in a kind of class-warfare with the actors over the profits of the theatrical enterprise". Greene's Groats-worth does indeed provide evidence of such antagonism. The identity of the three playwrights as Marlowe, Nashe, and Peele seems well established, but the identity of that actor who was a shake-scene, a painted monster, a cleaving burr is uncertain. It could not have been a gentle, honey-tongued clown, but one who aroused special animosity in the playwright by his great popularity and self-promoting, scene-stealing tricks at the expense of the playwright's creation.<sup>3</sup>

Such an actor is described at length in a recent article by Max W. Thomas: "Kemps Nine Daies Wonder: Dancing Carnial into Market" PMLA (107, [May 1992]). William Kemp, after leaving the Lord Chamberlain's Men in 1599, publicized himself by doing what he called a Morris Dance from London to

Norwich, an account of which he wrote up in Kemps Nine Daies Wonder (1600). Thomas makes the point that, contrary to the celebratory nature of the Morris, with its accompaniment of drinking and socializing, Kemp accepted none of the brews offered at inns along the way, and accounted for every foot of the distance as he jiggered on by himself. In "marketing" himself, he was so successful that word traveled ahead of his coming; villagers welcomed him along the way; and the crowds in Norwich greeted his arrival as a great event, which included hanging his shoes in a place of honor in the town hall.

Of interest to Shakespeareans is Thomas's surmise that this acrobatic clown was replaced in the Chamberlain's Company the year before by Robert Armin (who "emphasized verbal and conceptual dexterity"), because of Kemp's "Physical knavishness" and "the disruptions his performance produced in the playhouse". In the light of Thomas's analysis, Kemp seems the likely object of Robert Greene's scorn in Groats-worth.<sup>4</sup>

Shakespeare's Hamlet (III,ii) likewise complains about the "clowns" who speak "more than is set down for them", and who "set some quantity of barren spectators to laugh", even while "some necessary question of the play be then to be considered". Using somewhat less derogatory epithets than Greene, Hamlet, nevertheless, sees such clowning as "villainous" and showing "a most pitiful ambition in the Fool that uses it". Shakespeare would seem to agree with Greene that the disruptive actor who believes that his own bombastic blank verse is superior to the playwright's verse, is a self-deluded fool. Shakespeare himself perhaps encouraged Kemp's replacement by Armin.<sup>5</sup>

In a broadside ballad (also published in 1592), "The Crow Sits Upon the Wall", signed "R.T.", Richard Tarlton, according to Joseph Tilly in Black-Letter Ballads and Broad-sides (London 1867) and called "one of Tarlton's jigs" by Walter Raleigh (Shakespeare, New York 1907), the refrain urges men to please all women, "Be they great, be they small", no matter what they ask: "Please one and please all./ ...So pypeth the crowe,/ Sitting upon the wall." In a 1972 Johnson facsimile Reprint, the "Crow-on-the-wall" ballad is combined with Tarlton's Jests and Kemps Nine Daies Wonder, indicating its association with Tarlton and Kemp and making it seem logical that if Tarlton, who died in 1588, engaged in crow-like pantomime while jiggering and improvising verses for the ballad, Kemp, who took over after the great clown's death, would be the "upstart crow".<sup>6</sup>

The facsimile of "A prettie newe Ballad, intytuled: The Crowe sits upon the wall,/ Please one and please all" appears on a broadside sheet about 12 by 15 inches necessarily folded and bound at the end, after the Tarlton and Kemp documents. The ballad consists of seventeen verses "Imprinted at London for Henry Kyrkham" (1592), supposedly in praise of the ladies, to whom all services should be rendered. Some verses, however, are slyly derogatory, and no doubt by a skillful patter-artist could be pointed at members of the audience. The ballad would seem to have been admirably suited for a clown like Tarlton, who was said to have been so funny as to set the audience laughing by merely sticking his head through a stage opening. He could no doubt have created a sensation, sitting perhaps on a stool, working his arms like a crow, with possibly a black beak-mask, while reciting an endless number of impromptu verses appropriate for the audience at hand. The crow, often a bird of ill omen, is also a ridiculous fowl with a raucous cry, featured in more than a dozen of Aesop's fables and portrayed in legend from ancient times. In fact Robert Greene in Francesco's Fortunes (1590) has the writer-orator Cicero deride the actor Roscius: "Art thou proud with Esops Crow, being pranced with the glorie of other feathers?" The many associations with the bird could make the "Crow" ballad a source of great

merriment in the hands of an expert mimic.<sup>7</sup>

Typical verses, somewhat satirizing courtly love, carry a note of resentment toward the ladies under a surface gallantry. Besides including the refrain in the title, the broadside notes that the ballad is to be sung "To the tune of, Please one and please all". No extent evidence, however, exists of this tune as separate from the "Crow" ballad. The crow's advice appears in such verses as the following:

Please one and please all  
Be they great, be they small  
Be they little, be they low,  
So pypeth the crow,  
Sitting upon a wall, —  
Please one and please all,  
Please one and please all.

The goodwife I do mean,  
Be she fat or be she lean,  
Whatsoever thet she be,  
This the crow told me,  
Sitting upon a well, —  
Please one and please all,  
Please one and please all.

Be she cruel, be she cursed,  
Come she last, come she first,  
Be they young, be they old,  
Do they smile, do they scold,  
Though they do nought at all, —  
Please one and please all,  
Please one and please all.

Though it be some crow's guise  
Oftentimes to tell lies,  
Yet thie crow's words doth try  
That her tale is no lie,  
For thus it is and every shall, —  
Please one and please all,  
Please one and please ell.

It is perhaps of some interest that Malvolio (III,4) seems to know the "Crow" ballad, when he appears to Olivia, smiling and cross-gartered. Admitting that his cross-gartering "does make some obstruction in the blood", he adds, "but what of that? If it please the eye of ona, it is with me as the very true sonnet is, 'Please one, and please all.'" If Malvolio's lines refer to the "Crow" ballad, there is a certain humor in the fact that lines which belong to a musical clown — in Twelfth Night, Feste has an outstanding singing, joking part — are repeated by the sour steward, who believes the lines mean that whatever pleases one woman pleases all, whereas the various verses indicate that each woman requires a different favor. Part of Malvolio's downfall is the result of his obtuseness concerning the nature of womankind. The verses of the "Crow" ballad make clear that the clowns — whether the master Tarlton or the upstart Kemp — are not so deceived.

If the "Crow" ballad was widely known as one of "Tarltons Jigs", even to be quoted by Malvolio, the "upstart crow" would justly apply to Kemp. What about another of the individualized unflattering epithets for some stage-stealing actor, "Johannes factotum", a phrase apparently made up by Greene from the commonly known "Magister" or "Dominus factotum"? Usually glossed as "Jack-of-all-trades", since Malone's suggestion of more than two centuries ago, that the line between playwright and actor could be crossed by an actor who could write, it more logically applies to a clown. A "factotum", (from facere totus) is a doer of all things, and a "John" who can do all things on the actors' side of the battle is one who can dance and sing and ad-lib timely verses to a well-known tune, as well as shake the stage with acrobatics and steal stage by bandying dialogue with other actors. Furthermore under his actor's skin he hides a carnivorous heart.

In reviewing Malone's interpretation of Groats-worth, however, noted Shakespearean critic, S. Schoenbaum (Shakespeare's Lives 1970, p. 176) insists that Malone "is wrong" in considering Shakespeare a plagiarist who had stolen the "tiger's heart" line from a play by Greene.<sup>8</sup> The "upstert crow" epithet,

Malone acknowledges, according to Schoenbaum, to be "the chief hinge of my argument", but as Schoenbaum continues, Malone's conclusions were "brilliantly deduced from a false premise." Schoenbaum, however, is too imbued with the mythos which Malone promoted of Shakaspeare as clown and writer to pursue the matter further. If, however, it is "a false premise" that the "upstart crow" is a playwright who has stolen the words of other playwrights, then we should question the "Johannes factotum" as having anything to do with the playwrights' side of the equation.

Based on the assumption that the epithet must refer to some "John", D. Allen Carroll in "Johannes factotum and Jack Cade" (S.Q. 40 [1989]: 491-92) makes the case that Jack Cade, also known as John Mend-All, a character in 2 Henry VI, Act. 4, resembles Shakespeare, who mended plays, and hence the phrase referred to the playwright, who, although not named "John" himself, had created the character. Besides the fact that Carroll, like many others, mistakenly crosses the barrier between actors and writers by applying an epithet concerning the former to the latter, Shakespeare, at least from what little is known of his life, can hardly be equated with the rebellious Jack Cade.<sup>9</sup>

I believe a less convoluted explanation of the Latin (partly German) phrase is found in Albert Cohn's Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: An Account of English Actors in Germany and the Netherlands and of the Plays Performed by them During the Same Period (1967 reprint of 1904 German publication). Cohn describes some two-dozen clown-parts in various plays, all bearing the name "John" except for one "Jodel" — for example, "Jahn Posset der Bott", "Jahn der Lackey", "Jahn der Narr", "Jahn der Engellandische Narr", "Hans Worst", "Johan Clant", "Johan Bouset", to name a few. Evidence shows that "Will" Kemp was in the low countries and Germany with Lord Leicester's Players in 1586. If he enacted even a few of the clown parts described by Cohn, he could well be called "Johann" or "Johannes".<sup>10</sup>

A possible pun which would make Kemp a "factotum" as well is revealed in The Gula Hornbook (1609) by Thomas Dekker (The Temple Classics, London, 1904). In Chapter Six, concerning gallants at the playhouse, Dekker writes, "The theater is your Poats Royal Exchange", where "their Musea" have become "Merchants" and where the players are "Factors", who put away the stuff, and make the baat of it they possibly can". In the battle between writers and actors, the actors buy cheap and sell dear, or in other words reap the profit as middlemen or "factors", profit which should go to the playwrights. The accusation against actors, like others cited, makes the actors self-aggrandizing merchants who outdo the creators of the goods. If Greene implies such a "factor" in his epithet, it appears to correspond to the merchantile image of Kemp exposed in the essay by Max W. Thomas, who well explains "Carnival" becoming "market" in Kemp's publicity stunt of a Morris dance from London to Norwich.

In the prologue to Kemp's account of his feat, Nine Daies Wonder, he addresses the "witles beetle-heads", the "impudent generation of ballad-makers and their coherents", as "notable Shakerags". If Kemp's vitriol in regard to writers is typical of his on-stage performance, Greene seems justified in designating Kemp a "shake-scene", as well as an "ape", "antic", "crow", and in the most derogatory sense a "Johannes factotum". According to Thomas, Kemp's writing "is infused with an awariness of the disruptions his performance produced in the playhouse". Thomas makes clear how Kemp, "a master self-promoter", managed to "market" himself in 1599 as a "Wonder", a feat which Kemp apparently had attempted earlier as a stage actor, much

to the annoyance of a large number of playwrights.

It is of some interest that the ghost of Richard Tarlton, one of five apparitions appearing to Chettle's Kind-Hart in a dream of "abuses raining", after some paradoxical ramblings about evils of the theatre, ends, as might be expected, by taking the side of the players against the playwrights. As to "Playes," he concludes, "some of them do more hurt in a day, than all the Players (by exercizing theyr profession) in an age." Playwrights and clowns, during the years of the flowering of Renaissance drama, are on the opposite sides of a thick wall, an envious rivalry making it impossible that an extremely popular clownish actor like Kemp, "an upstart" and a "crow", could ever be considered a creative playwright. Chettle himself (in his "Note to the Gentlemen Readers" of Kind-Hart), expressing puzzlement that Greene's letter "written to divers play-makers, is offensively by one or two of them taken," claims to have stood always on the side of the writers: "How I have all the time of my conversing in printing hindred the bitter inveying against schollers, it hath been very well knowne."

Stratfordians must recognize that the "gap" of "lost years" in the Stratfordian biography cannot be shortened by the pamphlets, Groats-worth or Kind-Hartes Dreame, written by Robert Greene or Henry Chettle. Nothing in either refers to "Shakespeare", a name which did not even appear in print as related to drama until six years later in Francis Mere's Palladis Tamia (1598).

Oxfordians should recognize the accuracy with which, years ago, William Ghampan (William Shakespeare and Robert Greene: The Evidence [1912] Haskell House Reprint 1974) deduced that Kemp was the "upstart crow". Even without knowledge of the popular "Crow" ballad, and without some of the evidence provided by Thomas's article about the boastful Kemp, Ghampan wrote: "In the closing yeera of the sixteenth century...there lived in London the most spectacular comic actor and clown of his day, the greatest 'Shake-scene' or (dance-scene) of his generation, William Kemp, the worthy successor of Dick Tarlton. He had a continental reputation in 1589." Evidence of Kemp as "Johannes factotum", who played clownish "Johns" abroad can now be added as further evidence of Chapman's accurate deductions.

Let Oxfordians not be lured into debate about the meaning and origin of the Greene-Chettle documents, and let them not fall into the unwarranted belief that Shakspere-Shakespeare, in this writer-versus-player battle, was ever an actor on the basis of the "tigers heart" metaphor originated by playwright, Shakespeare. It may be of "capital importance" to the Stratfordian biography that Will was in London in 1592, but nothing in Groats-worth and Kind-Hartes Dreame relates to the question. And had these publications remained as obscure as others of their kind, Oxfordians would never have brought them forward today as providing any evidence that the Great Lord Chamberlain of England had any concern with such minor contributions to the literary scene.<sup>13</sup>

#### Footnotes

1. After a computerized comparison of a number of words typically used by Robert Greene with words used by Henry Chettle, Warren Austin had concluded that Groats-worth had been created by Chettle. A year later in The Shakespeare Newsletter (December 1970), Austin explained more fully: "Since completing the computer-aided linguistic analysis, I have succeeded in reconstructing Chettle's procedure in fabricating the Groats-worth of Wit. For the most part, he used Greene's genuine books of the same genre (prodigal son tales), patterning his forgery on episodes and passages in Greene's Mourning Garment, Never Too Late, and the sequel to the latter, Francesco's Fortunes; but he used at least four other identifiable sources, of which the most important was Thomas Nashe's prefatory epistle to Greene's Menaphon. Some passages

in A Groat's-worth of Wit, including the diatribe against the actors and the actor-playwright, Shakespeare, are largely pastiches by Chettle from these sources."

An example of how Chettle proceeded, according to Austin, "with Greene's books in front of him as he worked," is the episode in Groat's-worth, wherein Roberto is abandoned by the player who has persuaded him to become a playwright, which parallels Francesco's encounter with the players in Francesco's Fortunes, both of which illustrate the antagonism of writers for players found in the address to three play makers—and evidenced in the attitude of many other Renaissance playwrights besides Greene and Chettle, who claims in Kind-Hartes Dreame to have stood "all the time" on the side of the "schollars".

2. According to G. B. Harrison (Elizabethan Plays and Players, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956), Menaphon, "one of Greene's best novels", contains the like sentiment: "The trouble apparently was that in Greene's opinion educated men demeaned themselves by writing for unlearned actors (80)."

3. The battle line between playwrights and actors was recognized even in a Cambridge University play like The Return from Parnassus (1601), in which Burbage and Kemp boast of their victory over Ben Jonson. The scholars resent their subservience to the players: "Must we he practis'd to those leaden spouts,/That naught do vent but what they do receive." The poor poets complain, "Vile world, that lifts them up to hye degree,/And treades us downe in groveling misery." (E.K. Chambers. The Elizabethan Stage. Oxford, 1923. Vol.I, 385).

4. It must have been galling to the playwrights that the addition of Kemp's name to a printed play would add readers — for example, A Knack to Know A Knave (1594) included the inducement: "Newlie set forth, as it hath sundrie tymes bene played by Ed. Allen and his Companie. With Kemp's applauded Merriments of the men of Goteham." (Chambers, op.cit. IV,24).

5. David Honeyman in Closer to Shakespeare (Braunton, Devon: Martin Books Ltd. 1990) provides genealogies for various Elizabethans who had possible connections to Shakespeare. Among these is the Clown, William Kemp, who "is remembered today largely because Hamlet's 'advice to the Clown' is thought to preserve a rebuke to him by Shakespeare." After citing Hamlet's often-quoted lines, Honeyman adds, "Note especially the last ten words [shows a most pitiful ambition in the fool that uses it]. If they did refer to Kemp (and how could he think otherwise?) they surely reflect quite a rumpus among the Chamberlain's Men." Honeyman postulates that Kemp, having a more distinguished family background than many players, was probably arrogant, as proved by his "well-written" Nine Daies Wonder. Since Kemp was listed on the Elsinore payroll of September 1586 as an instrumentalist, he apparently had musical talent as well, which, according to Honeyman, he may have exploited.

Honeyman's assumption that Kemp was the object of Hamlet's admonition adds evidence that Greene likewise aimed barbs at Kemp in the battle of writers versus actors.

6. Thomas Nashe's bitterly satirical dedication for An Almond for a Parrat — "to that most Comicall and conceited Cavaleire Monsieur du Kamps, Jestmonger and Vice-gerent generall to the Ghost of Dick Tarlton" — while less vitriolic than Greene's attack on Kemp, illustrates a strong resentment of the status of the clown in the theater world.

7. Concerning the "Aesop's crow" metaphor, although critic F. G. Fleay had identified Marlowe as Cicero and the clown Robert Wilson as the actor Roscius, Chambers (op.cit. I,377) concludes: "The point of the passage is the indebtedness of the players as a body to the poets as a body." J. Dover Wilson (op.cit. 65) suggests that Greene was "fond of employing the [crow] image in his periodical girding against the players who, he complained, flourished and waxed rich on the products of the starving authors." It appears that all these critics would consider it impossible for Greene to call any playwright a "crow".

8. The "tiger's heart" metaphor, found in 3 Henry VI and the True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York, probably originated in Holinshed's account of the death of seven traitors on the gallows, whose bodies, after hanging, were to be severed and "their tigers hearts burned in the fire." Failing to recognize the nature of the war between playwrights and players, critics have paradoxically tried to identify the upstart player by a line from a playwright. Adolphus

Ward in A History of English Dramatic Literature (1999) writes that Greene's parody of the line "may quite conceivably have been introduced, more or less by accident, merely by way of allusion to a familiar stage phrase of the day (II,60)." Certainly no critic has accused Samuel Nicholson in Acolasus in 1600 (The Shakespeare Allusion Book, 1970, p. 74) of referring to Shakespeare when he uses his version of the line: "O woolvish heart wrapt in a womans hyde."

9. In another article relating "Johannes factotum" to the name "John" or "Jon", Nina Green (Edward de Vere Newsletter, No. 3, May 1989) speculates that it could have applied to (Ben) Jonson, who, as a brash 20-year-old actor, might have annoyed the playwrights by his insolence. Ben, however, seems not to have left a record as a well-known scene-shaking clown in 1592.

10. It would appear that "Johan" was a designated name for a clownish part in pre-Renaissance English drama, as well as in the plays exported to the continent. Johan Johan the Husbando (1533), attributed to John Heywood, is a three-character play in which the duped husband actually beseeches the priest, who is his wife's lover, to come to dinner, "in the dim-witted belief that the priest's admonitions will stint the strife between the couple." According to Edmund Creeth, the character of the luckless husband is "surely one of the funniest things in English drama." (Tudor Drama: An Anthology of Early English Drama. Ed. Edmund Creeth. New York: Doubleday, 1966, p.xxi.)

11. Besides Greene's "Shake-scene" and Kemp's "Shakerags", a number of semi-humorous combinations with "shake" may be noted: for example, the disreputable ruffian in Arden of Faversham is "Shakebag", and Ben's well-known eulogy to the bard includes "shake a Stage" and "shake a lance". Universally known of course is the hyphenated "Shake-(a-)speare". None of them have any relationship to the Stratford name of Shakspeare, with a short "a".

12. At the death of Robert Greene, according to G.B. Harrison (op.cit. 107) the "vultures" descended in search of his literary remains. Besides Gabriel Harvey, who hated Greene, and Cuthbert Burby, who published Greene's "Repentance", and the publisher of Greene's Vision, who claimed it was Greene's last work, Henry Chettle printed in Groats-worth, the story of Roberts, the letter to three playwrights, the Ant-and-Grasshopper fable, and a letter to Greene's wife.

Peter R. Moore in "Groats-worth and Shake-Scene" (The Shakespeare Newsletter, Winter 1991) sums up the evidence that Henry Chettle altered much of the content of Groats-worth, and rightly concludes: "Nothing that Chettle says can be taken at face value." In 1592 Chettle was a "compositor" for a stationer and later mainly a collaborator with known playwrights on numerous plays — few of which were printed. After the death of Queen Elizabeth, he published Englandes Mourning Garment, extolling the reign and the virtues of the Queen, and complaining: "Nor doth one Poet seeke her name to raise,/ That living hourly striv'd to sing her praise." In veiled terms he admonishes nine poets (Melicert supposedly being Shakespeare) for their negligence, seeming to make himself poet to honor the Queen.

Questions likewise arise about all of Chettle's claims in the preface to Kind-Hartes Dreame. Why would two playwrights—those "rare wits"—make some unnamed complaint to Chettle? In the small world of the London theater, how could he not know two of the three—Marlowe, Nashe, and Peele? How did Chettle conclude in less than three months—September 20 to December 8—that he admired the second playwright because of his "civill demeanor", his "uprightness of dealing", and his "honesty", and because "divers of worship" (who were these supposed noblemen?) had defended him. Against what? one asks. Chettle is always adept at promoting himself through controversial innuendoes.

13. Gabriel Harvey (Four Letters and certaine Sonnets, especially touching Robert Greene and other parties by him abused, 1592. ed. G. B. Harrison. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966) testifies to Oxford's aloofness from the literary peccadillos of the time. He writes that when "an other company of specially good fellows...would needs forsooth verie courtly perswade the Earle of Oxforde that something in those letters, and namely, the Mirrour of Tuscanismo, was palpably intended against him...the noble Earle, not disposed to trouble his Joviall mind with such Saturnine paltery stil continued, like his magnificent selfe..." 34-35.



## EDWARD DE VERE'S WILL

by Randall Barron

There are a great number of questions that revolve around the will of William Shaksper of Stratford-Upon-Avon, and quite justifiably so. The basic one is, if he was really the great writer, Shakespeare, why is there nothing whatsoever of this in his will? Oxfordians tend to jump all over the will and kind of wool it around like a kitten playing with a ball of yarn. And why not? The basic question is unanswerable.

But...

Such critical fun brings its own consequences with it. A new problem surfaces for Oxfordians, one seldom if ever addressed. One I would like to address now.

Why didn't the seventeenth Earl of Oxford leave a will?

I didn't use to have any answer to this, my own self-formulated question. Because, if you think about it, it really is disturbing. I was and am surprised the Stratfordians haven't jumped all over it and made it their own personal ball of yarn to play with.

And so my wife and I one fine day in May walked north from the Farringdon underground station to the Greater London Records Office to see what we could see.

Well, we found the parish records for Hackney and went to the original documents and in their ancient pages found the notation of Edward de Vere's death from the plague and his burial in the church at Hackney. All right. What next? Maybe his will was registered there, too?

Not that we could find, it wasn't.

In the reference Complete Peerage in the Greater London Records Office library it was stated Edward de Vere died intestate at King's Hold, Hackney, Middlesex, 24 June 1604, buried 6 July 1604. And talking to a librarian there, we learned an official Inquisition Post Mortem had been done in the absence of a will. That, we were told, would be found in the Public Records Office.

We had already looked for his will in Public Records up in the Wills room and found nothing. Well, we found his widow's will and made a copy of that to take home with us. But as to Edward himself we drew a blank...

But now in the Round Room we found the tome supposed to contain the almost four hundred year old post mortem inquiry. It was a thrill to look at it, all on a single big folded page inside the huge tome. But there was a problem. It was in Latin. It was my impression that such an Inquisition Post Mortem was just the Crown stepping in in the absence of a will in the case of important nobles to make sure the Crown's interests were protected, that the title and rights and lands were passed on to successors in a proper manner. That impression came from being able to translate a phrase here and a phrase there and mostly struggling through it in a defensive manner. That is, seeing if anything sensational jumped out at my eyes. Nothing did, which doesn't prove it wasn't there. We let the search end there and went on to other matters.

So...no will...and yet...

A year went by, the question nagged. At last I dared state it full out to myself. The Earl was very ill and knew it for at least the last year of his life. That is documented in his own letters. So, here we have the greatest writer of all time, of enormous intellect and heart, one of England's prime earls, who realizes the importance of his place in history better than anyone and...he leaves no will.

Okay. Okay. Sure, I told myself. I believe that. Absolutely. Just as easily as I believe that Will Shaksper of Stretford wrote all the Shakespeare works.

A thought occurred. Maybe he knew a will would be too hot to handle. And was careful to attend to his estate and inheritance matters in other ways. Well, maybe.

Question: If Edward de Vere left a will, and yet there is no record of it...how would you explain that?

I couldn't explain it. But the question refused to go away. It hung there, on the outskirts of the mind, like Hamlet's father's ghost at dawn. Immaterial, but for me real...

Then it came to me that the death of a man like Edward de Vere should create...reverberations. If he was who he was, his death could not pass unnoticed. There would be echoes, waves. Effects on other people. Certainly on people like...the Earl of Southampton, the young friend of the Sonnets.

I could look for that.

So one day I was leisurely stretched out on the living room sofa reading a biography of Southampton when I came upon a certain segment.

And there it was. The reverberation. A big one.

This is the segment of a chapter called, "The Favour of King James" and referring to the year 1604...

"Suddenly the even happy flow of Southampton's career came to a halt. Late on the evening of June 24th he was arrested, along with Lord Denvers (his old friend Sir Henry), Sir Henry Neville (the Essex sympathizer who had shared his imprisonment in the Tower), Sir Maurice Berkeley (a fellow member of Queen Anne's council) and Sir William Lee. Southampton's papers were seized and scrutinized. He himself was interrogated. According to the French Ambassador, King James had gone into a complete panic and could not sleep that night even though he had a guard of his Scots posted around his quarters. Presumably to protect his heir, he sent orders to Prince Henry that he must not stir out of his chamber.

Next morning, while the Privy Council was examining its prisoners, wild rumours swept through the Court."

The date.

The date of June 24, 1604 stuck in my mind. It had a haunting familiarity, yet I could not place it. Wait a minute, wait. Something ran up and down my spine. I got up off the sofa and went to the study and pulled down The Mysterious William Shakespeare, looked at the time frame in the back. There it was. Edward de Vere died on that date...

Okay, so I had found the reverberation. But what did it all mean?

First of all, the relevant information all comes from the book Shakespeare and the Earl of Southampton by G. P. V. Akrigg, first published in 1968, and begins on page 140. I should mention this is a very orthodox Stratfordian biography in which the name Edward de Vere never appears, which to me makes the information all that more valuable. It continues...

"Southampton was quickly found innocent of whatever charges had been brought against him. According to both the Venetian and French ambassadors, he was released on June 25th, the day after his arrest.

Probably we shall never know the nature of the charges brought against Southampton. No documents that relate to this episode survive in either the Public Record Office or in that other great depository of state papers of the period, the Cecil papers at Hatfield. Probably King James, embarrassed by what had occurred, ordered that all the papers be destroyed. Certainly a determined effort seems to have been made to hush up the whole affair."

Well, there is much that can be made of this. Perhaps there is much still to be discovered.

But I like this preliminary and hypothetical scenario...

King James is in a state of panic as described because he receives word that Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford, is fading fast. A state of panic perhaps inspired by the advice of Robert Cecil. The Crown may be in danger. Because...who knows what may be in the will of Edward de Vere? If nothing more than the admission or proud statement that he was Shakespeare, that would be dangerous enough. Reputations could suffer irreparable damage. Queen Elizabeth, members of her court, William Cecil...

And, too, the will might deal with manuscripts, any one of which could contain political dynamite. The sonnets alone might hold secrets no one wanted to come to light, not even Edward de Vere himself. And then, too, the Essex-Southampton rebellion at this time is only three years old and...No, there was no doubt about it. Edward de Vere's will could have things in it that could even bring down the government. There were still sensitive areas concerning the Essex rebellion. Hidden things. Some people said Robert Cecil himself gave Essex reason to believe he would back their rebellion. And some wondered why Southampton had been spared and why his lands and titles had been so quickly restored under King James.

Then, too, it is entirely possible that de Vere had already filed his will and Robert Cecil knew exactly what was in it. He knew he must move, but waited to make that move on the day of de Vere's death.

Whatever the truth about it, my scenario suggests Cecil advising the King that immediate action must be taken to forestall consequences. De Vere's will must never be seen. It must not even be known he filed one. The will on file is confiscated, all records of it obliterated. The copy of the will at his house in Hackney is confiscated by special King's guard troops and the widow warned it is never to be referred to again on pain of loss of all remaining rights and property of the estate. Certain belongings are confiscated, too, in particular manuscripts. Simultaneously, the Earl of Southampton is placed under arrest and all his belongings searched. This is to make sure no communication or documents have passed to his hands from the Earl of Oxford.

None have.

And so the hole in history is patched up, walled over...and normality restored. Soon after, Southampton once again becomes the King's companion and a favorite of Queen Anne.

Maybe this is fantasy. The explanation I have given of the very strange historical event... Certainly speculation. Yet I can easily believe it. Much more easily than I could believe that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford and world's greatest writer, Shakespeare, knowing his old enemy Death was near, would leave no written will, no last communication with the world...

## DE VERE AND THE BATTLE OF BOSWORTH

by Linda B. McLatchie

"A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!" (RIII, Act V, scene iv)

Such was the *cri de coeur* of Richard III in the final act of Shakespeare's The Tragedy of King Richard the Third.

Did this image of an unhorsed but still combative Richard come from the playwright's rich imagination, or was he inspired by some graphic image before him?

At Stowe School in Buckinghamshire there exists a stone bas-relief of the Battle of Bosworth field. The artistic center of the carving is Henry VII, wielding a sword and rearing up on his horse.<sup>1</sup> Directly behind Henry VII is John, 13th Earl of Oxford, commander of the Lancastrian archers during the battle. ("My Lord of Oxford,...stay with me" [RIII, Act V, scene iii]). All combatants are on horse, with the exception of Richard, who is unhorsed and lying under the hooves of Henry VII's horse. ("His horse is slain, and all on foot he fights" [RIII, Act V, scene iv]). The prostrate Richard, still in full battle armor, grasps his crown with both hands. Also shown fallen in battle, although still on horse, is the Duke of Norfolk. Other notables who are armorially represented are Herbert, Stafford, Surrey, Blount, Digby, Brandon, and Radcliffe.<sup>2</sup>

On either side of the bas-relief is a statue: on the left is Henry VII (grandfather to Elizabeth I and founder of the Tudor dynasty), holding a sword and the shield of St. George ("God, and Saint George! Richmond, and victory!" [RIII, Act V, scene iii]); on the right is his queen, Elizabeth of York (grandmother to Elizabeth I). The plinth on which Henry VII stands is decorated with a red rose; that of Elizabeth is decorated with a white rose. ("We will unite the white rose and the red" [RIII, Act V, scene v]).

The bas-relief has an interesting provenance. The workmanship is seemingly Elizabethan (late 16th century); the piece is believed to have come from Hedingham Castle in Essex—one of the Earl of Oxford's properties. Hedingham was in the Earl's possession until 1591, when it was deeded to Lord Burghley; at about the same time as the transfer, part of the castle was dismantled. Perhaps it was when the castle was partially dismantled that this bas-relief started its long journey. In 1736 it was discovered by the antiquarian, Sanderson Miller, in an old farm house in nearby Halstead. Mrs. Nugent obtained possession, had its heraldic shields restored to their former splendor, and placed it in the library of her house at Gosfield. In 1922 it was moved to the library at Stowe School, where it can now be viewed by prior permission of the headmaster.

If the provenance and artistic dating of the piece is correct (I will use this assumption throughout the rest of this article), it would mean that the bas-relief was commissioned by the 17th Earl of Oxford for his home at Hedingham. While Oxford surely lost no love on Henry VII (who ruined the

1. Incidentally, the pictorial representation of Henry VII in the thick of battle is contradicted by contemporaneous accounts of the battle, which indicated that Henry avoided hand-to-hand combat with Richard III.

2. A photograph of the central portion of the bas-relief can be seen in The Ricardian, number 38, June 1972, p. 4.

de Veres' family fortunes with his imposition of a heavy fine for exceeding the allowable number of retainers), Henry VII was the founder of the Tudor dynasty. And the 17th earl was profoundly loyal to the final rose to blossom on the Tudor family tree: Elizabeth I.

Both the bas-relief and the play Richard III make certain political statements: they proclaim the glorious military triumph of Henry Tudor (Yorkists would surely question how glorious that triumph was!); they celebrate the joining of the Houses of York and Lancaster-the white and red roses-in the marriage of Elizabeth of York and Henry VII; and they feature the 13th Earl of Oxford as a prominent Lancastrian.

However, the bas-relief and the play also resonate with certain present-day concerns of the 17th Earl of Oxford. Both the play and the sculpture feature two prominent anti-Lancastrians-the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Surrey, father and son of the Howard clan, who fought against Henry VII at the Battle of Bosworth and were therefore traitors. (Henry didn't earn his reputation as sneaky without reason: He declared that his reign started the day before the Battle of Bosworth; therefore, those who fought against him at Bosworth Field were technically traitors because they opposed a lawful king.)

Oxford had good reason to vilify the Howards: In 1580 Oxford was suspected of treasonous pro-Catholic activities, but he in turn denounced Lord Henry Howard, son of the Earl of Surrey and brother of the 4th Duke of Norfolk, as the real traitor.

This leads us to the dating of the play Richard III, which is in just as much question as any other play. While the first known quarto of the play was printed in 1597, Eva Turner Clark surmises that the play was written in 1581 because of the play's numerous references to the Tower of London.<sup>3</sup> In that year, Oxford was sent to the Tower after Anne Vavasor bore his illegitimate son. The play also hints at the de Vere-Howard antipathy that came to a head in 1580.

Here I will quote from Eva Turner Clark: "It will be noted that the chief supporters of Richard III were Norfolk and Surrey..., and that among the chief supporters of Henry VII (Earl of Richmond) was the thirteenth Earl of Oxford. This is very interesting since it is to be considered that, when the play was written, the same kind of an alignment had been formed by their descendants, the (seventeenth) Earl of Oxford supporting the granddaughter of Henry VII, whilst the contemporaneous representatives of Norfolk and Surrey were engaged in intrigues against her. It was, as I have said, Lord Oxford's way of showing his loyalty to the Queen and the treason of the others; not only his own loyalty, but that of several other courtiers of his time who were descendants of those named as supporters of Henry VII. By means of the lines of the play, he was able to remind the Queen that his ancestors for generations had been loyal supporters of her family; and, by the same means, to suggest that he was no less faithful than they, while at the same time he could point out the fact that the line to which Norfolk and Surrey belonged had never been faithful to her family and was no more loyal now."<sup>4</sup>

3. Eva Turner Clark, Hidden Allusions in Shakespeare's Plays, pp. 417-418.

4. Clark, Hidden Allusions, pp. 420-421.

Clark's discussion of the play's political allusions could just as easily apply to the Stowe School bas-relief. Which came first - the bas-relief or the play Richard III? We do not know. But whether the sculpted image of the battle-scene was before Oxford as he wrote, or whether the play itself inspired him to commission the bas-relief is immaterial. What is important is that both the play and bas-relief artistically underscore certain themes: the de Veres' multigenerational loyalty to the Lancastrian cause and the House of Tudor; the Howard family's history of disloyalty to the Tudors; the military prowess and prominence of the 13th Earl of Oxford; and an homage to the founding of the Tudor dynasty in the union of the red and white roses.

As an interesting footnote, in 1748 Horace Walpole (an early defender of the much-maligned Richard III) visited the remains of Hedingham Castle and viewed the bas-relief, which was then at Gosfield. This immersion in the history of the de Veres led Walpole to comment: "[I]n short I am just now Vere-mad." 5

Aren't we all?

5. Letters of Horace Walpole, ed. by P. Toynbee, vol. 2, p. 323.

#### Editor's Addendum

Ms McLatchie's impressive treatise strikingly parallels Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn, Sr. in their prodigious This Star of England, pp. 310-312:

A notably sensible man, who was also an independent thinker and a poet, Walt Whitman, had the following to say about the chronicle of this great dramatist:

The English historical plays are to me not only the most eminent as dramatic performances (my mature judgment confirming the impression of my early years, that the distinctiveness and glory of the Poet reside not in his vaunted dramas of the passions, but those founded on the contests of English dynasties, and the French wars) but form, as we get it all, the chief in a complexity of puzzles. Conceiv'd out of the fullest heat and pulse of European feudalism - personifying in unparallell'd ways the mediaeval aristocracy, its towering spirit of ruthless and gigantic caste, with its own peculiar air of arrogance (no mere imitation) - only one of the 'wolfish earls' so plenteous in the plays themselves, or some born descendant and knower, might seem to be the true author of those amazing works - works in some respects greater than anything else in recorded literature.

Only one of the 'wolfish earls ... or some born descendant and knower' could possibly be 'the true author of those amazing works,' beginning with King John and running the gamut. These dramas of English civil wars between the Lancasters and Yorks, and wars against the French, with their Warwicks, Somersets, Montagues, Northumberland, Westmorelands, Mortimers, Stanleys, Hastings, Oxfords, and the rest, are absolutely authentic, 'conceived', as Whitman puts it, 'out of the fullest heat and pulse of European feudalism' by one of the tribe, 'a born descendant and knower.' It is preposterous to suppose that anyone

could from mere hearsay have re-created these men with such vividness and power; and before Oxford wrote of them, there was no opportunity for an outsider intimately to learn their ways. But the Earl of Oxford himself was one of them: he had spent his childhood in just such a feudal castle as their fortress-homes were and had heard of their exploits from the counterparts of these doughty men and their descendants. The tang of barbarism which characterizes Warwick, Clifford and the others had informed the very air he had breathed in those early days when he had acquired so keen a taste for the 'old tales' upon which he drew for his dramatic writing until the end of his career....

It never ceases to be amazing to observe how Lord Oxford was able to graft the events of his time upon those of an earlier era without as a rule doing much violence to either.

English historian and author Thomas Babington Macaulay also corroborates Ms. McLatchie's exposition:

(The deVeres are) the longest and most illustrious lines of nobles that England has seen, whose heads brought it honour in the fields of Hasting, Jerusalem, Runnymede, Crecy, Poitiers, Bosworth, and the court of Elizabeth where shone the 17th Earl who had himself an honourable place among the early masters of English poetry.

The above facts provide a typical example of how traditional Shakespeare scholars and their journalistic advocates are not well-read and thereby misrepresent. In his Reinventing Shakespeare, Gary Taylor affirms at p. 250:

The growing conviction that Shakespeare addressed his best work to a cultural elite also found expression in less orthodox venues. In 1920 J. Thomas Looney identified Shakespeare, in "Shakespeare" Identified, as Edward de Vere, seventeenth earl of Oxford. Oxford rapidly replaced Bacon as the favored candidate of those who doubted Shakespeare's title to the works published in his name. The aristocratic credentials of Oxford, son-in-law of Lord Burghley, surpassed those of Bacon. (underlining supplied)

A laudatory blurb by Michiko Kakutani in her review in the New York Times influences her readers who will believe Oxford only surpasses Bacon as "William Shakespeare" because he was the son-in-law of Lord Burghley.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### EDITOR'S NOTE

At the request by Russell des Cognets, Jr. (1st Vice President of the Shakespeare Oxford Society), I printed a letter written by Roger Stritmatter to Mr. des Cognets in the Spring 1993 Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter. Mr. Stritmatter has asked me to affirm that he had no knowledge or approval of that printing.

Bible holds proof of Shakespeare's identity  
(The Herald July 31/93)

by Joseph Sobran

I keep trying to convince you heathen that the works of "William Shakespeare" were actually written by Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford. So far my success has been limited.

Well, if you won't believe me, maybe you'll believe the Bible. The Earl of Oxford's Bible, that is.

A young scholar has recently made one of the greatest discoveries in the history of the Shakespeare authorship controversy. Roger Stritmatter, a graduate student of comparative literature at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, has studied Oxford's copy of the Bible, and it strongly supports the view that Oxford was in fact the author we call "Shakespeare".

Oxford owned the Geneva translation of the Bible, the version Shakespeare echoes more than any other. Moreover, Oxford marked his copy heavily - and he marked hundreds of verses that scholars have already found echoed in the works of Shakespeare.

As far as we know, the Stratford man usually thought to be Shakespeare didn't even own a Bible. His will mentions no books or manuscripts at all. Ironically, Oxford's Bible has been in the great Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington since 1925. But Mr. Stritmatter is the first scholar to examine it closely.

It would be a near-miracle if two different readers had taken special note of so many of the same verses, mostly little-known verses, as Shakespeare and Oxford did. Space forbids a full summary here, so let me concentrate on one Shakespearean character: Sir John Falstaff.

Falstaff appears in three plays and is mentioned in a fourth. He also quotes the Bible constantly, to wonderfully comic effect. And he and his companions quote, echo or allude to at least nine of the verses marked by Oxford!

Even if you've read the Bible, do you remember Achitophel? Falstaff does. He calls one of his myriad creditors (children, cover your ears!) "a whoreson Achitophel." Oxford has underlined the entire verse (II Samuel 16:23) that identifies Achitophel as the counselor of David and Absalom.

Falstaff humorously likens his drunkard friend Bardolph's bright nose to "an everlasting bonfire-light" - recalling the phrase "everlasting fire" in Matthew 25:41, a verse Oxford also marked. But for that nose, says Falstaff, Bardolph would be "the son of utter darkness", a clear allusion to 1 Thessalonians 5:5: "Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day: we are not of the night, neither of darkness." Yet again Oxford has marked the verse referred to by Falstaff.

When his friend Prince Hal becomes king, Falstaff, mistakenly thinking his own ship has come in, exults: "Blessed are they that have been my friends, and woe unto my lord chief justice!" This plainly echoes the beatitudes and admonitions of Jesus, and Oxford has marked one of the verses Falstaff's cry suggests.

Of course the words of Jesus are so familiar that an allusion to them is unremarkable. But most of Falstaff's biblical echoes are arcane. Consider one of the most striking of them, Falstaff's boast: "I fear not Goliath with a weaver's beam." This can only refer to II Samuel 21:19, where Goliath's spear is said to be "like a weaver's beam." Oxford has underlined those same words in his own Bible. This can hardly be accidental.

These are only a handful of many examples. Mr. Stritmatter's discovery has reinforced the already powerful circumstantial case that the Earl of Oxford was "Shakespeare", the man who gave us Falstaff. Neither Shakespeare nor Oxford has ever been thought of as very religious; yet both fasten on the same verses in the same translation of the Bible - because they were the same man.

Until now, the Shakespeare authorship question has usually been considered a marginal issue, if not a crank idea. "What difference does it make who wrote the plays?" people ask. "The important thing is that we have the plays themselves."

But the annotations in Oxford's Bible are more than a solution to a whodunit; they are a major addition to Shakespeare's studies. They give us a truly priceless look into the creative process of our greatest poet. To read them is to witness the birth of Falstaff.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### CHARLES VAN DOREN JOINS THE STRATFORD-SHAKSPERE DOUBTERS

by Tom Goff

It is a pleasure to add the noted author and editor Charles Van Doren to the lengthening list of eminent men and women who doubt that William Shakspere of Stratford-upon-Avon wrote the great dramas traditionally ascribed to him. Mr. Van Doren is the son of the celebrated poet and literary scholar Mark Van Doren, who was also the writer of much insightful Shakespeare criticism. Nor has Charles Van Doren suffered for lack of critical accolades. As writer or editor of more than twenty books, many of them in history, Mr. Van Doren has been praised by such luminaries as Mortimer Adler, Julian Krainin, and Clifton Fadiman (Mr. Fadiman is himself a recent convert to Oxfordianism).

In A History of Knowledge: The Pivotal Events, People, and Achievements of World History, completed in 1991, Mr. Van Doren was said by the reviewer for the San Francisco Chronicle to have achieved "[n]o less than the summation of the entire experience of the human race from the bird's-eye-view of a tremendous, encyclopedic intelligence." On page 146 of that volume (I refer to the 1992 Ballantine paperback), at the beginning of his entry for "Shakespeare", Van Doren makes a remarkable statement:

I confess at the outset to some doubts about the authorship of Shakespeare's plays. The Stratford actor may have written them; the Earl of Oxford perhaps wrote them; perhaps it was someone else. After five centuries, the question whether "Shakespeare" is the real name or a pseudonym of an author otherwise unknown is of no importance, except to explain why I can make no attempt to compose a biography.

Some of us may beg to differ, and not mildly, with that "of no importance"; but it is refreshing to have so candid an admission of doubt from someone of Van Doren's stature. Though not all of his succeeding remarks are free of error (particularly regarding Shakespeare's understanding of the Greek tragedians), many of his comments are as heartening as the one just quoted, and in perfect accord with what Oxfordians have maintained all along about the true "William Shakespeare" [emphasis has here been added

when detailed related by Mr. Van Doren have particular bearing upon the Earl of Oxford's life and career]:

It is enough to say that the author of the plays was born in England around the middle of the sixteenth century [Oxford was born in 1550] and probably lived until about 1615 [Oxford died in 1604]. He wrote some thirty-five plays, all of which were apparently produced, sometimes more than one in a year. He was a great success as a playwright in his own time as well as all subsequent times.

When he (let us call him Shakespeare, even if we admit not knowing to whom the name really refers) began to write, he had little to go on in the way of good dramatic examples. The great Greek tragedians were unknown to him...he literally created English dramaturgy. In itself that is a signal achievement. But it is only the beginning of what Shakespeare did.

If Shakespeare's plays did not exist, we would not know how marvelous the drama can be. More than that, we would not know how deeply literature can reach into the human soul.

Man and woman are always the focus of the plays. The medieval world picture that Shakespeare inherited fades into the background, and humankind emerges, naked and unadorned with vestments or protected by canon law. The plays are hardly even Christian, to say nothing of being orthodox...

...It is one of the most precious contributions of Shakespeare that he invaded the life of ordinary families in his plays, revealing to us what we had always known but never faced. Every one of the famous tragedies is a family tragedy, whatever else it is...

The French language inherited from Rabelais proved inadequate to Montaigne's needs, and as a result he had to invent a new prose. The English that Shakespeare would employ in his last masterworks hardly existed when he began to write his earliest works, and he, too, had almost to invent a language. Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio had performed similar magic for Italian, and Cervantes would perform it for Spanish, Lessing and Goethe for German. As in everything else, Shakespeare was the greatest of these linguistic creators. Inexhaustible in his imagination, he was also inexhaustible in his inventiveness. We compliment ourselves when we claim that ours is the language that Shakespeare spoke. Would that we spoke or wrote it so well.

At this point, having begun by coming amazingly close to accepting the Oxford theory of Shakespeare authorship, Mr. Van Doren concludes by letting "Shakespeare" himself have the last word, in eloquent and familiar passages from Hamlet, King Lear, and The Tempest. Van Doren's own remarks, eloquent in themselves, are uncanny in their similarity to general assessments of Shakespeare's place in English and world literature made by the Ogburns, the Millers, and the very first Oxfordian, J. T. Looney.

## THE WRITING OF AN OXFORDIAN PLAY

by Richard Desper

The year 1993 is the quadricentennial of the poet and playwright "William Shakespeare", who first became known to the world with the publication of his poem Adonis in 1593. An ever-lingering question, however, "Who, in truth, was this author?" Over the years, scholars have found serious discrepancies in the usual identification of the author with William Shakspeare of Stratford-upon-Avon. I first became interested in Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, as the answer to the authorship question, in 1989 with the PBS Frontline broadcast, "The Shakespeare Mystery". Since then I have read extensively on de Vere's life, and my interest was whetted to the point that I decided to write a play on the subject. I recognized this as a major undertaking in my life, first because my career as a polymer scientist requires a large commitment of time, second because I have never written a play before. I have had some passing familiarity with the stage -- I took the stage in productions of the M.I.T. Dramashop in my student days, and have taken part in community theater productions later in life -- but I had never written for the stage. Nonetheless, I began the project in the spirit of the best sense of the word "amateur": "one who participates in an activity for the love of it."

I did not set out to write a polemic on the Authorship Question -- I felt that making the play interesting and bringing the characters to life was of prime importance. I have striven to make the play historically accurate, yet there is sufficient ambiguity as to detail in the record that even other Oxfordians may hold to different interpretations of particular events. The historical record does not fully document people's inner drives, motivations, aspirations, and intentions -- such are left for interpretation, and *Star-Crossed Lovers* is my interpretation.

Looking for a guide on playwriting, I found *The Art of Dramatic Writing*, by Lajos Egri (1), whose principles I eventually took for my own. In order to be something more than a mere pageant, a play must have a theme, a thesis, a central idea, a root idea, a subject, a driving force, which Egri calls the premise. Such a premise consists of a simple proposition, either stated or more likely assumed, which forms the backbone of the plot of the play. The stronger the premise, the better the play. *Macbeth*, for instance, has the premise that "Ruthless ambition leads to its own destruction", while *Henry VIII*, as far as I can tell, has no such root premise. Thus Neilson and Hill (2) comment of the latter that "This drama is singularly lacking in unity. The material is simply translated into dialogue or pageant; and there results a succession of brilliant stage pictures, sketches of character, and fine speeches, entirely without dramatic coherence."

My ambition was to write a dramatic play, not a pageant. Thus I focused on the need for a premise, and in the process decided that the life of Edward de Vere was, of itself, too large a subject to deal with in a single play. Instead, I chose to focus on a particular phase of his life where, while showing his literary and dramatic efforts, I would develop a premise based on that phase of his life, and how the character of the protagonist and of those about him in the process of developing that premise. I also chose *Star-Crossed Lovers* as the title for my play, but I shall not state the premise of the play here -- I leave that to be found within the play itself. Suffice it to say that the premise involves de Vere's rather complicated love life between the ages of 24 and 32.

According to Egri, "Character creates plot, not vice versa". Egri borrowed this simple truth from John Galsworthy, but from my point of view, as I undertook to write an Oxfordian play, this pointed to the key decision I must make at the outset: How am I to portray the character Edward de Vere? His adversaries have, over the years, painted him with a heavy hand as a scoundrel, while we who support him find a more sympathetic character. Does that mean that I, as an Oxfordian, should gloss over his faults? I found the answer in Othello (V.ii.342): "Speak of me as I am; nothing extenuate/Nor set down aught in malice..." Thus I portray the Earl as a flawed personality, with the best and the worst of all of us in him; one striving for growth, one driven towards growth by a major aspect of his personality, his o'erweening perfectionism; and one driven to create, to the point of obsession, by the overpowering God-given genius of his abilities. And one capable of great ineptitude in his personal relationships.

The action of Star-Crossed Lovers derives from two sources: the conflict inherent in nature of the various characters and in the growth that these characters, or at least the protagonist, undergo during the course of the play. There is a natural conflict, for instance, between Oxford and his father-in-law, Lord Burghley, in terms of their attitudes towards money and towards art: Burghley places his greatest priority on the former, while Oxford places his highest priority on the latter. There is conflict between Oxford, representing Castiglione's (and thus Hamlet's) concept of the ideal courtier, and the Earl of Leicester, more attuned to the values of Niccolo Machiavelli. There is conflict between Oxford and his sister Mary de Vere, rooted in the usual childhood rivalry of siblings and amplified by Mary's self-assertiveness. There is the conflict within Oxford between his steadfast de Vere allegiance to his Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth I, and his marriage oath to Anne Cecil. And then there is Anne Vavasor...

In writing the play, I have worked with the statement that "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players". Each of us is acting a role in our lives, whether we think of it self-consciously or not. Then comes the corollary: what roles we learn, and how well we learn them, depends upon the roles others played in our lives during our youth, and how well they played them. Example: Queen Elizabeth knew that her father signed her mother's death warrant. This will color her attitude towards the signing of death warrants; witness her vacillation over the decisions to execute the Duke of Norfolk and later, Mary Queen of Scots. This will also color her attitude towards marriage. On the part of Edward de Vere, we may well ask how his attitudes towards marriage were affected by his childhood example. His father, you may recall, was at the point of marrying another, a certain Mistress Dorothy, when he switched at the last moment to marry Margaret Golding, who was to become the mother of Edward and Mary de Vere. And Oxford's mother remarried a short time after his father's death, without observing much of a period of mourning. The young Earl would seem to have had no role model for a loving husband-and-wife relationship in his early life.

The play, as originally written, would have run three hours, which I considered unacceptable. So I proceeded with the process of cutting: cutting speeches, cutting entire scenes, cutting out characters -- always using the criterion, "How essential is this to the premise of the play?" In the end, the play was reduced to my goal as stated in Romeo and Juliet [Prologue:12]-- "the two hours' traffic of our stage". I am indebted to George de Avilla for the selective lighting, into several substages. All of the set furniture is on stage at the outset and throughout the play. Between scenes, minimal

movement of set furniture, and often no change of set furniture, is required. This allows one scene to flow into the next with minimum of delay. Scene changes are indicated largely by lighting changes alone, and are accomplished without a curtain. Using this concept the play has been performed in under two hours.

Star-Crossed Lovers was produced in a community theater setting, directed by George DeAvilla, under the auspices of the Fenway Players in the Boston area in April, 1993, to small but enthusiastic audiences. The production was under-written by the author himself, with quite limited expenditures for staging and publicity. The costumes, however, were quite excellent, thanks to the efforts of Ms. Cathleen Crocker. The key roles -- The Earl of Oxford, Queen Elizabeth, Lord Burghley, and the Countess of Oxford -- were played by John Payette, Brenda Ladoulis, Stephen Gainer, and Joyce Rich. Others in the case were Duane Hess, Nancy Wilson, Phil Scanlon, Kim Hudson, Grady Spires, Bruce Silvia, David Goldberg, Jennifer Dunnell, and Karl Ginalski, who also served as Assistant Director.

For those who are interested (or perhaps merely curious), printed copies of the script are available; contact the author for further information (57 Drummer Road, Acton, MA, 01720). Star-Crossed Lovers is copyrighted (1992,1993), so should you wish to produce it on stage you would need permission from the author, but you will not find him difficult. A videotape of the April 1993 production is also available at cost for \$5 from the author.

Perhaps the most difficult aspect of writing such a play is the sure knowledge that one's efforts are going to pale beside those of the original author. I can only say that is a humbling experience. It is also a fulfilling experience to see Edward de Vere come to life, and to make a contribution to "telling his story", as Hamlet urged Horatio to do some four hundred years ago.

#### References

1. Lajos Egri, The Art of Dramatic Writing, Touchstone Books, New York, 1960, 2-7,89-91,113-118,187-191,230-235,248-250,255-259,262-265,268.
2. W. A. Neilson and C. J. Hill (eds.), The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, Riverside Press, Cambridge, MA, 1942, 905-906.

\* \* \* \* \*

From Katherine Chilton:\*

The Shakespeare Authorship Question continues to be one of the most fascinating - and complex - mysteries of all time. I have studied the problem for nine years. Academia has proven to be reluctant to even admit there is a Shakespeare identity problem. Inspired by Charles Vere's lecture, I have developed a slide lecture on the Shakespeare Mysteries which I have been presenting at public libraries and bookstores in the L.A. area since July 1993. The free lecture is one full hour and features over 85 color slides of relevant Elizabethan portraits, sites, title pages and quotes. A two-page summary handout is provided. The first part of the lecture describes the Shakespeare mysteries, and the second page gives the Oxfordian solution. With a minimum of publicity, the lectures have been well attended, with a low of 50 and a high of 125 people. All of the lectures have inspired about 30 minutes of question/answers. I am a UCLA graduate and Shakespeare Oxford Society member since 1988.

\*1404 N. Central Ave., #1, Glendale, CA, 91202 - (818) 246-4075

## AN EXCURSION TO THE LATEST (MAYBE THE LAST) BACONIAN CONFERENCE

by W. Ron Hess

Readers of the SOS Newsletter may recall that in Fall 1992 there was an article about certain diggings by fringe elements of the Bacon camp into a "Bacon vault" in the graveyard of Bruton Parish church in Williamsburg, Virginia. Somehow my name got on the mailing list for a flyer about "A Three Day Conference on Francis Bacon, Shakespeare, and the Search for the Vaults in Williamsburg, Oak Island, and England" held April 16-18, 1993 in Richmond, Virginia. So, out of curiosity, I called the conference organizer, Paula Fitzgerald (804-587-2671) of "The Corinthian Radio Drama Theatre" to make reservations and see if I might present a paper with Oxfordian overtones. A respected colleague said to me over the phone, "I didn't think there were enough Baconians left to hold a conference." Was he right?

Mrs. Fitzgerald was happy to have me attend, and initially agreed to have me present my paper. However, once the conference had begun, it became clear that the colleague's quip had struck reality. Only about 25 people were in attendance, of which about 10 were the speakers (and others I'm not counting were actors). However, Mrs. Fitzgerald announced several times that there were enough attendees present "in spirit" to fill the auditorium. I feared the organizer's economic circumstances might conspire against my getting the chance to present the paper I'd worked so hard on.

So, still hoping to do what I came to do, I sat through two and a half days of Reincarnationists, Rosicrucians, Spiritualist-Cayceans, Atlanteans, Worlds-in-Collisionists, Millennialists, and vault seekers. Worse yet were the ultra-Baconians who believed Bacon authored Marlowe, Cervantes, Montaigne, Shakespeare, and Bacon (among others). One even identified Bacon as an "Ascendant Master" who founded the Masonic order 100 years before St. Germaine is credited with having done so, authored the Declaration of Independence, and then had the Masons keep it hidden until 1776. Does this mean Jefferson has been overrated?

My pedestrian views were quite different from those "New Age" thinkers. However, each extremist as an individual was a very pleasant, intelligent person. It was quite an experience to sit down to lunch with a nice person, find them very agreeable and well informed on general subjects, then watch that same person take the podium and spout the most outrageous theories about Bacon and the Shakespeare works as if sanity were out of style!

On the other hand, one speaker worth listening to was D'Arcy O'Connor, author of the books "The Money Pit" and "The Big Dig". He spoke about three centuries of treasure-hunting on Oak Island off of Nova Scotia. Mr. O'Connor began by stating that he was not a Baconian, and that "for all I know, the Earl of Oxford may have been Shakespeare", upon which he received a jesting boo from one segment of the audience. Mr. O'Connor stated that the best theory about the 16th century pit and tunnels found on the island is that the Spanish dug them, though others seem to think that Sir Francis Drake had something to do with them. No one yet really knows why the excavations were done, though a California syndicate is supposedly going to sink up to ten million dollars starting in 1993 on the hope of finding out! Want to invest?

On a remotely possible connection to Bacon, Mr. O'Connor reported that there was mercury residue found in island pottery, and it may have been just coincidence that Bacon described experiments to preserve documents by

immersing them in mercury. Moreover, I was particularly struck by Mr. O'Connor's mentioning that Bacon had consulted with a "Cornish mining expert." As I told him after his speech, I remembered that during the 1590s the Earl of Oxford was performing official duties of an unknown nature which had him in Cornwall writing to Lord Burghley about Cornish Tin Mines. Trying to get into the Baconian mindset, I asked the question, "Might Bacon and his cousin Oxford have been conducting an excavation project together, maybe leading to Oak Island?"

Another feature of the conference which might be worth some praise was the play written by Paula Fitzgerald, I, Prince Tudor, Wrote Shakespeare. If its 4.5 hours would be cut by one third, I could recommend it as a thought-provoking exercise. I enjoyed the Radio Drama approach, where the actors read their parts as if doing a radio broadcast. However, I found it hard to believe the basic premise, which was that Shaxspere the supposed stage manager had a close and heart-warming relationship with Shakespeare the author, depicted as Bacon in disguise. Bacon was presented as the pen behind Ben Jonson's Sejanus and other "masks", and as having packed Hamlet with spiritual guidances.

When I finally obtained a half hour period to give my Oxfordian speech (originally scheduled to take much longer), I spent almost all of my time explaining that an eminent colleague had noted from the "Induction" to Taming of the Shrew that the author actually ridiculed Shaxspere by portraying him (through his pedigree) as Christopher Sly; whatsmore, the author placed himself in Shrew as the Italianate lord with his hunting retinue, Italian painting and play, etc. I was also able to say a few words about correspondences found in The Tempest by Georges Lambin in his Voyages de Shakespeare en France et en Italie, which was essentially the article of mine printed in the Summer 1993 SOS Newsletter. The audience was politely unenthused by my efforts.

Lest you think that Baconians are all mystical "New Agers", let me mention the excellent recent book of retired jurist Penn Leary, The Second. Cryptographic.Shake-speare (Westchester House, Omaha, NE, 1990) Mr. Leary privately deplores many Bacon fringe elements and was not at the conference. His book concedes that earlier Bacon cipher systems "found" by Ignatius Donnelly, Mrs. Gallup, Mrs. Bauer-Hall, and others have been debunked by World War II code-breakers William and Elizabeth Friedman in their definitive book The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined (Cambridge University Press, 1958). But, Mr. Leary maintains that many of Shakespeare's works appear to contain over a hundred examples of enciphered words (such as variants of Bacon's name) coded in a respectably straight-forward system originated by Julius Caesar. He believes this satisfies the Friedmans' requirements and he has even created an automated system so that anyone who wishes can search for the cryptograms themselves. He is persuasive in many regards (but I have my own doubts), and very informative on anti-Stratfordian issues of interest to Oxfordians. Should SOS wish to examine his system, perhaps arranging for modern cryptologists to evaluate it, Mr. Leary can be contacted at 402-391-0188.

But, you're wondering about the Burton Parish digs? Surprisingly little came up at the conference about the digs (or at the digs themselves, for that matter). Mrs. Fitzgerald was kind enough to supply me with news clippings. I read that in October 1992 the church had given-in to extremists who wanted an archeologist to excavate in the same location that illegal diggings had targeted since 1938. After excavating to at least the same level as prior digs, the crew sunk numerous bore holes down another 20 feet,

even sending one diagonally down at 45 degrees. But this has not been enough to satisfy extremists who say more of the diagonal bore holes should have been dug and two previously-undiscovered tombs should have been opened and dug beneath (Bacon's supposed spiritual guidances apparently justify trespass and desecration).

Unfortunately for the poor church, "Ascendant Master" Bacon is such a demigod to these extremists that even bedrock and depths of hundreds of feet are supposed not to have been beyond his secret technology (remember that all this vault nonsense was supposed to have been done by others for Bacon nearly a century after his death). Some speculate tunnels were dug from a ravine without having had to dig vertically down. Even if authorities nuked the whole area for blocks around, the extremists would no doubt be able to claim that an "error of calculation" had been made; they would continue absurd demands for digging nearby.

The radical Baconians' agenda is to continue to grab press attention whenever they can get it (and to peddle their weird literature on the side). It bothers them not at all that their antics smear all other anti-Stratfordians with unfair guilt by association. I for one get very tired of having to deny that I'm a Baconian every time I tell someone that I don't believe Shaxspere wrote Shakespeare's works. Ironically, these very peculiar people may have done more in the public mind for propping-up Shaxspere's feeble bones than any of the speculative biographies by "authorities" of the Stratfordian persuasion!

\* \* \* \* \*

#### THE SHAKESPEARE OXFORD SOCIETY PETITION CAMPAIGN

Members are encouraged to reproduce the petition on page 17 and vigorously circulate one or more. A wide range of people will sign such a petition which only seeks redress for an issue that involves academic freedom and intellectual honesty. A number have already signed, including:

Oxfordian Sir John Gielgud

Stratfordian Louis Marder-prior editor of The Shakespeare Newsletter

Oxfordian Michael Hart-author of "The 100, A Ranking of the Most Influential Persons in History"

Stratfordian Norrie Epstein-author of "The Friendly Shakespeare: A Thoroughly Painless Guide to the Best of the Bard"

Please mail to Charles Boyle, 208A Washington St., Somerville, MA, 02143. If you have any questions call him - (617)776-7782.



**THE SHAKESPEARE  
OXFORD SOCIETY**

We, the undersigned, petition the Shakespeare Association of America, in light of ongoing research, to engage actively in a comprehensive, objective and sustained investigation of the authorship of the Shakespearean Canon, particularly as it relates to the claim of Edward De Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford.

---

(signature)	(name - please print)
-------------	-----------------------

---

(address)	(city)	(state)	(zip)
-----------	--------	---------	-------

---

(occupation - affiliation)	(phone)
----------------------------	---------

---

(signature)	(name - please print)
-------------	-----------------------

---

(address)	(city)	(state)	(zip)
-----------	--------	---------	-------

---

(occupation - affiliation)	(phone)
----------------------------	---------

---

(signature)	(name - please print)
-------------	-----------------------

---

(address)	(city)	(state)	(zip)
-----------	--------	---------	-------

---

(occupation - affiliation)	(phone)
----------------------------	---------

---

(signature)	(name - please print)
-------------	-----------------------

---

(address)	(city)	(state)	(zip)
-----------	--------	---------	-------

---

(occupation - affiliation)	(phone)
----------------------------	---------

'Mock Trial' in Fanueil Hall  
1s Centerpiece of 17th Annual Conference

by Richard Whalen

More than 125 Oxfordians, one adamant Stratfordian and one sympathetic agnostic gathered in Boston for the 17th annual conference of the Shakespeare Oxford Society.

They heard and critiqued a variety of papers, learned that membership has increased to almost 500 thanks in large part to Lord Burford's lecture tour, and indulged in endless corridor gossip about the life and times of the 17th Earl of Oxford.

The most spectacular event was the public "mock trial" held at historic Fanueil Hall, thanks to the efforts of Elliott Stone. Sponsored and conducted with great skill by the Boston Bar Assn., the mock trial pitted Lord Burford, a descendant of Oxford and accomplished lecturer in his cause, against the adamant Stratfordian, Dr. Louis Marder, founder of the Shakespeare Newsletter and proprietor of a mammoth Stratfordian data bank. A U.S. District Court judge presided.

The jury of distinguished barristers and civic leaders voted 10-4 for the Stratford man. The majority apparently were not ready to switch their allegiance on the basis of a 45-minute presentation. Initially, Oxfordians were disappointed. Upon reflection, however, the consensus became more positive. More than a thousand people, who filled the hall, saw the strong case that could be made for Oxford. In fact, while the jury was out a show of hands in the audience indicated that those who said they came with an open mind (a small minority) decided 2-1 for Oxford. Another show of hands indicated that the audience was about evenly divided between Oxfordians and Stratfordians.

Perhaps most important, the leading prime time TV newscast in New England carried a balanced report, and the correspondent concluded by declaring himself, on camera, for Oxford. Charles Boyle, 2nd vice president, worked closely with the TV newsmen so that he had all the background he needed for his report, which was seen by millions.

Boyle hosted the conference on November 12-14 with Len Deming of Nashua, N.H., the society's treasurer. Boyle also produced and directed a performance of Twelfth Night by his Ever Theater, a production informed and enlightened by Oxfordian convictions. And Deming, an attorney, delivered a paper on "invalid logic and the slippery Stratfordians."

Dr. Marder, the adamant but genial Stratfordian, attended most of the conference sessions and exchanged views with the members, who generally enjoyed responding to his challenges. He also autographed copies of his 1963 book, His Exits and His Entrances: The Story of Shakespeare's Reputation.

The sympathetic agnostic was Norrie Epstein, author of the best-selling The Friendly Shakespeare, which includes several chapters on the authorship controversy. A university lecturer who majored in Shakespeare, she explained the reasons why the Stratfordian establishment finds it so difficult even to acknowledge the possibility of Oxford as the author. Her appearance drew questions for more than an hour; and several Oxfordians expressed their appreciation for her frank and helpful comments.

Other outstanding guest speakers included Michael Hart, author of The 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential Persons in History. Between the first and second editions of his book Hart switched from the Stratford man to Oxford and explains why in his preface. His speech at the Saturday night banquet

examined what he considers the greatest difficulty to accepting Oxford, namely the use of a front man in the person of Will Shakspere. Verily Anderson, author of The de Vere's of Castle Hedingham, came over from England for the conference; she supplied insights into the writing of her new book. And Derran Charlton, an archival researcher, also came from England for the conference. He offered some glimpses of work he has underway. Ruth Loyd Miller could not attend but sent a paper: "'Welcome, Guildenstern to Castle Hedingham', from Work on Oxfordian Sources of Hamlet".

An award for outstanding achievement was presented to Trudy Atkins of Greensboro, N.C. for her work arranging and coordinating speaking engagements for Lord Burford. She emphasized the opportunity for sponsors across the United States and Canada to invite Lord Burford to speak in their cities. "It's a wonderful experience," she said. "Everyone who has sponsored his talks has been very happy about the results." (She can be reached at 919/454-3516.)

Next year's conference will be held in October at Carmel, CA on the Monterey Peninsula in conjunction with Stephen Moore's Carmel Shake-speare Festival. The conference will be partly al fresco, with outdoor banquets and performances of Shakespeare plays by a successful theater group that is staunchly and openly Oxfordian.

\* \* \* \* \*

Gary Taylor in the Introduction to his Reinventing Shakespeare (1989) reports:

As an actor he (Shakespeare) needed to become only two or three characters per play; as a playwright he had to perform all the parts in his head, momentarily recreating himself in the image of each. He juggled selves....Like his characters, he played his part in family burials and marriages; he loaned money, bought property, invested venture capital, sued people, testified in court. He delighted civil audiences in an open-air theater in the suburbs; he deferred to rowdy crowds indoors at court. He doubled one set of commitments in metropolitan London with another set in provincial Stratford-upon-Avon, like two roles in one play, like plot and subplot, like art and nature. He embodied mutability.

Excerpts by Professor Louis Benezet from "Shakespeare Authorship Theories", an article in Grolier Encyclopedia (1950):

The Shakespearean plays indicate that the author was an aristocrat, at home in castle, palace, and court. Some 312 scenes were laid in haunts of nobility and gentry, 4 in middle class homes, and only 2 in hovels of the poor. He was a scholar who wrote idiomatic French and Italian and quoted Latin and Greek writers then untranslated into English. He was a traveler who knew France and Italy. Caroline Spurgeon, in Shakespeare's Imagery, 1935, listed the author's interests, from the figures of speech and allusions found in the plays: classical mythology, 260; sports and games (all aristocratic, e.g. bowling, tennis, hawking, and riding to hounds), 196; war and weapons, 192; seas and ships, 172; law, 124; drama, 74; and many in music and horticulture. The Sonnets show: law, 40; horticulture, 40; classical mythology, 28; war and weapons, 23; astronomy, 21; feudal chivalry, 18; ships and the sea, 17; painting, 17; healing and cures, 17; and hawking and riding, 8. Inanimate things often mentioned are glass, mirrors, jewels, and clocks, all restricted in Elizabethan times to homes of the aristocracy. The author has the aristocrats scorn of money and little understanding of the working classes, who are not represented in any of the plays by a single dignified character. They are "chaff and bran", "crows and daws", "greasy mechanics" with "sweaty nightcaps" and "stinking breath". Shakespeare was familiar with Cambridge University slang, knew 137 technical musical terms and the vernacular of the camp and the quarterdeck.

# CORRECTION

In W. Ron Hess' article "Certain European Researches into Shakespeare's French and Italian Connections" printed in the Summer (Vol. 29, No. 3A) Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter, two serious errors occurred on pg. 3 in the paragraph which begins with "Additionally" and ends with "death". Mr. Hess regrets having misquoted Charlton Ogburn on the subject of Oxford's son-in-law and the editing and revising of Shakespeare's works after 1604. He hopes that readers have not been misled. Mr. Ogburn has submitted to the editor the following words on the matter:

"In the Mysterious William Shakespeare [pg. 389] I say that if there are any 'verbal parallels' in The Tempest with Strachey's report of 1610, as claimed by E. K. Chambers, 'I should guess that they were put in by Derby in filling out a play left unfinished at the author's death in 1604.' I have never, as is stated in the Summer issue of the Newsletter, proposed the Earl of Derby 'Oxford's son-in-law (or some other) as editor and revisor of Shakespeare's works after Oxford's death' except in the sense that, as Ivor Brown surmises, references to 'historical events' may 'have been put in for topical effect during a revival..'"

The second correction to that paragraph involves an entire line of original text which was left out in printing the SOS Newsletter. The sentence which read "...regicide of King James I..." should have read "...regicide of Henri IV in 1610, after which he said it was presented before King James I..."

Therefore, Mr. Hess submits the following substitute paragraph:

"Pertly because of Ferdinand's sunset speech, Lambin theorized Tempest was written (some might say filled out) shortly after the regicide of Henri IV in 1610. Lambin further believed that Tempest was first presented before King James I on All Saint's Day in 1611. This dating would be difficult for Oxfordians, because Oxford died in 1604. Of course, some Oxfordians have filled out some of Shakespeare's works after Oxford's death."

Mr. Hess further hopes that the two errors in this important paragraph have not distracted the readers from understanding the crucial points of the article.:

- that Lambin's dating of The Tempest might be in error if we apply Lambin's own model of what the play was about;
- that Lambin's model claims Shakespeare the author analogized Marie de Medici as the sweet Miranda of the play;
- that such an analogy would have been almost impossible to conceive of much later than 1600 due to the power-hungry, non-sweet disposition that Marie/Miranda exhibited only a few years after her 1600 marriage to Henri IV/Ferdinand; and
- therefore, using this interpretation of Lambin's model, the analogizing of Marie de Medici as Miranda almost certainly would have occurred before 1604, allowing Oxford to have been the primary author of the play during its crucial formative stage.

Audiences for Lord Burford's Lectures  
Approach the 20,000 Mark

The scene was a hall at the Boston Public Library. The event was a lecture by Charles Vere Lord Burford on Oxford as the true author behind the pseudonym William Shakespeare. The problem was not enough room in the hall for everyone who wanted to hear Lord Burford's lecture. Fire marshals had to turn away several dozen people for lack of space after about 250 eager Shakespeareans filled the hall to capacity.

Launched several years ago before a capacity audience at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C. Lord Burford's lecture tour will have reached an estimated 20,000 people sometime in 1994. Plus hundreds of thousands more on television and radio. Among the other prestigious platforms have been the Players Club in New York City and the Strictly Shakespeare Society in Kansas City, where some 400 heard him speak.

Trudy Atkins of Greensboro, NC, a society trustee, has been the moving force behind the lecture tour in 1993 and 1994. She has encouraged society members to be sponsor/hosts for Lord Burford in their cities. And she coordinates the various schedules to make best use of his time.

Coming up in mid-January are appearances by Lord Burford in Washington, D.C. Virginia and Maryland, including the Washington Shakespeare Company, Woodberry Forest School and the Charlottesville chapter of the English Speaking Union. In late January and early February, Aaron Tatum of Jackson, TN will sponsor a return engagement before various audiences in Tennessee. The rest of February is open at this writing; in March Matt Wyneken of Grand Blanc, MI plans a series of platforms in Minnesota.

Still in the planning stages are appearances by Lord Burford in Albuquerque and Santa Fe, NM in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Shakespeare Assn. of America, in California under the auspices of the Shakespeare Authorship Roundtable and Carol Sue Lipman, at the Newberry Library in Chicago, at the Woodstock, VT Shakespeare Festival, at the University of Kansas at Lawrence and at the Philadelphia Free Library and the English Speaking Union there.

In addition, the Boston Public Library is considering a return engagement for Lord Burford - but this time in the main auditorium, which has several hundred more seats.

Trudy Atkins notes that the only major source of platforms for Lord Burford is individual society members who take the initiative and organize appearances in their cities. She can provide ideas for platforms, such as libraries, bar associations and literary societies; and she can provide a wealth of assistance in arranging speaking engagements for Lord Burford, handling logistics and generating publicity. The success of Lord Burford's lecture tour, however, is dependent on the efforts of Oxfordians who want to spread the word. Trudy Atkins promises them a rewarding experience. Her telephone numbers: Office (919) 454-3516; home (919) 299-0419.

THE CHAIRMAN'S CORNER: RING OUT THE OLD! RING IN THE NEW!!

At the 17th Annual Conference of the Shakespeare Oxford Society in Boston last month, Richard Whalen was elected President of the Society. After six momentous years which changed the course of our Society and saw its emergence into a truly international scholarly organization, Elisabeth Sears stepped down as President. What tremendous strides have been made during her period of leadership, which began at the moot trial before three justices of the U.S. Supreme Court in September, 1987!

Over the past six years our Society has experienced a tremendous metamorphosis. We are no longer a "Mom 'n' Pop" organization. We are truly international, and are providing the major leadership world-wide for the Oxfordian cause. For this growth and leadership we can thank Betty Sears who has often worked till she dropped and has never stinted in her efforts for the Society and what she has perceived to be our long term goals. Such leadership is seldom to be found, either in such high quality or such length of availability. And now she steps down -- but not out! Her efforts are only cranking up! She has bought a house in Cambridge which she will turn into our long-needed archives. We have had many Oxfordian collections offered to us, but heretofore have had no place where they could be stored, catalogued and offered to scholars for research. Now, thanks to Betty Sears, we HAVE such a place, and I predict that within a very short time the archives will take over Betty's world! How splendid that as a great encore to her leadership, she provides us with this fundamentally important asset to help assure our future growth and research! Brava! mille fois, Betty!!

We do not want to overlook the efforts of another officer of the Society who stepped down. Dr. Paul A. Nelson took over a treasury that was a disaster and did an heroic job in bringing order out of the chaos. He had to do it the hard way, since he did not have computer equipment available. With the enlistment of Len Deming as Assistant Treasurer, Paul supervised the transposition of our financial records to Len's computer. So now Paul has finished his task and the Society's financial and membership records are all coordinated for the first time ever. We owe Paul Nelson a great debt of gratitude for his conscientious efforts over the last several years. A vote of thanks must be offered as well to Ron Davies and Ralph Bota who proffered aid and advice for Paul's efforts. Jill Ross has been Len's strong right arm in the establishment of our new system and we could not let the occasion pass without a big "Thank you, Jill!!" to her.

I should like to express abundant thanks also to Ralph Bota. Because of the outstanding job he did selling Oxfordian merchandise at the Blue Boar Gifte Shoppe at the conference our Society's general fund will realize well over a thousand dollars profit.

I am delighted to report the election of four new Trustees: Tim Holcomb, Charles Burford, Lydia Bronte, and Sally Mosher. We look forward with great anticipation to their contributions to the efforts of the Society. Betty Sears and Paul Nelson, whose terms were expiring, were reelected.

And now a word about our new President. There is no one else in the Society who is as capable of leading us into the future as Richard Whalen. Richard is retired after a career as an executive with IBM, and I see in him a leader who will help to build the kind of bridges which will enable the increasingly large numbers of wavering Stratfordians to cross over into Oxford's Promised Land, with dignity and civility and without fear of recrimination. This is particularly important for those in the academic field, where such a transition is fraught with real dangers of many kinds, both from within and without their Stratfordian vested community.

It is a great responsibility which Richard shoulders. We are now better organized than we have ever been, and are on the threshold of exponential growth. The next few years will see us expand to well over a thousand paying members. There will be vast amounts of new information and Oxfordian Authorship evidence emerging from forthcoming books, pamphlets and articles. In addition, the future will see an even broader public awareness of the Authorship Controversy as plays, TV shows, and even movies concerning the 17th Earl of Oxford make their way through the mills. A number are already in the works. The coordination and exploitation of such an explosion of Oxfordian awareness will require great generalship, and Richard Whalen is the man who can provide it.

As I step down after three years as Chairman of your Board of Trustees, I feel that the torch has been passed to the most capable hands, and I wish President Richard Whalen -- and all of you -- the very best. It has been an honor to serve in such a cause. Ave atque vale! Verily!

Johnny Price

\* \* \* \* \*

To definitively acclaim what Johnny Price has accomplished for three years as the Chairman of The Board of the Shakespeare Oxford Society, I can only commandear quotations - sometimes paraphrased - from the plays of "William Shakespeare" (i.e., Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford):

What a piece of work (you are) how noble in reason how infinite in faculties, in form and moving how express and admirable...(Hamlet).

You greet with present grace and great prediction...you can look into the seeds of time. And say which grow will grow and which will not...(Macbeth).

A man of sovereign parts ...(you) are esteemed, well-fitted in the arts... (Love's Labour Lost).

(You) have brought golden opinions from all sorts of people. (Macbeth).

(You recognize) that it is most expedient for the wise...to be the trumpet of (your own) virtues (Measure for Measure).

(You) are a scholar, and a ripe and good one; exceedingly wise, fair spoken, and persuading (Henry VIII).

(We) will note you in our books of memory (Henry VI, Part One).

Morse Johnson

## **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.

### **DUES**

Student \$15.00

Annual Regular \$35.00

Sustaining \$50 or more

#### **Dues and requests for membership information to:**

Shakespeare Oxford Society, First Bldg., 71 Spit Brook Rd., #107,  
Nashua, N.H., 03060. Tel. (603) 888-1453 - FAX. (603) 888-5411.

#### **Submit materials for publication in the Newsletter to:**

Morse Johnson, Suite #819, 105 W. 4th St., Cincinnati, OH 45202

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

### **RENEWAL DUES FOR QUARTER-ANNUAL NEWSLETTERS PAYABLE BY JANUARY 31, 1994**

to

Shakespeare Oxford Society  
First Bldg., Spit Brook Road, #107  
Nashua, New Hampshire 03060