

Memorandum on Sources

Wildenthal, “The Strange Response to Winkler’s Book on Shakespeare”

by Bryan H. Wildenthal (July 20, 2023)

This “Source Memorandum” sets forth citations to sources supporting factual statements in the above-titled essay and provides some related discussion of various points. The sources and discussions below are organized according to the parts and page numbers in the printable and paginated PDF version of the essay.

Part 1. *A Strange Panic Attack?*

Page 1:

The essay responds primarily to three reviews of Elizabeth Winkler’s book, *Shakespeare Was a Woman and Other Heresies: How Doubting the Bard Became the Biggest Taboo in Literature* (Simon & Schuster, May 2023) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/198217126X>).

Isaac Butler, “Shakespeare Was Shakespeare” (*Slate*, May 11, 2023, <https://slate.com/culture/2023/05/shakespeare-woman-authorship-question-truthers.html>).

Sir Jonathan Bate, “Was Shakespeare Really a Woman? And Does Taylor Swift Know Him Best?” (*The Telegraph*, May 28, 2023, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/books/what-to-read/review-winkler-duncan-shakespeare-woman-juliet-bate>).

Emma Smith, “Shakespeare Sceptics Are the New Literary Heroes” (*The Spectator*, June 3, 2023, <https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/shakespeare-sceptics-are-the-new-literary-heroes>).

Winkler’s original article “Was Shakespeare a Woman?” (the basis for her book) was published by *The Atlantic* (online May 10, 2019, in print June 2019, p. 86) (<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2019/06/who-is-shakespeare-emilia-bassano/588076>).

Page 2:

Information about the affiliations and credentials of reviewers Butler, Bate, and Smith, and the background information about *Slate*, *The Telegraph*, and *The Spectator*, is easily googled in Wikipedia and other reliable online sources. Some of it is stated in “about the author” information on Amazon.com and similar sites. Winkler herself is a widely published journalist and book critic holding a master’s degree in English literature from Stanford University, but it did not seem necessary to say all that in the essay, as it is stated on the dust cover of her book, and her status as a journalist is generally acknowledged in published reviews of her book.

I am entirely sincere in stating that Butler, Bate, and Smith “command ... respect” as scholars and authors. Indeed, I own and admire a total of eight books by these three reviewers. I am especially fond of Bate’s *Shakespeare and Ovid* and *Soul of the Age*, both of which I constantly recommend to my fellow authorship skeptics.

See, by Bate:

Shakespeare and Ovid (Oxford University Press, 1993)
(<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0198183240>).

Soul of the Age: A Biography of the Mind of William Shakespeare (U.K. ed. Viking, 2008; U.S. ed. Random House, 2009) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1400062063>).

The Genius of Shakespeare (U.K. ed. Picador, 1997; 2d ed. Oxford University Press, 2008)
(<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0195372999>).

How the Classics Made Shakespeare (Princeton University Press, 2019)
(<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0691210144>).

By Smith:

The Making of Shakespeare's First Folio (Bodleian Library, Oxford University, 2015; now in a 2d ed. 2023 since I purchased the 1st edition years ago)
(<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1851245987>).

Shakespeare's First Folio: Four Centuries of an Iconic Book (Oxford University Press, 2016; 2d ed. 2023) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0192886649>).

By Butler:

The World Only Spins Forward: The Ascent of Angels in America (Bloomsbury, 2018)
(<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1635571766>)

The Method: How the Twentieth Century Learned to Act (Bloomsbury, 2022)
(<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1635574773>).

Part 2. *Ad Hominem Insults*

Page 3:

Ron Rosenbaum, "10 Things I Hate About *Anonymous* and the Stupid Shakespearean Birther Cult Behind It" (*Slate*, Oct. 27, 2011) (<https://slate.com/culture/2011/10/anonymous-a-witless-movie-from-the-stupid-shakespearean-birther-cult.html>).

Bate calls Winkler "cruel" because of her alleged badgering of Sir Stanley Wells while interviewing him, which is debunked later in the essay (pp. 16-17).

On the Holocaust denial comparison and other slanders (see also pages 6-7 of the essay, in the ***Early Doubts*** section), see:

Wildenthal, "The Snobbery Slander" (Shakespeare Oxford Fellowship, July 15, 2019, updated April 2021) (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/snobbery-slander>) (generally commenting on such slanders).

Stephen Greenblatt (Professor, Harvard University) (*New York Times*, letter to the editor, Sept. 4, 2005) (<https://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/04/opinion/shakespeare-doubters-826111.html>) (comparing Shakespeare authorship question or “SAQ” to Holocaust denial).

Matthew Reisz, “Shakespeare Studies Spat: Author and Journal Editors Feud Over Paper on Shakespeare’s Identity” (*Inside Higher Ed*, Sept. 10, 2014) (<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/09/11/controversy-over-articles-publication-renews-shakespearean-authorship-controversy>) (discussing comparison of SAQ to Holocaust denial by Florida State University Professor Gary Taylor, current Chair of the English Department there).

Oliver Kamm, “Conspiracism at *The Atlantic*” (*Quillette*, May 16, 2019) (<https://quillette.com/2019/05/16/conspiracism-at-the-atlantic>) (Kamm, a British journalist, comparing SAQ to Holocaust denial); same in Kamm, “We Must Denounce Insidious Theories About Shakespeare” (July 3, 2023, <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/we-must-denounce-insidious-theories-about-shakespeare-qcbs9spc9>).

Winkler’s book (pp. 17-18) discusses a comparison of the SAQ to Holocaust denial by Sir Jonathan Bate (Professor, Oxford University, now at Arizona State University), though the essay does not specifically mention this. Bate contends he was criticizing a specific authorship skeptic who he says did question the Holocaust, not framing a general comparison of authorship doubters to Holocaust deniers (as Greenblatt, Taylor, and Kamm clearly did).

Professor Greenblatt has reportedly apologized for his comparison, but only (to my knowledge) verbally and casually at one or more quasi-public events, never in print. He has never, to my knowledge, formally retracted his 2005 letter to the *New York Times*.

Taylor and Kamm have never, to my knowledge, retracted or apologized for their comparisons. Kamm, on the contrary, keeps eagerly repeating this outrageous slur.

With regard to Smith’s comment, quoted on page 3 of the essay, about “authorship scepticism ... espoused ... by actors,” the “ironies are stark” indeed.

Note that as discussed later in the essay (pages 12-13), Sir Jonathan Bate argues that to the extent actors embrace the traditional authorship theory and reject authorship doubts, we should respect their views, because of course as actors actually performing Shakespeare, they know the plays inside out. Bate’s formerly expressed belief that “no major actor has ever been attracted to” authorship doubts was a hilarious blunder, as the essay points out (pp. 12-13).

And yet, to the extent that some of our most famous and admired Shakespearean actors actually embrace (rather than reject) authorship doubts, Smith (and many others) have suggested that ... well ... they’re just actors, what do they know? Their authorship skepticism is thus to be snobbishly dismissed.

So let’s recap this dizzyingly contradictory set of views: When actors (as actors) support the traditional theory, they should be respected and we should all bow to their views. But when they question the traditional theory, we should disregard and disrespect their views. Am I the only one seeing a slight contradiction here? Can we spell “hypocrisy”? Can we spell “cognitive dissonance”? Not for nothing is this a major theme of the essay!

Page 4:

QAnon is regrettably common knowledge by now. For a useful summary and further citations, see the Wikipedia article on it (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/QAnon>).

Bate has publicly needled Waugh for allegedly being an aristocrat-loving snob on at least two occasions.

Bate's review of Winkler, in an admittedly funny passage, suggests that Waugh's Oxfordian views "might have something to do with his descent [via a grandmother] from ... the 17th Earl [of Oxford] himself." Bate notes that when Waugh was asked about this by Winkler (pp. 253-55), "[t]he unflappable Waugh" (Bate's words) "retort[ed] that he is also descended from [three other prominent authorship candidates] — "So I've got a choice, OK?" (Waugh's words quoted by both Winkler, p. 254, and Bate).

Previously, in a 2017 authorship debate on YouTube (<https://youtu.be/HgImgdJ5L6o>), Bate mocked Waugh as a "contrarian" and said Waugh and his family "love an aristocrat." Bate also labeled Oxfordians generally as "cultists."

Part 3. *Early Doubts: A Pseudonym Hiding in Plain Sight?*

Page 5:

My discussion of the reaction to the 2019 article is in my blog posting, "*The Atlantic* on Shakespeare in 2019" (July 10, 2023) (<https://profbhw.org/2023/07/10/atlantic-2019>).

On Sam Shepard's authorship doubts, see Jonathan Cott (interview), "Sam Shepard on Working With Dylan, Why Jim Morrison Has No Sense of Humor" (Rolling Stone, Dec. 18, 1986) (<https://www.rollingstone.com/culture/features/sam-shepard-the-rolling-stone-interview>).

My book, *Early Shakespeare Authorship Doubts* (2019), is available on Amazon (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1732716617>), and a Shakespeare Oxford Fellowship website article provides more information and links (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/new-book-explores-early-doubts-about-shakespeares-authorship>).

On Jonson's early doubts, and the many ambiguities in the 1623 First Folio, see my book (pp. 14-15 & fns. 34-36, pp. 54-55 & fn. 38, pp. 274-93, p. 339 fn. 48), and also, e.g.:

Diana Price, *Shakespeare's Unorthodox Biography* (issued in 2001 by mainstream scholarly publisher Greenberg Press; rev. 2012; <https://www.shakespeare-authorship.com>) (ch. 10, pp. 176-200) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0986032603>).

Chapters 10 and 11 (pp. 113-35) by John M. Rollett and Richard F. Whalen in *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt? Exposing an Industry in Denial* (John M. Shahan & Alexander Waugh eds. 2013) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1537005669>).

Alexander Waugh, "Jonson's 'Sweet Swan of Avon'" (*Oxfordian* 16, 2014, p. 97) (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/wp-content/uploads/Waugh.Swan-of-Avon.pdf>).

Katherine Chiljan, *Shakespeare Suppressed* (2011, rev. 2016) (chs. 8-9, pp. 137-71) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0982940556>).

On similar ambiguities in the Stratford Monument to Shakespeare, first installed some time between 1616 and 1623 and altered at various times in later centuries, see, e.g., chapter 12 (pp. 136-51) by Richard F. Whalen in *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt?* (2013); Price, *Shakespeare's Unorthodox Biography* (rev. 2012) (ch. 9, pp. 161-75); Chiljan, *Shakespeare Suppressed* (2011) (ch. 10, pp. 173-90); and Waugh, "Thy Stratford Moniment' — Revisited" (*De Vere Society Newsletter*, 21:3, Oct. 2014, p. 28; rev. 2015) (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/thy-stratford-moniment-revisited>).

Page 6:

Chiljan discusses the *Venus and Adonis* dedication in her 2015 lecture, "Origins of the Pen Name William Shakespeare" (<https://youtu.be/ezk1B-airWD>); see also Chiljan, *Shakespeare Suppressed* (2011) (pp. 27-31), and my 2019 book (pp. 49-50 & fn. 28).

On the relevant *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) definitions of "invention," as discussed in my 2019 book (p. 50 fn. 28), two definitions (3.b and 4) reflect its meaning as the artistic or creative faculty, presumably the intended surface meaning here. OED, v. 8, p. 40 (citations to 20-volume printed 2d ed. 1989).

While the OED does not explicitly cite the word "pseudonym," definition 2 equates "invention" with "[t]he action of ... contriving, or making up; contrivance, fabrication"; definition 6 (under heading II, a "thing invented") is "[s]omething devised; a method of action ... contrived by the mind; a device, contrivance, design, plan, scheme"; definition 8 is a "fictitious statement or ... fabrication"; and definition 9 is "an instrument ... originated by the ingenuity of some person."

The latter four OED definitions are supported by 16th-century illustrations, including two by Shakespeare. OED, v. 8, p. 40; see also *Henry VI, Part 3*, act 4, sc. 1 ("[King Edward:] What if both ... be appeased By such invention as I can devise?"); *All's Well That Ends Well*, act 3, sc. 6 ("[Bertram:] [W]ill [Parolles] make no deed at all of this that so seriously he does address himself unto? [French Lord:] None in the world; but return with an invention, and clap upon you two or three probable lies.").

Supporting the idea of "invention" as the *debut* of a pseudonym (or "contrivance," "fabrication," etc.) are two OED definitions obsolete today but supported by 17th-century illustrations: definition 10 ("[s]omething formally or authoritatively *introduced* or established") and definition 12 ("[c]oming in, arrival"). OED, v. 8, p. 40 (emphasis added).

The 1589 reference to *Hamlet* is by Thomas Nashe in his preface "To the Gentlemen Students of Both Universities" in Robert Greene's *Menaphon* (London: Sampson Clarke, 1589, rep. Edward Arber ed., London: Constable, 1895) (<https://books.google.com/books?id=TI4LAAAIAAJ>), discussed in my 2019 book (pp. 68-70); see also Chiljan, *Shakespeare Suppressed* (2011) (pp. 53-55). As my book comments (bracketed comment added here): "Orthodox scholars have ... concocted the convoluted and implausible theory of an earlier play by some other author, a play they call the "ur-*Hamlet*," allegedly a source or basis for Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and responsible for Nashe's and other "too early" references to *Hamlet*. [No one has ever discovered the slightest shred of evidence for any such "ur-*Hamlet*" play or whoever supposedly wrote it.] The simplest and most logical explanation for the early references to *Hamlet* is that the author we know as "Shakespeare" ... had already

written an early version of his masterpiece by then.... If there is any more blatant violation of Occam's Razor than the ur-*Hamlet* theory, at least in the field of literary history, an example does not readily come to mind."

On the "too early" references to Shakespearean works generally, see, e.g., Chiljan, *Shakespeare Suppressed* (2011) (pp. 49-67, 343-81).

Orthodox scholars have gone through remarkable contortions to deny or rationalize away the inexplicable silence during 1616 about the death of England's greatest writer. They try to claim in various ways that there were recognitions of him following his death, but what's fascinating is that even these arguments concede that none of these recognitions can be shown to date from 1616 (or during the immediately following years), and some do not even clearly relate to the Stratford man specifically, as opposed to being vaguely and generically about the famous author "Shakespeare" whose name (or pseudonym?) appeared on numerous publications.

See, e.g., Kathman, "Shakespeare's Eulogies" (undated article, <https://shakespeareauthorship.com/eulogies.html>) (on website edited by Kathman & Ross), and the brief and peculiar discussion in Professor James Shapiro's book *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?* (2010) (pp. 242-44) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1416541624>). Shapiro, for example, cites the 1619 "Pavier edition" of some Shakespeare plays, an apparently unauthorized publication that was not presented as a "memorial" to Shakespeare, contains not the slightest hint connecting the works to the Stratford man personally, and has no evident connection to his death three years earlier.

Regarding the Pavier edition and the 1623 First Folio (seven years after his death), my book comments (p. 8, fn. 17):

Neither had any clear linkage to [the Stratford man's] death in 1616, though [his death] may have cleared the way for the Folio's curiously elliptical suggestions of some connection to him. There are several vague lamentational references in the Folio prefatory materials to the author having died some time in the past. But the only specific reference offering any concrete clue [to the timing of the actual author's death] is the comment in the letter "To the great Variety of Readers" that the author was "by death" deprived of the opportunity "to have set forth, and overseen his own writings." That fits very well with Edward de Vere's death in 1604, when [the author] "Shakespeare" seems to have been in the midst of producing new or revised works, but is oddly inconsistent with [the actor] Shakspeare's retirement to Stratford for years during which he would have had ample leisure to collect and edit his writings.

The essay notes the "silence of 1616" issue at three points (pp. 6, 8, 15), because of its importance, and also (p. 16, quoting the Shakespeare Oxford Fellowship website) notes the puzzle of the Folio prefatory letter quoted above.

Orthodox writers, as far as I can tell, completely ignore the puzzle that Ben Jonson himself ignored the Stratford man's death in 1616, when Jonson published the massive folio of his own works just a few months later that very same year! As my book comments (pp. 54-55 fn. 38) (edited slightly here):

It is curious that Jonson — so particular about the spelling of his own name [as his orthodox biographers have discussed, he made an apparently conscious decision to drop

the original third letter “h” and stuck very consistently to that afterward] — spelled the name “Shakespeare” once like that and once hyphenated as “Shake-Speare” (double-capitalized), in the only two references to that person or author in the entire 1616 folio of Jonson’s own *Works* — published just months after the death of [the actor] Shakspeare of Stratford. Jonson seems to have taken great care in editing his [1616] folio. Also strange is that each reference merely lists Shakespeare as a cast member in two Jonson plays when performed many years earlier (among the few published references to him as an actor before 1623).

Only six other names in Jonson’s folio are set forth in hyphenated, double-capitalized form: the comic characters “Brane-Worm,” “Shoo-Maker,” “La-Foole,” and “Love-Wit,” and the epigram targets “Court-Parrat” and “Poet-Ape.” John Shahan has highlighted this fascinating and telling point; see also Price, *Shakespeare’s Unorthodox Biography* (rev. 2012) (pp. 65-66).

While the Jonson folio was published just months after Shakspeare died and included epigrams praising many other people, including both writers and actors, Jonson made no explicit reference whatsoever to Shakespeare (however spelled) apart from the two cast lists — no acknowledgment of him, for example, as a fellow playwright or poet.

Stranger still, even orthodox scholars have speculated that Jonson’s satirical epigram to “Poet-Ape,” written years earlier and chosen by Jonson for publication in the 1616 folio, might implicitly comment on Shakespeare (or perhaps, doubters would suggest, only on Shakspeare the theatre shareholder and actor, not on the author). If so, it suggested that Shakspeare (the actor) was a huckster who bought, stole, rewrote, and plagiarized plays. See, e.g., Price, *Shakespeare’s Unorthodox Biography* (rev. 2012) (pp. 87-90).

If the Stratfordian theory were valid, why would Jonson, in 1616, coldly ignore Shakspeare’s death, merely cite his name without comment in two cast lists, and even worse (it appears), mock a recently deceased and widely admired fellow writer? ... Jonson may have felt some rivalry with Shakespeare, but under Stratfordian assumptions this reaction ... makes Jonson look implausibly mean, small, and silly — and seems wildly inconsistent with Jonson’s extravagant praise seven years later (in the 1623 First Folio of Shakespeare’s works) for “my beloved, The AUTHOR,” “Star of Poets,” “Soul of the Age!” etc. Suffice it to say that the 1616 Jonson folio poses quite a mystery, like so much else about Jonson.

Bate, in the course of a 36-page chapter devoted entirely to the authorship question in his book *The Genius of Shakespeare* (U.K. ed. Picador, 1997; 2d ed. Oxford University Press, 2008) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0195372999>) (2d ed. 2008, pp. 65-100), does not even bother to mention the silence of 1616 or any of these puzzles relating to Ben Jonson, whom Bate falsely depicts as providing only clearcut testimony in support of the traditional authorship theory.

It appears that many orthodox writers would simply like the puzzle of 1616 to go away and be forgotten.

On early doubts during the decades postdating 1616, through the end of the 1700s, and into the early 1800s, see Julia Cleave’s excellent article, “Seeing Double: Early Doubters of Shakespeare’s Identity” (*De Vere Society Newsletter*, 21:2, May 2014, p. 32); see also my 2019 book (p. 2 fn. 3, p. 15 & fn. 37, pp. 27-30, 34-37).

Professor Shapiro's 2010 book generally denies any early doubts about Shakespeare's authorship before the 1850s. But then he strangely contradicts himself (p. 20), conceding that there were in fact expressed doubts during the late 1700s, which he weakly dismisses on implausible grounds. Later in his book (pp. 234-37), he discusses some additional even earlier references (1592-1605), which in fact raise authorship doubts, though he doesn't seem to realize this. In the course of these discussions, he makes a number of misleading, puzzling, and self-contradictory statements, as my 2019 book discusses (pp. 34-37).

Shapiro's response to Winkler's 2019 article appears in *The Atlantic*: "Shakespeare Wrote Insightfully About Women. That Doesn't Mean He Was One." (June 8, 2019, <https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2019/06/shakespeare-was-not-woman/590794>).

Oliver Kamm's ad hominem screed to which Shapiro's *Atlantic* article links is entitled "Conspiracism at *The Atlantic*" (*Quillette*, May 16, 2019, <https://quillette.com/2019/05/16/conspiracism-at-the-atlantic>).

Page 7:

Kamm's *Times* column is "We Must Denounce Insidious Theories About Shakespeare" (July 3, 2023, <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/we-must-denounce-insidious-theories-about-shakespeare-qcbs9spc9>).

The essay's comment, that "there's no evidence that the traditionally credited author or anyone in his family ever personally claimed that he wrote anything literary at all," may strike many readers as surprising, but no orthodox scholar has ever claimed to the contrary. That's because, quite simply, there is no such evidence.

Shapiro's "double falsehood" about the spelling of the name appears in his 2010 book (p. 227). It is debunked in an article by David Kathman on the *Shakespeare Authorship* website edited by Kathman & Ross: "The Spelling and Pronunciation of Shakespeare's Name" (undated article, <https://shakespeareauthorship.com/name1.html>); see also "Chronological List of References to Shakespeare as Author/Poet/Playwright" (undated article, <https://shakespeareauthorship.com/name3.html>).

Kathman, like Shapiro, is a staunchly orthodox scholar and harsh critic of Shakespeare authorship doubts and doubters. Shapiro's 2010 book (p. 281) praises the Kathman & Ross website as providing "a point-by-point defense of Shakespeare's authorship." But Shapiro did not seem to notice that the two cited articles on this website refute his own false statements about the spelling of the author's name. My 2019 book (pp. 43-45) discusses this and some related problems in both Shapiro's and Kathman's scholarship.

Part 4. A Frontman By Any Other Name?

Page 7:

The non-rarity of the "Shakespeare" name (and all its variations) is discussed in Samuel Schoenbaum's classic orthodox biography, *William Shakespeare: A Compact Documentary Life* (Oxford University Press, rev. ed. 1987) (pp. 12-13) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0195051610>).

The point about the first name “William” (or variants like “Bill” or “Will”) being used by around one fifth of all Englishmen during Shakespeare’s time, appears in the following two orthodox scholarly works: Margreta De Grazia, “The Scandal of Shakespeare’s Sonnets,” originally published in *Shakespeare Survey* (v. 46, 1994, p. 35), reprinted (p. 89) in James Schiffer, ed., *Shakespeare’s Sonnets: Critical Essays* (1999); see De Grazia (1999 reprint, p. 111 fn. 56), citing Paul Ramsey, *The Fickle Glass: A Study of Shakespeare’s Sonnets* (1979) (p. 23).

The point about John Shakespeare, bitmaker for King James, is discussed in the classic orthodox work by Edmund K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems* (Oxford University Press, 2 vols., 1930) (v. 2, p. 153) (also discussing the work of another orthodox scholar, Charlotte Stopes).

On the three Englishmen of the time named John Davies, see my 2019 book (p. 48 & fn. 24) and Bate, *Soul of the Age: A Biography of the Mind of William Shakespeare* (U.K. ed. Viking, 2008; U.S. ed. Random House, 2009) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1400062063>) (U.S. ed. 2009, pp. 217, 233-36, 250, 460). My 2019 book (pp. 149-51, 202-18, 262-72) discusses the two poets by that name and the authorship doubts they expressed.

Page 8:

On the March 1595 record of payment for December 1594 performance at court of unspecified plays, to Shakespeare of Stratford, Richard Burbage, and William Kempe, as players or shareholders of the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, see Price, *Shakespeare’s Unorthodox Biography* (rev. 2012) (pp. 15, 31-32) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0986032603>); see also Chambers, *Facts and Problems* (1930) (v. 1, pp. 62-63).

Winkler’s discussion of the 1592 reference in *Greene’s Groats-Worth of Wit* (pp. 37-41) is persuasive and shifts my own former view more firmly to the conclusion that it simply does not relate to Shakespeare at all (compare my 2019 book, pp. 71-112).

On the Elizabethan-Jacobean era as a “golden age” for pseudonyms, see, e.g., Archer Taylor & Frederic J. Mosher, *The Bibliographical History of Anonyma and Pseudonyma* (University of Chicago Press, 1951). See generally *Anonymity in Early Modern England: “What’s in a Name?”* (Janet Wright Starner & Barbara Howard Traister eds., Ashgate, 2011) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/113827545X>).

The “apocryphal” works of Shakespeare are easily explored on Wikipedia and sources cited therein.

Tom Regnier’s cited article is “Why Would Anyone Need to Fake Shakespeare’s Authorship?” (posted on the Shakespeare Oxford Fellowship website, Feb. 8, 2020, <https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/why-would-anyone-have-needed-to-fake-shakespeares-authorship>).

Sources for the points on the silence of 1616, Ben Jonson, and the First Folio are set forth above in relation to page 6 of the essay.

Pages 8-9:

The Davies of Hereford poems are discussed in my 2019 book (pp. 202-18, 262-72). For the original sources, see the following postings on the *Shakespeare Documented* website (“An

Online Exhibition Documenting Shakespeare in His Own Time”), Folger Shakespeare Library, <https://shakespearedocumented.folger.edu>).

Microcosmos: The Discovery of the Little World, With the Government Thereof (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1603), excerpted in Alan H. Nelson, “*Microcosmos: John Davies of Hereford Alludes to Shakespeare*” (<https://shakespearedocumented.folger.edu/exhibition/document/microcosmos-john-davies-hereford-alludes-shakespeare>)

Humour’s Heaven on Earth: With the Civil Wars of Death and Fortune, as Also the Triumph of Death (1609), excerpted in Alan H. Nelson, “*The Civile Wars of Death and Fortune [Humour’s Heaven on Earth]: John Davies of Hereford Alludes to Shakespeare*” (<https://shakespearedocumented.folger.edu/exhibition/document/civile-wars-death-and-fortune-john-davies-hereford-alludes-shakespeare>).

The Scourge of Folly (London: Richard Redmer, c. 1610-11), excerpted in “*The Scourge of Folly: John Davies of Hereford Praises William Shakespeare*” (<https://shakespearedocumented.folger.edu/exhibition/document/scourge-folly-john-davies-hereford-praises-william-shakespeare>).

The Davies of Hereford poems are also discussed (very briefly and misleadingly, as the essay comments) in Bate’s book *The Genius of Shakespeare* (2d ed. 2008, p. 71).

With regard to the Folger Library link to the Davies *Scourge of Folly* epigram, I offered this comment in my 2019 book (pp. 266-67):

The Folger Shakespeare Library subtitles its posted excerpts of *Scourge* on the *Shakespeare Documented* website as: “John Davies of Hereford Praises William Shakespeare.” This posting, unlike those in which the Folger provides excerpts of *Microcosmos* and *Humour’s Heaven*, is not accompanied by any explanatory essay. But, as suggested by Price’s analysis, the subtitle alone is tendentiously misleading — to the point of surrealism.

How is it “praise” for Davies to directly imply — in the very title of No. 159 — that Shakspeare is a fake writer covering for someone else? Or, leaving that aside, not to even mention in the epigram (much less “praise”) anything to do with his supposed literary career? Or to suggest he would have enjoyed more honor if only he had not misbehaved in some obscure ways? True, No. 159 does say he’s not prone to “railing” and has “a reigning Wit” and some “honesty.” Thank goodness for small favors!

As Price documented, quoting numerous other epigrams in *Scourge*, Davies knew perfectly well how to really “praise” people when he wanted to, with entirely lucid and flowery language. As Price put it [*Shakespeare’s Unorthodox Biography* (rev. 2012), p. 63]: “If Davies intended [No. 159] to be complimentary, why did he write cryptic copy?” The whole thing “suggests uncomplimentary satire.”

Part 5. *Shaky Evidence*

Pages 10-11:

The anonymous Parnassus plays are discussed in my 2019 book (pp. 167-85) and in several other studies, both orthodox and skeptical. The original plays are reprinted in William D.

Macray, ed., *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus With the Two Parts of the Return From Parnassus* (Oxford University Press, 1886) (<https://books.google.com/books?id=khAMAQAAlAAJ>). See *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* (c. 1598-99) (“Parnassus 1”), rep. in Macray (p. 1); *The Return From Parnassus* (Part 1 of *Return*) (c. 1599-1600) (“Parnassus 2”), rep. in Macray (p. 25); *The Return From Parnassus, or The Scourge of Simony* (Part 2 of *Return*) (c. 1601; orig. pub. London: John Wright, 1606) (“Parnassus 3”), rep. in Macray (p. 76).

The plays in the late 1700s raising early Shakespeare authorship doubts are also alluded to on page 6 of the essay and are discussed in Cleave’s article, “Seeing Double: Early Doubters of Shakespeare’s Identity” (*De Vere Society Newsletter*, 21:2, May 2014, p. 32), in Shapiro’s 2010 book (p. 20), and in my 2019 book (pp. 27-30, 34-37).

Part 6. Reasonable Doubts

Page 11:

The “Declaration of Reasonable Doubt About the Identity of William Shakespeare,” sponsored by the Shakespeare Authorship Coalition (SAC), founded by John Shahan, has been posted online since 2007 (<https://doubtaboutwill.org>).

The names of many famous doubters may be found on the SAC website above, though it does not happen to mention Malcolm X, Helen Keller, David McCullough, or Abel Lefranc.

See, e.g., Malcolm X & Alex Haley, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (1965, Ballantine rep. 1973) (p. 185 and generally ch. 11) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0345350685>).

On Keller, see, e.g., “Helen Keller, Shakespeare Skeptic” (Perkins School for the Blind Website) (<https://www.perkins.org/stories/helen-keller-shakespeare-skeptic>).

McCullough wrote a laudatory foreword (p. x) to Charlton Ogburn’s classic skeptical account, *The Mysterious William Shakespeare: The Myth and the Reality* (issued by the major mainstream publisher Dodd, Mead, in 1984; rev. ed., EPM Publications, 1992) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0939009676>).

Lefranc co-founded the skeptical Shakespeare Fellowship in 1922 (see <https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/the-shakespeare-fellowship-english-news-letter-1937-1958>), following his earlier publication of a major study promoting the theory that “Shakespeare” was a pseudonym for William Stanley (Earl of Derby). See Lefranc, *Behind the Mask of William Shakespeare* (orig. pub. in Paris in French, *Sous le masque de William Shakespeare*, 2 vols., 1918-19), reprinted and translated by Cecil Cragg in 1988 and by Frank Lawler in 2022 (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/BOBCZNNMQW>).

On doubters on the U.S. Supreme Court, see, e.g., Jess Bravin, “Justice Stevens Renders an Opinion on Who Wrote Shakespeare’s Plays” (*Wall Street Journal*, April 18, 2009, p. A1) (<https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB123998633934729551>), and my article, “The Oxfordian Era on the Supreme Court” (2016, rev. 2020, available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2834349> and <https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/end-of-an-oxfordian-era-on-the-supreme-court>).

Felicia Hardison Londré, Curators' Distinguished Professor Emerita of Theatre at the University of Missouri, reviewed Winkler's book favorably for *The Village Voice*, "The Lady Doth Protest Too Much for Traditionalists" (June 13, 2023, <https://www.villagevoice.com/2023/06/13/the-lady-doth-protest-too-much-for-traditionalists>). Professor Londré, an Oxfordian, has edited what appears to be the leading published collection of scholarly articles on *Love's Labour's Lost: Critical Essays*, published by Garland Reference Library of the Humanities in 1997 and reprinted by Routledge in 2001 (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0815338880>).

Following is a partial list that I have prepared of other credentialed professional academics who have publicly stated doubts about Shakespeare's authorship, just within the closely relevant fields of literature, theatre, and the humanities. (I myself am a law professor not within those fields, albeit a scholar whose published work on legal history has been cited in two U.S. Supreme Court decisions; and my work has included challenges closely analogous to studying Shakespeare or any archaic literature: namely, how to interpret and contextualize such writings and figure out how they were understood by their contemporaries.)

Roger A. Stritmatter (Ph.D.), Professor of Humanities, Coppin State University (Baltimore):

Stritmatter accomplished two historic firsts, as the first person to earn a Ph.D. in a field directly relevant to Shakespeare studies, and to obtain a tenured faculty position in such a field, while openly embracing the Oxfordian perspective. He has been a prolific Shakespearean scholar for more than 30 years, publishing numerous articles in leading mainstream peer-reviewed journals, including *Review of English Studies*, *Shakespeare Yearbook*, *Notes and Queries*, *Critical Survey*, and *Cahiers Élisabéthains*.

Stritmatter is co-author (with Lynne Kositsky) of *On the Date, Sources, and Design of Shakespeare's The Tempest* (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0786471042>) (McFarland, 2013), which has earned well-deserved praise from mainstream scholars and refutes the argument that *The Tempest* could not have been written prior to 1604. He is also co-author, with acclaimed British writer Alexander Waugh, of the forthcoming *New Shakespeare Allusion Book*. His 2001 Ph.D. thesis, *The Marginalia of Edward de Vere's Geneva Bible*, a modern classic and *tour de force* of Shakespearean scholarship, explores parallels between biblical references in the works of Shakespeare and hundreds of hand-marked verses in the personal copy of the Geneva Bible owned by de Vere (17th Earl of Oxford) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1517306957>).

Also (in alphabetical order) (some details may no longer be current):

Professor Jeff Abell (M.Mus.), Associate Professor of Art and Art History, Columbia College (Chicago) (interdisciplinary artist and writer and editor for numerous publications).

Professor Michael Delahoyde (Ph.D.), Washington State University (Pullman).

Professor Ron Song Destro (M.F.A.) (Kennedy Center award-winning playwright and theatre producer; directed and taught in theatre programs at several schools, including as Assistant Professor of Theatre at Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Tex., and at Brooklyn College, N.Y., and University of Bridgeport, Conn., among others;

founding director of the Oxford Shakespeare Company, which offers training and free lectures on acting and authorship and presents free Shakespeare plays throughout the world, including on-location sites such as Birnam Wood for *Macbeth* and Bosworth Field for *Richard III*).

Professor Emeritus Ren Draya (Ph.D.), Blackburn College (Carlinville, Ill.).

Professor Alice Knox Eaton (Ph.D.), Springfield College (Springfield, Mass.) (Professor of English and Chair of the Department of Humanities).

Professor Sky Gilbert (Ph.D.), University of Guelph (Ontario) (retired) (award-winning writer, director, and film-maker; co-founder and artistic director for 18 years of Buddies in Bad Times Theatre in Toronto, North America's largest gay and lesbian theatre).

Professor Patricia Keeney (M.A.), York University (Toronto) (poet, novelist, and theatre and literary critic, with more than a dozen books published).

Associate Professor Theresa Lauricella (M.A.) (Program Coordinator for Theatre and Music, Clark State Community College, Springfield, Ohio).

Professor William Leahy (Ph.D.) (Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs and Civic Engagement, and former Head, School of Arts, Brunel University, London).

Professor James Norwood (Ph.D.), University of Minnesota (retired) (taught theatre and humanities for more than 25 years).

Professor Anne Pluto (Ph.D.), Lesley University (Cambridge, Mass.).

Professor Emeritus Don Rubin (M.A.), York University (Toronto) (former chair, Department of Theatre; series editor of Routledge six-volume *World Encyclopedia of Contemporary Theatre*; managing editor of *Critical Stages (CS)*, a peer-reviewed, mainstream, online scholarly journal published by the International Association of Theatre Critics).

Professor Emeritus William Rubinstein (Ph.D.), Aberystwyth University (Wales) (formerly with Australian National University, Canberra, and Deakin University, Victoria, Australia).

Professor Emeritus Jack M. Shuttleworth (Ph.D.), Brigadier General, U.S.A.F. (retired) (served as Professor of English, Head of the English Department, and Chair of the Humanities Division, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo., and as President of the Association of Departments of English).

Professor Daniel L. Wright (Ph.D.) (deceased 2018) (Professor of English for many years at the former campus of Concordia University in Portland, Oregon, where he was also Director of the former Shakespeare Authorship Research Center).

There is a vast literature on the case for Edward de Vere (Earl of Oxford) as the potential true author of the Shakespearean works. A convenient summary with links to additional summaries (both shorter and longer), and key books on the subject, is on the Shakespeare

Oxford Fellowship (SOF) website (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/top-reasons-why-edward-de-vere-17th-earl-of-oxford-was-shakespeare>). See also the SOF “Authorship 101” page (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/discover-shakespeare>).

The major biography, “*Shakespeare*” by *Another Name: The Life of Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, the Man Who Was Shakespeare* (2005), issued by mainstream publisher Gotham Books (a division of the Penguin Group), and written by Mark Anderson (now known as Margo Anderson), is also extremely useful (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1592402151>).

The biography by Professor Alan H. Nelson, an orthodox scholar tendentiously hostile to the Oxfordian theory and to Oxford himself, *Monstrous Adversary: The Life of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford* (Liverpool University Press, 2003), is also useful though very biased and flawed (see links and critical reviews collected at <https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/4-reviews-of-monstrous-adversary-by-alan-nelson>).

The first biography of Oxford (somewhat dated, with some errors that have since been corrected, but also very valuable) has recently been republished in a scholarly edited and annotated edition: Bernard M. Ward, *The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford: 1550-1604* (1928) (James A. Warren ed. 2023) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/B0C1J1PBJG>).

Winkler’s interview is in *The Guardian* (David Smith, June 27, 2023) (<https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2023/jun/27/elizabeth-winkler-shakespeare-was-woman-author>).

Pages 12-13:

On the contradictions between Bate’s former take on the authorship views of actors (and our apparent duty to defer to them as actors as long as they endorse the traditional Stratfordian theory), and the contemptuously dismissive attitude of Emma Smith (and many other defenders of orthodoxy) toward actors who dare to question the traditional theory, see discussion above in this Source Memorandum relating to page 3 of the essay.

Part 7. Cognitive Dissonance and Conspiracy Theories

Page 13:

The subject of Shakespearean “co-authorship” or “collaborators” is vast and complex.

The *New Oxford Shakespeare* (2016), with its radical claims of co-authorship, has been the subject of many critical reviews, e.g., Pollack-Pelzner, “The Radical Argument of the New Oxford Shakespeare” (*New Yorker*, Feb. 19, 2017) (<https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/the-radical-argument-of-the-new-oxford-shakespeare>).

See especially Dudley, Goldstein & Maycock, “All That Is Shakespeare Melts Into Air” (*Oxfordian* 19, 2017, p. 195) (https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/wp-content/uploads/TOX19_Dudley_Goldstein_Maycock_Review.pdf).

As Winkler notes (pp. 312-13), more recent studies have suggested that it amounts to “pseudoscience” which some English professors have too quickly and uncritically embraced because they “lacked the mathematical knowledge” to understand or properly use the computer-based “stylometric” techniques involved. The Shakespeare Oxford Fellowship has

posted a useful short article summarizing the numerous problems with such stylometric claims and arguments (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/the-stylometrics-debate-continues-online-three-articles-from-the-oxfordian-now-posted-on-the-shakespeare-oxford-society-website>).

Pages 13-14:

Smith's 2012 article co-authored with Maguire is summarized by a press release from Oxford University (<https://www.ox.ac.uk/news/2012-04-25-shakespeares-co-author-revealed>), entitled "Shakespeare's Co-Author Revealed" (after more than 400 years, apparently!). The Smith-Maguire article was published in the *Times Literary Supplement*, April 20, 2012.

A blistering critique by Sir Brian Vickers and Marcus Dahl (*TLS*, May 11, 2012), stated in part that Smith and Maguire

record that only one previous critic anticipated them [in identifying Middleton as co-author of *All's Well That Ends Well*], John Dover Wilson. That ought to have given them pause, for to follow the path of the Grand Disintegrator [Wilson] so many years after his methods have been discredited is to risk a similar fate. When faced with some aspects of a Shakespeare play that he didn't like or understand Wilson was always ready to postulate some "inferior dramatist" or the relic of "an old play" as the explanation. For *All's Well* the fiction of a dramatist who ... "had a passion for sententious couplets and a mind running on sexual disease" conveniently excused Shakespeare It is rather shocking to find such antiquated attitudes taken seriously, after four decades' scholarship has established authorship attribution as a serious discipline.

Although Maguire and Smith do their best to detach *All's Well* from its place in Shakespeare's canon, treating it as an isolated and suspect oddity, it has many links with the undoubtedly Shakespearean parts of *Measure for Measure*. Both have the basic plot structure of tricking a man who has reneged on a marriage contract (Angelo, Bertram) into consummating it by sleeping with the woman he has forsaken, the so-called "bed trick"; both have a lesser character (Lucio, Parolles) whose deceit and corruption are exposed; both feature women of exceptional virtue and strength of character (Helena [in *All's Well*], Isabella and Mariana in *Measure*).

Maguire and Smith attempt to dissolve the standard classification of *All's Well* as a "problem play," alongside *Measure for Measure* and *Troilus and Cressida* (in all three a sexual relationship is consummated during the action), and christen it a Middletonian prodigal-son comedy, although Bertram neither wastes his inheritance nor returns to be forgiven....

Trying to fit this play into a Middletonian mould, Maguire and Smith reduce Helena to "a strumpet" and convict the virtuous Countess of Roussillon (Bertram's mother) and [the] Widow, both women who help Helena to get her man, of "essentially bawd-like activities," downgrading them to the level of some of Middleton's "pragmatic mothers." To produce such unsympathetic readings of Shakespeare's heroines is a high price to pay for the claim of co-authorship.

The new disintegrators' case ignores existing scholarship, and misinterprets what evidence they do cite....

Page 14:

Some orthodox scholars question the reality of the “aristocratic stigma of print.” But it is supported by one of the leading works of literary criticism published during the Elizabethan era, *The Art of English Poesy* (anonymous; widely attributed to George Puttenham) (London: Richard Field, 1589), reprinted in 1869 (Edward Arber ed.) (<https://books.google.com/books?id=ThEJAAAAQAAJ>), and as *The Art of English Poesy by George Puttenham: A Critical Edition* (Frank Whigham & Wayne A. Rebhorn eds. 2007) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0801486521>); see 2007 ed., p. 112 & fn. 56 (book 1, ch. 8), and p. 149 (book 1, ch. 31); see also Diana Price, “The Mythical ‘Myth’ of the Stigma of Print” (2002) (<https://www.shakespeare-authorship.com/?page=stigma>).

Page 15:

Jonson’s “Poet-Ape” is thought to have been written some time between 1595 and 1612 and is one of only three poems Jonson is known to have written in the form of a Shakespearean sonnet. It was first published as Epigram No. 56 (p. 783) in *The Works of Benjamin Jonson* (1616). A facsimile of Jonson’s 1616 folio available on the University of Pennsylvania library website (<https://colenda.library.upenn.edu>); enter “Jonson” and “Works” into the “search” field.

Sources documenting and discussing the vast array of evidence supporting the Oxfordian theory are set forth above in relation to page 12 of the essay.

Specifically, as to early “published references hinting at links between [Oxford] and the works of Shakespeare,” my 2019 book discusses (and cites and quotes many other sources on): Harvey’s pamphlet *Pierce’s Supererogation* (1593) (pp. 130-32); Edwards’s *L’Envoy to Narcissus* (1593) (pp. 136-39); Covell’s *Polimanteia* (1595) (pp. 144-49); Hall’s *Virgidemiarum* (1597-99) (pp. 151-53); Meres’s *Palladis Tamia* (1598) (pp. 154-63); Weever’s *Epigrams* (1599) (pp. 164-67); the second *Parnassus* play (1599-1600) (p. 170 fn. 345); Chettle’s *England’s Mourning Garment* (1603) (pp. 199-202); the preface to *Troilus and Cressida* (1609) (pp. 252-61); and Peacham’s *Minerva Brittana* (1612) (pp. 272-74). Some of these hint generally that the author of the Shakespearean works was a nobleman; several hint at Oxford specifically.

As my 2019 book summarizes this documented historical evidence (p. 308), “we [see] suggestions like this again and again and again — pointing to pseudonymity, to plagiarism, to a frontman, to an aristocratic author, to an author ‘stained’ somehow by mysterious disgrace, to an author denied due honor, to an author who laments that his ‘name’ will ‘be buried’ forever, ‘forgotten,’ and that he, ‘once gone, to all the world must die.’”

All of this fits strongly with Oxford (see generally pp. 308-18 of my 2019 book).

Pages 15-16:

Sources for the points on “too early” references to Shakespearean works, on the author’s apparent death years before the Stratford man died in 1616, and on the peculiar silence of 1616 itself are set forth above in relation to page 6 of the essay.

On the evidence for authorship by, or sourcing in the writings of, Sir Thomas North, see, e.g., independent scholar Dennis McCarthy's website on the subject (<https://sirthomasnorth.com>); McCarthy's book co-authored with respected orthodox (at least formerly orthodox?) Professor June Schlueter, *Thomas North's 1555 Travel Journal: From Italy to Shakespeare* (Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2021) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1683933079>); respected reporter Michael Blanding's book, *North of Shakespeare: A Rogue Scholar's Quest for the Truth Behind the Bard's Work* (Hachette, 2021) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0316493244>), republished in paperback as *In Shakespeare's Shadow: A Rogue Scholar's Quest to Reveal the True Source Behind the World's Greatest Plays* (Hachette, 2022) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0316493279>); and, most recently, Dennis McCarthy, *Thomas North: The Original Author of Shakespeare's Plays* (self-published, 2022) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/B0BM3KV3M4>).

A useful book review, by Michael Hyde (of Blanding's book, but with various links to McCarthy's books and website too), was published on the SOF website on May 24, 2021 (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/blanding-north-hyde-review>).

On the 1609 Sonnets dedication (and reference to the "ever-living poet"), as my 2019 book summarizes (pp. 242-46, quoting part of the discussion here):

What does "ever-living" mean? Quite simply, it means the author Shakespeare was dead in 1609, seven years before the death of Shaksper of Stratford. There is very little, if any, reasonable doubt about this. As Diana Price among many has pointed out [*Shakespeare's Unorthodox Biography* (rev. 2012), pp. 153-54], this compound "adjective is synonymous with immortal and [is] used," almost always, "to describe deities, non-human entities, or dead persons" — almost never (if ever) to describe a living mortal person.

As Price noted, "the Oxford English Dictionary's first illustration of the term 'ever-living,' as applied to a human being," is drawn from Shakespeare's *Henry VI, Part 1*: "our scarce-cold conqueror, That ever-living man of memory, Henry the Fifth." [See OED, v. 5, p. 464, def. 1.b.] [Price] noted that Richard Brome's poem, in the 1647 folio of plays by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, refers to "the memory of the deceased, but ever-living Author ... Fletcher."

On whether any Shakespearean works have been proved to have been written after 1604, the dating scheme provided by a leading scholarly collection of the works, *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare* (Viking Penguin, Alfred Harbage ed. 1969) (p. 19), provides estimated date ranges for first performance (and thus necessarily composition) of Shakespeare's plays extending back before 1604 for every single play except for *The Tempest* and *Henry VIII*. Everyone agrees *Henry VIII* shows signs of "co-authorship" (or posthumous revision or completion), most likely by John Fletcher, which would easily explain any evidence of post-1604 completion or revision in that case. This could also apply, actually, to any number of other plays, given the widespread insistence of orthodox scholars themselves on extensive "co-authorship" of the Shakespeare canon, so they themselves would appear to have undermined their own favorite "1604 argument" against the Oxfordian theory.

As for *The Tempest*, the Stritmatter-Kositsky book cited on page 12 of this source memo, *On the Date, Sources, and Design of Shakespeare's The Tempest* (issued by respected mainstream

academic publisher McFarland in 2013) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0786471042>), has proven that a post-1604 date for that play is not compelled or even likely. The book has been favorably reviewed in a mainstream Shakespearean journal, as cited by the Shakespeare Oxford Fellowship (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/oxfordians-tempest-book-gets-favorable-mainstream-review>).

The Stritmatter-Kositsky book thoroughly debunks the idea that *The Tempest* necessarily draws upon William Strachey's account of the 1609 Bermuda wreck of the *Sea Venture* (which was not published until 1625 anyway). Even if this might still be viewed as a possible inference, it is now clearly well within the zone of reasonable doubt and debate. The so-called "1604 objection" can no longer properly be cited as a "silver bullet" justifying out-of-hand dismissal of the Oxfordian theory. The foreword to the book (pp. 1-6) by former *New York Times* reporter William S. Niederkorn is especially worth reading. He comments (p. 1):

In the field of Shakespeare studies, there are two factors that impede progress. One is credulous allegiance to eroded scholarship. The other is quasi-religious fervor for biographical dogma. These two tendentious impulses have had unfortunate consequences for academic discourse. They are, obviously, the underlying reasons why Roger Stritmatter and Lynne Kositsky, whose initial ... work on the dating ... of *The Tempest* was published in the top-tier Oxford [University Press] journal *The Review of English Studies*, were denied the right to respond to attacks that followed in other academic journals, and why in the same injurious spirit their acceptances as speakers at two major academic conferences were rescinded.

Niederkorn's foreword also comments (p. 6):

If the idea that Shakespeare took the subject matter for a play from obscure colonial reports like those of the 1609 [Bermuda] storm were not sanctioned by tradition and were today proposed for the first time, orthodox scholars would dismiss the notion as absurd.... The evidence ... shows that a far more likely source for Shakespeare's New World inspirations was Richard Eden's 1555 translations of accounts of the first discoverers and navigators of America

The Shakespeare Oxford Fellowship website sets forth the two chronological points quoted on page 16 of the essay (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/discover-shakespeare>) (scroll down to near the end of the page, under "So Who Wrote Shakespeare? Meet Edward de Vere (Oxford)," Point #10: "1604: Not a Problem").

Part 8. Misrepresenting Facts

Pages 17-18:

The candid acknowledgment by Sir Stanley Wells, the acknowledged dean of orthodox Shakespearean academics, Professor Emeritus at the University of Birmingham and Honorary President of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, that there is no clear evidence from the Stratford man's lifetime connecting him personally to the works of "Shakespeare," is highlighted in my 2019 book (pp. 3-4).

The Wells concession appears in his essay, "Allusions to Shakespeare to 1642" (p. 73; his relevant statement is at p. 81), which is the centerpiece of the most systematic book-length scholarly effort ever published to debunk and lay to rest for all time the Shakespeare

authorship question: *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt: Evidence, Argument, Controversy* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), co-edited by Wells himself and Paul Edmondson (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1107603285>).

It is a handsome volume, printed on very high-quality paper and graced by an attractive cover photograph — depicting, rather ironically, the actor Joseph Fiennes portraying a concededly fictionalized version of the Bard in the Hollywood fantasy film *Shakespeare in Love* (1998).

As my 2019 book discusses (pp. 43-44 & fn. 9), one of the oft-cited essays in the Edmondson-Wells collection, David Kathman’s “Shakespeare and Warwickshire” (p. 121), has been thoroughly debunked. See Ros Barber, “Shakespeare and Warwickshire Dialect” (*Journal of Early Modern Studies* 5, 2016, p. 91) (<http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-18084>). The essays by both Wells and Kathman (see pp. 81, 125) alter relevant spellings in historical documents without notifying readers, even using deceptive quotation marks implying the altered versions are the originals, as noted in *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt?* (Shahan & Waugh eds. 2013) (pp. ii-iii, 13).

Page 18:

Diana Price’s related point, that this undeniable paucity of literary evidence connected to the Stratford man during his lifetime is extremely unusual, compared to virtually all other significant Elizabethan and Jacobean writers, is documented in her book *Shakespeare’s Unorthodox Biography* (rev. 2012, pp. 309-22; see also her website with related updates and materials, <https://www.shakespeare-authorship.com>). A good example of many false orthodox claims that this paucity is actually typical for writers of that era is in Wells’s 2013 essay cited above (p. 87).

Professor Lukas Erne, an exceptionally candid and thoughtful Shakespearean scholar (though still, oddly, an orthodox Stratfordian), has broken from most of his colleagues by conceding and anticipating Price’s basic point. As noted in my 2019 book (pp. 6-7), Erne stated in 1998:

“With possibly no other English author [than Shakespeare] is there a greater discrepancy between the scarcity of extant historical documents that reliably deal with the author’s life” — much less, Erne might have added, his literary career — “and the precision with which biographers have tried to trace his life.” Erne admitted “this has created a gap between how much” we really know about Shakespeare “and the inferences that can be drawn ... with a reasonable degree of certainty Apocryphal stories have contributed their share”

Quoting Erne, “Biography and Mythography: Rereading Chettle’s Alleged Apology to Shakespeare,” *English Studies* 79:5 (1998), p. 430; see specifically pp. 438-39.

Pages 18-19:

Winkler’s cited letter responding to Bate’s review appeared in *The Telegraph* on June 1 (<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/2023/06/01/letters-tory-mps-have-forgotten-the-values-they-represent>). Convenient word searches of the entire Shakespeare canon, using the word-finding function in any standard web browser, may be conducted at a website containing the full text of the works (<https://shakespeare.mit.edu>). The reference to a “gondola” in *The Merchant of Venice* is in act 2, scene 8. The reference to a “gondolier” in *Othello* is in act 1, scene 1. The references to the Rialto in *Merchant* are in act 1, scene 3, and act 3, scene 1.

Bate's shameless obduracy on the issue of Venetian canals and gondolas in Shakespeare is staggering to behold. What is it with this guy, anyway?

Five weeks after he was figuratively caught with his pants down by Winkler's June 1 *Telegraph* letter, in an obvious (though unacknowledged and highly evasive) response to Winkler, Bate took up the issue again in an article in *The Times* of London ("Who Really Was Shakespeare? Our Expert Separates the Fact From the Fiction," July 7, 2023, <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/who-really-was-shakespeare-our-expert-separates-the-fact-from-the-fiction-zjj3x5892>). (The more forthright and gentlemanly approach would have been to openly concede he was responding to and engaging with Winkler's letter, but never mind.)

Without acknowledging Winkler, or her June 1 correction of his embarrassing blunder on this point in his May 28 *Telegraph* review of her book, Bate stated in *The Times* on July 7:

"Shakespeare wrote two plays set in Venice without mentioning a canal and he thought that 'gondola' was merely the Italian word for 'boat', which is why in *As You Like It* he placed one (on the Avon?) in the Forest of Arden, home of his mother, Mary Arden."

One's head spins. Let us try to sort out the various misleading and tendentious evasions packed by Bate into this one sentence.

First of all, it remains true that Shakespeare does not literally and explicitly use the word "canal" in *The Merchant of Venice* or *Othello*. For reasons Winkler and I have noted, that is irrelevant and clearly does not prove or even reasonably support the point Bate is trying to make (that the author was "ignorant" of the canals and by implication never traveled to Venice).

Note that Bate, on July 7, very carefully does not repeat his May 28 claim that the author was "ignorant" of the canals. Bate retreats to the very minimal (and essentially meaningless) point that neither play explicitly "mention[s]" the word "canal."

A further sidenote: Right after the above-quoted sentence in his *Times* article, Bate desperately grabs for the fig-leaf that "[i]t is ... just possible that early in his career [the Stratford man] was ... in a touring company" that might have traveled to continental Europe. This is a far-fetched speculation devoid of any known documentary support, to which even most orthodox scholars do not give much credence given the extreme expense, dangers, and political restrictions of travel outside England for anyone except high-ranking aristocrats, diplomats, spies, and their attendants. Of course, I would not be surprised to see Bate and other Stratfordians speculate that Shakspeare of Stratford was a manservant to some such traveler during his convenient "lost years"!

Returning to the point: Did the author, as Bate claims, think "gondola" was merely the Italian word for "boat"?

Let's take a look at the well-known early modern Italian-English dictionary by John Florio, who was born to Italian emigrant parents in London in 1552, then grew up in continental Europe, returning to England at age 19 where he lived out his life and career as a fascinating and distinguished scholar and translator (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Florio). Florio, *A World of Words* (Italian-English dictionary) (London: Edward Blount, 1598, rep. Georg Olms Verlag, 1972) (<http://www.pbm.com/~lindahl/florio1598>) (rev. & rep. as *Queen Anna's New World of Words*, 1611) (<https://books.google.com/books?id=5MlKAAAACAAJ>).

Both orthodox and skeptical Shakespearean scholars tend to think Florio must have been well-acquainted with whoever wrote the Shakespearean works (which show obvious knowledge of Italian). Indeed, orthodox advocates sometimes suggest Florio could have been the source for the author's obvious knowledge of Italy (though that is implausible for various reasons; as a boy, Florio lived for some years in Soglio in northern Italy but mainly in areas now part of modern Germany and France).

The generic modern Italian word for "boat" is "barca," and indeed, not surprisingly, Florio's 1598 dictionary (p. 39) translates "barca" as a "bark," "boat," or "barge."

Florio also translates "gondola" (p. 153) as "a kind of small boat like our [Britain's] wherries used in Venice" ("wherry" is a common British term for a light boat). Keep in mind that Florio, by 1598, certainly considered himself an Englishman and loyal subject of Queen Elizabeth, albeit of Italian derivation.

Thus, it is extremely unlikely that the author Shakespeare (whoever that was) "thought that 'gondola' was merely the Italian word for 'boat'." The author obviously knew perfectly well that "gondola" was (as it is today) a word for a specific type of Italian boat known to be "used in Venice."

And what in the world does Bate mean by suggesting that *because* the author (allegedly) thought "gondola" was merely a generic Italian word for "boat," that is (in Bate's words, my emphasis) "*why* in *As You Like It* he placed one (on the Avon?) in the Forest of Arden, home of his mother, Mary Arden."

If in fact the author did set *As You Like It* in a forest in England, "why" indeed would he have used an Italian word for "boat"? Much less a word that he obviously must have known referred specifically to a type of Italian boat "used in Venice"?

Perhaps you, like me, suspect there's something "rotten in Denmark" with regard to Bate's reasoning, and his reading of *As You Like It*.

The reference to "gondola" in *As You Like It* appears in act 4, scene 1 (as I see from a quick word search of the full text available online, <https://shakespeare.mit.edu/asyoulikeit/full.html>).

Without (cross my heart and hope to die) recalling or knowing anything ahead of time about what the play or this edition says about the issue (I am typing this in real time as I look all this up), I now turn to my Arden Shakespeare edition of *As You Like It* (Third Series, Bloomsbury, 2006) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1904271227>), edited by Juliet Dusinberre.

Turning to the beginning of act 4 (pp. 286-88), I first note with amusement Rosalind's comment to Jaques (line 21, p. 287): "I fear you have sold your own lands to see other men's." Oxfordians have long noted this line describes precisely what Oxford himself did when he traveled to continental Europe (mainly northern Italy) during 1575-76. Jaques is viewed by most Oxfordians as, in part, a self-representation by the author.

Could this have something to do with Rosalind's reference to a "gondola" just 13 lines later in her conversation with Jaques (line 34, p. 288)? The reference comes at the end of this statement by Rosalind to Jaques (who, the stage direction indicates, exits just before she makes the utterance, presumably as or right after he departs):

“Farewell, Monsieur Traveller. Look you lisp and wear strange suits; disable all the benefits of your own country; be out of love with nativity and almost chide God for making you that countenance you are, or I will scarce think you have swam in a gondola.”

Now ask yourself, does this really sound, as Bate claims, like a straightforward “place[ment]” of the gondola “in [an English] Forest of Arden,” perhaps even “on the Avon”? (Note how desperate Bate is to reach for some connection to the Stratfordian author’s home town.)

Rosalind *explicitly* refers to Jaques as a “Traveller.” She says she won’t believe (“will scarce think”) that he has ever been “in a gondola,” *unless* he adopts a foreign “lisp” and “wear[s] strange suits,” *unless* he “disable[s] all the benefits of [his] own country” and forsakes his “nativity” (place of birth).

Based on the context of this scene (selected by Bate, mind you, to prove whatever point he was trying to make), and Florio’s dictionary (which I’m guessing Bate did not bother to consult), it seems pretty clear the author was well aware that “gondola” was (and is) a specifically Venetian term for a boat, and that he puts this reference in Rosalind’s mouth precisely to add *to the sense of foreignness* conveyed by her entire statement to Jaques (and probably tying into the preceding line about Jaques “hav[ing] sold [his] own lands,” precisely as Oxford did *in order to travel to Venice and other Italian cities*, “to see other men’s [lands]”).

So even stipulating Bate’s claim that the author placed the characters here in an English “Forest of Arden” (having something to do with the Stratford man’s mother), this is clearly an artful and sardonic (not literal) reference by Rosalind to a *foreign* (and specifically *Venetian*) “gondola”!

And what is Bate’s ultimate point anyway? Boat, gondola, call it what you will (by any other name it would smell as sweet), what are boats doing in the middle of a city, in both *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*, unless the author was *not* “ignorant” but actually very well aware of the canals? Again, as Winkler said in her June 1 response (the gist of which Bate simply ignores): “What does [Bate] think the gondolas [or ‘boats’ if he prefers] mentioned in those plays travel upon?”

I wrote a letter to the editor of *The Times* on July 8, the very day after Bate’s article appeared, pointing out the fallacy of his (implicit but obvious) response to Winkler on this point. *The Times* ignored my letter, as they have ignored and refused to publish multiple letters submitted by authorship doubters in response to an on-going rampage of pro-Stratfordian articles in *The Times*, mocking and attacking Winkler’s book and authorship doubters in general. I suspect this will only get worse in Britain’s national “paper of record” as we approach the 400th anniversary in November of this year of the First Folio of Shakespeare. They are circling the wagons and fiercely (even angrily) defending their chosen Stratfordian hero. At least *The Telegraph*, the main competitor of *The Times*, was willing to publish Winkler’s June 1 letter and, on June 9, a letter in response to Bate’s May 28 review by authorship doubters Sir Derek Jacobi and Sir Mark Rylance) (<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/2023/06/09/letters-country-needs-sensible-strategy-achieving-net-zero>).

Keep in mind that Oxfordians and other authorship doubters do not contend that merely setting plays in Venice, or referring to gondolas or the Rialto (or knowing about the canals in general), prove the author must have traveled there. In theory, an author who never left

England might have been able to learn quite a bit from someone like Florio (or just from reading his dictionary), or from some other traveler. What suggests the author actually did travel to Italy and other parts of continental Europe is, as the essay notes, the “intimate” and seemingly firsthand “knowledge” the works reveal “of many far more obscure details of ... geography, art, and culture.” These details really do not seem like things an author would pick up at a local English pub while knocking back a few drinks with someone who traveled to or used to live (long ago) in Italy.

Now, finally (before putting the canals and gondolas to bed), let us explore Dusinberre’s Arden edition further on the location of this mysterious Forest of Arden. Is the play *As You Like It* actually set in an English forest?

Even before consulting Dusinberre, I was vaguely aware (as best I could recall) that this is a popular Stratfordian conceit, but that an alternative reading is that the setting is better understood as the Forest of Ardennes (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ardennes>), which Wikipedia helpfully describes as “a region of extensive forests, rough terrain, rolling hills and ridges primarily in Belgium and Luxembourg, extending into Germany and France.”

And indeed, Dusinberre notes (p. 48): “Scholars have debated whether” the setting “is [the presumed Stratfordian] Shakespeare’s own Warwickshire Forest of Arden, or the Ardennes in Flanders (first suggested by Malone). Lodge’s *Rosalynde* offers a third location, north of Bordeaux, which he also calls ‘Ardennes.’” (Edmond Malone (1741-1812) was one of the earliest scholarly editors of the works of Shakespeare. Thomas Lodge’s *Rosalynde* is a 1590 prose novella viewed by many scholars as a key source for the play.)

You can read for yourselves Dusinberre’s excellent summary of the issue (pp. 46-52), and draw your own conclusions. I will just note that two of the three proposed locations for the forest are in continental Europe, not England. The only basis to think it might be in Warwickshire depends, in the first place, on acceptance of the Stratfordian theory. Nothing about the play itself suggests that.

As Dusinberre notes (p. 48), the author of *As You Like It* “is at pains to stress the Frenchness of the court in Act 1.” She also notes several other ways in which the “play embraces the literary and chivalric resonances of the Ardennes in France.” Furthermore (pp. 48-50): “If uncomfortable parallels could be drawn between Frederick’s court and Elizabeth’s, the French setting would be useful as a stalking-horse under the presentation of which the dramatist might, like the jester (5.4.104-5), shoot his wit with impunity.”

In an especially lovely and enlightening passage (p. 50), Dusinberre notes that this forest “has become a Shakespearean myth. Even the name of the Arden edition salutes it... Rooted in Elizabethan culture” — but query, *was* it entirely, or did it largely reflect the author’s travels in continental Europe? — “the Forest of Arden in *As You Like It* has grown, like the biblical mustard-seed, into a vast tree which casts shadows over other cultures and other times. The setting of a play, it transcends the theatre. All the world is its stage.”

Page 19:

Waugh’s chapter, “Keeping Shakespeare Out of Italy,” appears in *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt?* (Shahan & Waugh eds. 2013) (p. 72). Additional links to research documenting the connections between the Shakespearean works and Italy are provided on the Shakespeare Oxford

Fellowship website (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/review-of-richard-roes-shakespeares-guide-to-italy-huffington-post>).

The documentary evidence that Oxford had youthful Latin lessons, after his father died when he was 12 and he became a ward of Queen Elizabeth under the custody and supervision of Sir William Cecil (later Lord Burghley), is cited in both the leading orthodox and Oxfordian biographies: Nelson, *Monstrous Adversary* (2003, pp. 37, 448 & endnote 17); Anderson, *“Shakespeare” by Another Name* (2005, pp. 21-22, 435).

For Schoenbaum’s discussion of the “dangerous” weakness of the alleged parallel in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* to the “Welsh” schoolmaster in Stratford, see *William Shakespeare: A Compact Documentary Life* (Oxford University Press, rev. ed. 1987) (pp. 67-68).

Pages 19-20:

On the Will Sonnets (and related bawdy implications), see discussions in my 2019 book (pp. 181-84, 247-51), in Bate’s *The Genius of Shakespeare* (2d ed. 2008, p. 72), and in Bate’s *Soul of the Age* (U.S. ed. 2009) (pp. 353-59). See also Bate, “Who Really Was Shakespeare? Our Expert Separates the Fact From the Fiction” (*The Times* of London, July 7, 2023, <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/who-really-was-shakespeare-our-expert-separates-the-fact-from-the-fiction-zjj3x5892>) (recycling his absurd argument based on the Will Sonnets).

Waugh’s discussion of Sonnet 136 (one of the “Will” Sonnets) is in his chapter “My Shakespeare Rise!” in *My Shakespeare: The Authorship Controversy* (William Leahy ed. 2018) (ch. 3, p. 47; see p. 71) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/1911454544>).

Page 20:

Sources on evidence for the Oxfordian theory are set forth above in relation to page 12 of the essay. Links to additional sources on the cited parallels are provided on the Shakespeare Oxford Fellowship website (<https://shakespeareoxfordfellowship.org/poetic-justice>). Sources on evidence for the North theory are set forth above in relation to page 16 of the essay.

The evidence for Bate needling Waugh for allegedly being an aristocrat-loving snob is set forth above in relation to page 4 of the essay. Bate’s comment that “it’s terrific that someone from an ordinary background can get to be a great writer” occurs two minutes into the 2012 documentary film *Last Will. & Testament* (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/B09WJBTR8C>).

Part 9. Obsessive Details

Page 21:

Kamm’s “insidious” reference is in the title of his column cited in relation to page 7 of the essay (“We Must Denounce Insidious Theories About Shakespeare” (July 3, 2023) (<https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/we-must-denounce-insidious-theories-about-shakespeare-qcbs9spc9>).

Part 10. *Why We Should Care*

Page 22:

Background on the Klein quotation often misattributed to Gandhi is provided by Wikipedia (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicholas_Klein).

The quotation from Chiljan about the importance of knowing the true author is from her book *Shakespeare Suppressed* (2011) (p. 340) (<https://www.amazon.com/dp/0982940556>).