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The present DIO volume is not our first adventure2 in bringing math & science to bear on wider culture. E.g., proving that “key-Liberated” 12-tone music is actually 29 times less free than tonal: www.dioi.org/mus.htm#frtc.

We start Dennis Rawlins’ BardBeard with a raw compilation (§A1) of nothing but generally-agreed-to FACTS, unadorned with DIO interpretation. (An approach suggested by the eminent astronomer Myres Stanshill of CalTech & DIO.) This immediately shows: [1] Nothing more is required to make the Shakespeare mystery’s solution self-evident. [2] Marlowe is the sole authorship candidate whose case’s power is made clear in merely a single paragraph, because Marlovianism’s central evidence is clear & sparse, while those of Stratfordians & other cults are opaque, complex, & sprawling.

1See §§M11-M12. In 1633 playwright T.Heywood deemed Marlowe “the best of poets in that age”.
2Some skeptics discern (fn 58) surprisingly sparse evidence of WS as actor. On the stage.
3Chronology at §M5f.
4 §§M5k&S23. Colleague T.Kyd’s recent fatal ordeal (§M7) made torture a quite tangible prospect.
5§M11. For the Walsinghams’ epochal rôle in world history, see below at §Z1.
6Extensive details provided & more cited at §§N2k&S19.
7Possible actual identity: fn 122.
8§E12.
10Discussion at §Q.
11§F3.
12See §N2 (& §D84); three spy-ring pals (Poley, Skeres, & “killer” I.Frizer) were sole body-identifiers.
13§E16.
14Admitted even by #1 antiMarlovian Nicholl: fn 30; see §§D7, E17, T13; fn 45. Thus §J1.
15Declaration by “Shakespeare” that Venus & Adonis is his 1st work: §S2. Strat asstent: fn 30.
16Simple math: §C2. At §F19, watch this probability slaughter its feeble Strat odds-comparison.
17See §S3 for top Stratfordian’s asstent to this.
18See, e.g., EncycBrit at §J10.
19Strats insist (fn 173) WS completed school, only by wrongly thinking no disproof exists: §J3.
20§F5.
21§I9&L12.
22 §§J8&U16.
23§T26.
A2 WHY IT MATTERS

Did the passionate youth who immortally composed [Marlowe Hero & Leander]
Who ever loved, that loved not at first sight?
and dreamt of Trojan Helen from time-affar [Marlowe Doctor Faustus 5.1]
Was this the face that launched a thousand ships
And burnt the topless towers of Ilium?
later invent 24 “playwright” Wm. Shakespeare and project his own suicidal damned-exile 25 despair into the entray of a dying prince? [Hamlet 5.2]
O good Horatio, what a wounded name
Things standing thus unknown, 26 shall live behind me!
If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart,
Absent thee from felicity awhile,
And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain,
To tell my story.

B Solution by Detective Induction or Religious Heritage?

Before getting into the (quite literally) intriguing details behind our opening paragraph §A1, we confront what is likely to be the 2nd question (after §§G11 does-it-matter?) many readers will have: why is a science journal presuming to evaluate the Shakespeare mystery?

B1 Literati are naturally the most passionate commentators on the Shakespeare Controversy, a circumstance which has had the unfortunate consequence of ensuring that they virtually own it — in firm books, the press, encyclopedias, & coffee-table paper-weights. Nearly all are (or had-better §T6 profess to be) “Stratfordians” or “Strats”, i.e., those who support the authorship of Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon. (Sure that their nose for style swats Marlowe & we couldn’t have been WS.) So what are scientists doing, invading their turf? How can a scientific approach (§X) contribute to solution of the Shakespeare controversy?

B2 Inductive Police & P.C.Police. The answer is — as we’ve already seen in just one compact paragraph (§A1) — that there are here enough data of a non-literary nature — historical documents, medical and probabilistic matters, testimonies, dated events — as to render the Shakespeare authorship issue, generally speaking, a police mystery more than a literary one (§X30). Also: a philosophy of science puzzle (§E35) — where an ingenious (non)murderous fraud has long been suspected to have occurred, as well as heresy-persecution of an immortal writer because of much-ahead-of-his-time heresy on religion & maybe §P5 for promoting gov’t-verboten views on immigration & ethnicity, issues that still (in today’s yet-proscriptive P.C. world) inspire intolerance of free speech.

B3 When a painting is stolen from a museum, who is to blame? 28 to solve the crime, artists or cops? I.e., the WS mystery is a Detective case, too-long misfiled under Literature.

B4 Such considerations reflect the attitude of DIO, a journal of scientific history — which has already successfully detected and (www.dioi.org/hoa.htm#ptjm) undone more historical science hoaxes than any journal, ever, thereby restoring deserved credit to true creators (www.dioi.org/jus.htm), what DIO sometimes calls: doing justice to ghosts.

24Fn 136
25 §U22. On suicide, see iconic Hamlet (3.1): “To be, or not to be”.
27 At §P4 we detect the tope anti-Marlovian scholar misdating Marlowe’s final theatrical premiere through his own calendric naïvete, thereby undermining the theory he bases on it.
28 Though, of course, listening to contributions from every side is not only fair but wise.

DIO will not stoop to the Stratfordians’ practice (e.g., §§T3&U14) of suppressing, censoring, and harassing dissenting material — and will be grateful (e.g., §§E17&K13) not partisan for what scholarly contributions (e.g., §§E17&N15) Stratfordians have made and will continue to make to the controversy.

C No-Contest Odds-War: Are Strat Style-Noses 99.999% Reliable??

C1 A stark example of scientific thinking vs cultist insensitivity-immunity to (or innocence of) probability-math is central to the Marlowe-Shakespeare controversy, so we present it right up-front. Which is the more unlikely proposition of the two that follow:

[1] A powerfully-connected, brilliant fictionist-schemer-spy (§J7) found a way to escape highly imminent torture & death? Or [2] It’s nothing but a pair of coincidences that:
(a) During Marlowe’s maturity (c.3000d) his arrest & “brawl” were (§M5) 12d apart, and
(b) During the c.9000d (1586-1611) when CM or WS wrote, the gap between CM’s vanishing and WS’s debut (by V&A’s publication) was also less than 2 weeks: 13 days ($§1$).

C2 Segue-Squared. Simple division (3000d/12d, 9000d/13d) shows that the odds against each of §item[2]’s coincidences are several-100s-to-1. Equally simple multiplication (standard probability-computation) 29 shows their joint odds to be roughly 100,000-to-1. I.e., the probability of the three key 1593 Spring events’ mutual rapid-fire occurrence by mere chance is less than a 10th of a percent OF a percent. Another way to put this: it is 99.9999% certain 30 that the slimness of the two time-gaps between those three key events just cited (arrest, “death”, WS-onset) is not accidental. (In 1973, DR expressed [Peary at the North Pole: Fact or Fiction? p.263] similar disbelief at a flock of temporarily-overnight coincidences in Richard Byrd’s pat official report of his 1926 “North Pole” flight. The 1996 finding of Byrd’s diary data verified fraud: see DIO’s verdict at N.Y Times 1996/5/9 p.1, & www.dioi.org/vols/wal0.pdf [DIO 10 (2000), co-published with Univ. of Cambridge].

C3 Besides ongoing media-dominant pseudo-confident papal-bullowing, how can the Church of Latterday Stratfordians fend off its End-Time by convincing the sane fractions of academia and the general public that the odds are higher than 100,000-to-1 against [a] Marlowe’s survival, and-or [b] the possibility of unreliability in delicate, semi-arbitrary (§§U13) word-frequency-tests that for decades have attempted gauging the relation of WS & Marlowe’s writing styles? How can either Stratfordian argument even begin to compete with §C2’s plain, uncomplicated 100,000-to-1 coincidence, which any educated person can understand for himself (without resort [§Z6] to choosing or having to trust purportured experts), and whose unlikelihood we sense even before doing the high-school math of fn 29?

C4 Likewise for the haughty opinions of current orthodoxologists (contra the WS-doubts of several leading experts §§D6&U22), eminent jurists §§A1, F3, J2, fn 56, & world-class authorship-litigants (§§G11) do not partisan for what scholarly considerations (§§J7&S19) drive their discourse. If we could only seriously contend that these herculean scholars’ alleged discernment of Marlowe-vs-WS style-differences is 99.999% certain? Given the foregoing comparison of probabilities, is this even a serious contest of odds? Hardly. Rather, it’s precisely what the familiar phrase “No-Contest” was invented for. Further odds-contexts below: §§F17, I11, I17, K6.

C5 The Zaniest Theory of Them All. Since the Strat center’s chant (§T3) is that doubt of WS’ authorship is kook (see §W for who’s really nuts in the WS war), we will isolate the craziest of all Shakespeare-controversy assumptions, namely, that the Walsinghams — ultimo (§Z7) agile-spy-masters, rich and (§§J11&S19) shady operators at the power-pinnacle (fn 107) of the realm, patron, friend, and (§J6) — where an escape: the immediacy is undeniably consistent with Marlovian

28 To solve the crime, artists or cops? I.e., the WS mystery is a Detective case, too-long misfiled under Literature.
29 Odds: (3000d/12d)*(9000d/13d)-to-1, or ordmag 100,000-to-1 (www.dioi.org/cot.htm#rdmg).
30 Further extreme-probability discussion at §R2. Odds-strengths compared at §§C4, C8, K6, K11. Nicholl admits (E29) the “apparent chronological neatness” of the 2nd time-gap (5/30-to-6/12), but fails to realize (E34) that the 1st (5/18-30) doesn’t add but MULTIPLIES odds, and is cause by itself to render the Shakespeare authorship issue, generally speaking, than a literary one
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C6 Prior Priesthood’s Perception & Understanding of the Situation. Among the Strats, those who swear unwarranted Stratflat certitude that the plays were written by William Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon, the very few who happen to be aware of the foregoing facts (§A1) are reliably and cemently immune to them. Most Stratcultists are uninterested in serious evidence, believing their superior perception of the soft subtleties of writing style — discrimination exceeding that of nobodies like Swinburne (§J8) & Robertson (In 167; E247) — blocks forever any potential solution-foil for hard data.

C7 Evidence You Just Might Want to Take More Seriously Than Cultist “Authority”? E.g., such solid facts as: Marlowe’s looming date with torture (§MT); defaced body (§Q1); ultra-shady (§S18) & partisan (§Q10) witnesses to both the Brawl and the patently crucial matter of Marlowe’s body’s identification: that Richard Shakespeare 13-day-segue (§1). Despite all, Strats’ self-elevation leaves them in 100.000% (fn 179) certitude that Shakespeare and Marlowe CANNOT be the same person.

C8 Immediately-After Venuses: Adonis’ & Hesperos’. However, eons ago, human civilization wasn’t quite so smart & discriminating as it got later, when evolution ultimately crested by issuing forth preternaturally subtle Stratfordan experts. (Wiser than doctors about medicine [§E12], even knowing better than Shakespeare himself [§8] the year of his 1st work.) E.g., primitive man would watch the “morning star” — Eosphoros in Greek — in the east before sunrise for some months; then it would disappear, and a few weeks later there would appear in the west after sunset an “evening star” — Hesperos in Greek — of curiously similar brilliance & appearance. It’s been said that the early Greeks didn’t realize both were the same object: the planet Venus (§Z2). Instead, the morning & evening stars were Stratfordianly proclaimed separate animate deities, Eosphoros & Hesperos.

C9 Eosphoros Marlowe & Hesperos Shakespeare. Earlier priesthoods couldn’t admit the 2 were really 1 body, Venus, synodically swinging back&forth across the Sun — visually hinting that the base, morality-corrupting heliocentrist heresy might actually be true. Intolerable to the geocentrist goo-roos who for centuries dominated astronomical discourse by whatever force proved necessary to defend a cosmology known today (and to Aristarchos & Archimedes: 3rd century BC!) to have been embarrassingly dumb.

C10 So it may’ve been as late as the middle of the 1st millennium BC that Venus’ unity was 1st recognized in Greece (§Z3). Did that convert geocentrist priests to heliocentrism? No, ever-dodgy (§D7) geocentrist, e.g., the Serapic religion’s top astrologer-mathematician Claudius Ptolemey, 2nd century AD, henceforth advised that Venus merely looked like it circuited the Sun: actually, it (like Mercury) circled a point between us & the Sun. That crackpot sleight (see DR’s “Figleaf Salad”) held sway for over 1000 years of uninterupted geocentrist dominance. Meanwhile, only a few “fringe” (fn 35), impious outcasts (www.dioi.org/cot.htm#hcck) promoted the obviously “fantastic” (§R1) idea that the Earth went around the Sun, contrary to convincing but superficial indicias (§X27).

D Outta-ink Newspapers & Outta-Think Academies C.Hoffman (H10) just saw Stratfordism as a religion of essentially a priori mentality. But what are the wellspring & motive behind the heresy-stomping passion of Stratfordians? — who have distorted public perception by censorship and by typical establishment-lobby corruption of Wikipedia, where, in all controversies, Wiki-truth is strictly that of the party that fields the biggest edit-war army. Several factors have turned Strats into cultists:

D1 Worship of the works inspires passion. As with most religions, ultra-dedicated Stratfordians have grown up with their faith, surrounded (www.dioi.org/rel.htm#gqpj) by fellow believers — whose very unaniymity is mis-taken as effectively evidential — routinely scoffing at outsiders, thereby creating an investment in one’s religion being the Right One. The attendant invincible immuousness to evidence is thus assured: after all, who can face having wrongly condemned the truth and its bearers for decades?

D2 The top Marlowe documents appeared long after cultist cemental-hardening (§J7). That Shakespeare “is a money-courier” would be costly & messy.

D3 Marlowe is suspected of a life-style English pros have not wished to attach to Shakespeare himself, even knowing better than Shakespeare and Marlowe CANNOT be the same person. However, as homosexuality and atheism have lately become more fashionable, those aspects of Marlowe’s life may become a partial plus for his rehab.

D4 What does it say about the Expertise of the gods of the literary world, if most literati have been successfully hoaxed for 4 centuries? — rigidly rejecting the very possibility that Marlowe’s personality actually IS embedded in the works he published under WS’ name. Who amongst The Experts is going confess he never noticed?!

D5 Even while flexibly (fn 183, §§S3&W20) clinging to inflexible opinions, over 90% of the supposed (§V1) unanimous-for-Stratism scholars have never heard of (§T17) — or won’t speak or write (§R3) or investigate — the simple, compact evidences summarized at www.dioi.org/vols/w11.pdf (DIO 1.1) that skeptics are insanely self-deifying!), regard as more compelling (§X32) & Ros Barber (§8) — and the well-informed & fearless advisors who convinced Westminster Abbey to put a question-mark beside Marlowe’s death-date (§F3) are less easily fooled by William’s front, less herdable (fn 152) by orthodoxologists, and less divertable into the eternally-wheel-spinning frustration of the “Oxfordian” cult (whose authorship-candidate is a murderer [E40&45], the Earl of Oxford).

D6 Just as Han van Meegeren’s widely hosannahed 1938 fake Vermeer painting (§T23) put permanent quotes around the term “art expert”, so the unsubtle strength of the case for Marlowe has put similar quotes ... for evidence’ weakness. Typical religion. It must be added that some of the very best writers — e.g., Colin Wilson (§X23) & Ros Barber (§8) — and the well-informed & fearless advisors who convinced Westminster Abbey to put a question-mark beside Marlowe’s death-date (§F3) are less easily fooled by William’s front, less herdable (fn 152) by orthodoxologists, and less divertable into the eternally-wheel-spinning frustration of the “Oxfordian” cult (whose authorship-candidate is a murderer [E40&45], the Earl of Oxford).
mature debate, etc? And (§G9) US forums do so every time. (Does such invincibly-reliable filtering arise from inexucuable universal journalist-ignorance and or from newspapers’ drama departments’ cult-mission to protect [§T14] the presumably heresy-vulnerable public from itself?) This, though we’ve just seen that the essential data suggesting Marlowe’s authorship can be summed up in a very few lines (§W28). Marlowe is plainly the superior alternate candidate (as creator of the “Shakespeare” corpus) on several central bases. Among the serious candidates, he alone has the crucial attributes and distinctive features (§T12) which we now list:

D10 [1] Very — nay, the ONLY — convincing reason (yet put forth by any side) for the author hiding forever in anonymity (§H12).

D11 [2] Track-record of writing plays arguably very much like WS.’


D13 [4] Marlowe was as lowborn as WS. So, among the major parties to the controversy, Marlovians alone cannot (§T4) be deemed elitist.

D14 [5] Provocative evidential foundation summarizable in a paragraph (above at §A1), Marlovians are distinctly unprone to fall for fantastic and tootteringly ornate (§H6) speculation-piled-on-speculation compost-heaps, a resort which is naturally standard for competing cults who (§T13) have no documents to compete with the force of those backing the Marlovian case, e.g., those (§M5) which prove that the Star Chamber was pushing Marlowe towards a desperate & swift choice between torture-death or escape back into an alias-anonymity that was not entirely new to one who (§A1) was already part of a spy ring.

D15 [6] MOST IMPORTANT OF ALL: the preferability (§E35) according to Occam’s Razor of a simple, plausible, predictive (§E), and unifying theory which solves the Shakespeare case’s many outstanding mysteries simultaneously (§X1). Contra the obviously improbable, Rube-Goldberghian theories of cults who have wasted decades vainly scrounging for the hard evidence they (rightly) sense is required to miraculously make credible their otherwise-uncompelling (§H8) pet theory’s truth, this is a case where no direct documentary proof for any contender’s authorship is likely ever to be found (fn 98). (Though recent bombshell-realization that WS succeeded Marlowe by just days is a shock-vindicatinion (§E17) that’s closer to proof, than anyone a decade ago had ever expected to appear.) Which (§X) is why Occam’s Razor is the appropriate scythe for eliminating baselessly complex theories, leaving us with the most likely answer to the former (§Z1) authorship mystery.

D16 [7] Marlowe had the connexions (D85; §Q10) — and definitely the motive — to escape imminent (§M10) torture-death. And if he escaped he became Shakespeare (§R3) — immediately (§E17), and just as maturely (§S3) as his former self.

[37] See §§J7&U1.

[38] See fn 146. A particularly naive, abusive, and suspiciously unoriginal (§T10) 2011/10/24 Newsgroup message-touting T2:12 conjures-up pre-1593 WS plays (“Marlowe did . . . . [was] the greatest of Shakespeare’s plays appeared”) thereby — without telling the reader — rejecting WS’ own (§S2) chronology-testimony that ALL of his works began appearing at a date that happens to be just when Marlowe vanished. The review thereby continues an apparently uniform journallistic policy of preventing the public from learning of the starting 13-day seam (§S1) that is one of the most powerful jumpstart-alerts to the strength of the Marlowe case. (But, of course, that is exactly why orthodox historians don’t wish the wider public to be Clue-Confused by facts of such plain implication as those at the head [§A1] of this article.) As any student of propaganda knows: this is how it’s done.

[39] Through the numerous historical reconstructions in her 2012 The Marlowe Papers, Ros Barber boldly climbs out (in contagious iambic pentameter)

onto more limbs than came to Dunsinane

— but her speculations have two key differences vis-à-vis the Oxfordians: [i] they are clearly speculations of varying strengths (some exhibiting remarkable, plausible detectivework by several dedicated Marlovians — herself prominently included), & [ii] the Marlowian case does not rise or fall on their detailed validity (§W1), since the prime strength of Marlovianism lies elsewhere: §A1.

E Practical Epistemology: Unsung Vindications and a Glovely Fit

At each stage of the centuries-old Shakespeare controversy, reasonable challenges to Shakespeare's authorship have been proposed, and then have repeatedly (e.g., §§E9&E11) become supported by later new findings (§X3).

E1 Scientists recognize such success as how a theory becomes progressively validated.

E2 Contra Stanley Wells (§E7), doubt of Shakespeare’s authorship can be traced as far back as the 17th century (see §L16) and perhaps re-appears (though see S11-13) in the 18th.

E3 Later growing awareness of WS’ education-blank increasingly supported such doubts.

E4 In the mid-19th century, examination of Shakespeare’s will independently (§H21) confirmed said blank, & a possible (E1 vs §E2) prior proposal that WS wasn’t an author. So, it’s authorship. In 1895, Wilbur G. Ziegler (in a novel summarized at Hxii) noted the Marlowe—WS 1593 temporal segue (though the time-gap’s extent was then but roughly known) plus their similarity of style — and naturally wondered why Marlowe would hide.

E6 On the thinnest of evidence (Z291; §M8) and without access to most of the documents we now have, Ziegler nonetheless guessed (Zx): “some tremendous fear . . . . what else but Marlovians alone cannot sanely (§5) speculate-piled-on-speculation compost-heaps, a resort which is naturally standard for competing cults who (§T13) have no documents to compete with the force of those backing the Marlovian case, e.g., those (§M5) which prove that the Star Chamber was pushing Marlowe towards a desperate & swift choice between torture-death or escape back into an alias-anonymity that was not entirely new to one who (§A1) was already part of a spy ring.

E7 To appreciate Ziegler’s precissance, keep in mind (fn 205) that neither arrest-warrant nor coroner’s report (found in 1925: §N15) were known in Marlowe’s time or Ziegler’s.

E8 Nor in 1916, when Twain’s friend H.Watterson floated a loose fantasy (Pittsburgh Gazette Times 1916/4/16) that saw Marlowe behind Shakespeare. And noted a solid Twainism: if WS’ genius was accepted by informed contemporaries, why were so few biographical data re WS’ literary life sought after by anyone in the decades after his death? E9 In 1923, Archie Webster (even in innocence of the Marlowe—Shakespeare switch’s) precision) added to the growing strength of Marlovians’ case by pointing out in the Sonnets passages suggesting biographical parallels to Marlowe (but not Shakespeare or Oxford).

E10 Parallels such as exile (§U23; §N5), especially the 29th sonnet, When, in disgrace with Fortune and men’s eyes, I all alone beweep my outcast state (Later authors [W, H111, B259] noted sonnet #74’s “coward conquest of a wretch’s knife”, Marlovian investigation of the Sonnets was the subject of A.D.Wright’s 1994 opus.) Recall also our opening (§A2) quotation from Hamlet, lamenting a “wounded name”. E11 Next vindication came soon after Webster’s 1923 article: the 1925 finding of the arrest warrant stunningly confirmed Ziegler’s hypothesis of “some tremendous fear”.

E12 Why the Lie? Neither Marlowe Nor the Substitute-Body Died of Stabbing. Further confirmation of the suspicious nature of the Deptford “killing” came with the 1925 recovery of the coroner’s report, which said (T1:156): “mortal wound over his right eye . . . . of which mortal wound . . . Morley then & there instantly died”, which — medically — is virtually impossible.

Why the Lie? Neither Marlowe Nor the Substitute-Body Died of Stabbing. Further confirmation of the suspicious nature of the Deptford “killing” came with the 1925 recovery of the coroner’s report, which said (T1:156): “mortal wound over his right eye . . . . of which mortal wound . . . Morley then & there instantly died”, which — medically — is virtually impossible.

38 See fn 146. A particularly naive, abusive, and suspiciously unoriginal (§T10) 2011/10/24 Newsgroup message-touting T2:12 conjures-up pre-1593 WS plays (“Marlowe did . . . . [was] the greatest of Shakespeare’s plays appeared”) thereby — without telling the reader — rejecting WS’ own (§S2) chronology-testimony that ALL of his works began appearing at a date that happens to be just when Marlowe vanished. The review thereby continues an apparently uniform journallistic policy of preventing the public from learning of the starting 13-day seam (§S1) that is one of the most powerful jumpstart-alerts to the strength of the Marlowe case. (But, of course, that is exactly why orthodox historians don’t wish the wider public to be Clue-Confused by facts of such plain implication as those at the head [§A1] of this article.) As any student of propaganda knows: this is how it’s done.

39 Through the numerous historical reconstructions in her 2012 The Marlowe Papers, Ros Barber boldly climbs out (in contagious iambic pentameter)

onto more limbs than came to Dunsinane

— but her speculations have two key differences vis-à-vis the Oxfordians: [i] they are clearly speculations of varying strengths (some exhibiting remarkable, plausible detective-work by several dedicated Marlovians — herself prominently included), & [ii] the Marlowian case does not rise or fall on their detailed validity (§W1), since the prime strength of Marlovianism lies elsewhere: §A1.
Logical StairCase [1]: They didn’t stab any (live) person in the forehead, or they would have learned from experience that a frontal lobotomy doesn’t kill. Thus, the body produced was already dead when stabbed (§§N13&Q1). There would have been no point in stabbing a dead body if it were Marlowe’s. So it wasn’t.

Logical StairCase [2]: To explain a planted bloody body found in Eleanor Bull’s guest-house, without unfixed witnesses’ involvement, the story had to be: [a] one quick blow (more would weaken a self-defense plea), and [b] instant death.

Either of these simple lines-of-argument ([1] or [2]) indicate the likelihood that the superficially-bizarre lifetime Marlovian substitute-body theory could be true, after all.43

E13 The 20th century recovery of the coroner’s report also (publicly for the 1st time) identified the witnesses to the “death”, who turned out to be (fn 12, §21) the most gifted liars in all of England, which meant that even the body’s very identification was far from sure — obviously suggesting that another person’s body had been substituted.

(Why else the need for wall-to-wall top-notch & tight-circle fabricators?)

E14 The warrant’s 1925 recovery added 2 previously-unknown (fn 30) data: spy-ring & royal connexions (fn 107), backing the theory that Marlowe fled a “tremendous” threat.

E15 In the context of 1955 suspicion that a body was substituted for Marlowe, it is remarkable that a few decades later David More (then Editor of The Marlovian) revealed that the prominent Puritan pamphleteer John Penny (only slightly older than Marlowe) had just the evening before been hanged (he had no high connexions with unexpected suddenness, very near Deptford). It must be emphasized (§Q8) that the body’s being stabbed once (only) quite deeply into the forehead is peculiar for a brawl but is consistent with the body-switch theory in that blood-flow — and possibly facial-distortion from a split skull — would of course be desired if such a scheme were being carried out. Once the oddity that the damage to the body presented upon the face is noted, all but the dullest (§X25) observer would wonder whether evidence of identity had been deliberately obscured.44

E16 On that point: others have remarked (e.g., F, B305&337) that Measure for Measure (4.2) features a planned (§Q4) body (head) substitution, but it’s objected (in the play) that the guile knows both persons, so it can’t possibly work. Reply: “O, death’s a great disguiser; and you may add to it.” (Q210&391; Peter Farye [F] picks up on add-to-it: like, maybe, a stab in the face?) All obviously relevant to the identification of the body produced in 1593 by Marlowe’s fellow spies, yet far less startling than the fact that a body-switch is used in a play suspected by Marlovians to have been written by one who used that very ploy to add escape-artistry to the many other remarkable accomplishments of his amazing life.

E17 The Thirteen-Day-Segue. Once it had been modernly realized (D84-85) that Marlowe’s style and substance were similar to WS’, it was noted (e.g., H3-4) that the 1st appearance of Shakespeare as a writer was suspiciously soon (at 1st it was thought [by Hotson, Hoffman, & Blumenfeld] to be 4 months: H4n) after Marlowe’s disappearance. Only very recently was it remembered, due to a modern Stratfordian (§T13) recovery of a 1595/6/12 diary passage (originally discovered in 1794 but later long-forgotten) that the 1st known appearance of a work published under Shakespeare’s name was less than 2 weeks (§S1) after Marlowe’s disappearance. So early nascent suspicion (§E5) of connexion between Brawl & V&A (suspicion based merely on the 4 month gap between the former

43 Hoffman adds (H791) several common-sense suspicions, including wondering (H81) at the curiously large inequality (§Q4; H91) of the wounds. Note: alleged attacker Marlowe should have had full-windup strength of strike, while defensive-stabber Frier’s sword would likely (contra N85’s odd scenario) be thrashing-around with him off-balance (legs squarely trapped twist table&chair and [N11] Poleys&Skeses, obviating the possibility of stripe-windup) during the plainly-brief supposed Brawl. Also: for obvious evolutionary reasons (related to hunting & combat), the front of the skull is particularly strong. (Further: try mock-stabbing someone in the forehead — and it immediately becomes obvious that the knife will just skid off to the side almost perfect perpendicularly.)

44 A clever and compelling alternate theory put forth by Barber (Q210) is that the eye-wound would be so horribly yukkie (fn 123) that jurors wouldn’t want to look too closely at the corpse’s face.

& 1593/9/28 registration of the latter) now suddenly is super-vindicated by the shocking true proximity of CM-exit to WS-debut. (BlindingStradom, which [fn 30] for decades ducked [not listened to] less crushing but nonetheless strong evidences, treating them as pests rather than helpful warnings of future embarrassment. Similarly: DIO 10 pp.83-84.)

E18 The span of Marlowe-WS works being c.9000 days, the probability of writer-Shakespeare materializing by pure chance just 13 days or less later is mathematically calculable as 13/9000, or about 1 1/2 TENTHS of a percent. (In 1998, DR used like probabilistic span-math to challenge the theory of eternal afterlife: www.doi.org/cot.htm#ftnt.)

E19 And the also improbable prelude to this Deep-Bench (§G4) miracle: “death” follows 5/18 arrest and 5/20 Star Chamber appearance-terror & release by less than 2 weeks.

E20 The mutually-enhancing PAIR of coincidences compounds improbability to almost comically fantastic heights (computed at §J2): arrest — Brawl immediately succeeded by the Brawl → “invention” (§S2) of Shakespeare.

E21 Nicholl (N315) and Barber make the sensible suggestion that Marlowe’s high connexions are indicated by his bail-release, but Barber (with Farey) explicates the natural thought that both the bail & the high friends (D85) made escape possible.45

E22 The obvious suggestion from the foregoing double-miracle is that Marlowe’s “death” was a planned fake, and this has for many years been Marlovians’ contention. Pure speculation? No, it is not pure speculation that Marlowe’s Deptford end was planned: [a] We’ve already learned (§E12) that the witnesses’ ignorant lie of instant lobotomy-death leads us logically to suspect that another party’s body was indeed produced for the coroner. [b] Below (§J5), we find that the most recent (other) fiction which Marlowe had conceived before the Deptford “death” was the last scene (fictionalising an incident actually occurring only 4 previously) of his play Massacre at Paris, in which the Deptford event’s bizarre main feature was written by him before Deptford: the play ends when (as there) a dagger-attacker is killed by the attachee with his own wrestled-away dagger.

E23 Question 2: In light of the evidential items provided here (§A1) at the outset, is there any way to maintain rigid public acceptance of WS’ authorship than by convincing to inhibit (§T15) their mass-dissemination? E.g., shunning (§W20), non-citation (§D7), fantastic falsehoods (fn 38), exile-threat (§V1) to silence public apostates, goo-roo-echoing (§T9), and (§F17) rigid, non-engaging,46 dismissive scorn. Only in a fear-dominated field would one have to say aloud what courageous Ros Barber concludes her 2009 article with (D106): “it is my contention that to continue to resist the exploration of the Shakespeare authorship question goes against the spirit and purpose of academic enquiry.”

E24 Question 2: In an internet age (§F8), how much longer can orthodoxy’s long-successful omerâ (§W20) continue to be effective? Especially when the accumulated evidence has now become so overwhelming (with the realization that “Shakespeare”

45 She also cites (Q425) Peter Farye’s further provocative suggestion that Marlowe’s escape “would be unlikely to succeed without official sanction”, leading to Farye’s speculative proposal that Marlowe’s fate was decided in camera at the highest level of gov’t by a compromise deal between those (e.g., mutual enemies Cecil & Essex) who valued Marlowe’s creativity and those (primarily the Archbishop of Canterbury) who insisted on the educational value (§M6) of prominent punishment for atheism. (Hints in favor of Farye’s theory: Some Marlowe histories were TudorProp, e.g., Richard III. The earliest known purchaser ([E17]) of a copy of Venus & Adonis. Richard Stoley, worked in the service of Cecil & the Queen: D85 & S237. Farey has also shown [F] that at the time of the Deptford event, Poley was working “in her majesties service”. )

46 Only to one who cannot fit theory to evidence and so (fn 194) believes nothing not told him by a goo-roo, a pol, or a sacred book.

47 In communities with evidence for their orthodoxy, such resort-to-force isn’t necessary. E.g., those physicists — Wilson, Chauvenet, Dingle, etc — who resisted Einstein’s relativistic theories, were not threatened. The orthodox just put their trust in ever-acumulating evidence instead.
appeared so ultra-immediately ([E17] after Marlowe vanished) that one need no longer be an expert to discern the truth. That is, the average person encountering even a brief summary of the evidence will sense⁴⁸ there is a credible case for Marlowe’s authorship.⁴⁹

E25 Several of the above-condensed items were summarized in the opening pages of [H3] of the epochal 1955 book by US poet Calvin Hoffman. Marlovian pioneers Ziegler & Webster, & especially Hoffman should always receive prime credit for substantially and convincingly breaking through the fog formerly surrounding the Shakespeare mystery — thus launching the Marlovian revolution now growing through current high scholarship and dedicated detective work, repeatedly adding crucial unexpected clarifying detail (fn I22). Also, Diana Price (non-committal on who is the best candidate) should be recognized for her unequalled analytic & meticulous 2001 quietus ([§I5K114]) to any rational basis for accepting that Wm. Shakespeare ever authored anything. Rodney Bolt’s 2005 fantasy-novel added to Marlovian momentum. Blumenfeld 2008 inspired DR to involvement. Ros Barber’s 2012 fantasy bravely re-created Marlowe’s style, escape, & free spirit. One hopes that the above efforts, along with those of dedicated but balanced present & future researchers such as Peter Farey will ultimately quash & break Strats’ inertial grip on public discussion.

DIO’s main independent (possibly original) contributions are:

E26 [1] Illustrating Stratfordian orthodoxy’s ample menu of resemblances to the very creationist ([§W]) and geocentrist ([§C10]) kookery which irony-immune orthodoxyologists unceasingly charge Shakespeare-skeptics with. (Note also parallel to UFOlogy: [§I12].

E27 [2] Discovering ([§O5]) that Marlowe included the strikingly odd & improbable mechanics of his upcoming “murder”, right at the end of his last acknowledged play ( & later in Hamlet) — on the subject of religious persecution (fn 117) — this, at the very time he realized that he likely would very soon require an escape from his own religious persecution.

E28 [3] Logical demonstration from medical considerations ([§E12]) that body-substitution is not “far-fetched” ([§G6K7]) but evidently implied. (And, for desperate deft spies, an obvious & compelling option.)


E30 [5] The hilberto-looked-over possible significance ([§K4]) of Shakespeare being an actor — what better choice could there be for a devious front?

E31 [6] Computing for the 1rst time the shockingly high 100,000-to-1 odd ([§C2]) against chance occurrence of 1593’s rapid-succession of Marlowe’s arrest, his Death, & WS’ debut.

E32 [7] Producing several evidences ([§§I3, K1, K6]) that whether WS was adequately educated is not, as commonly thought, a case where there is no evidence at all, pro or con.

E33 [8] A time-travel experiment ([§J6]), asking which candidate original WS-skeptics would have chosen as most likely WS-corpus-author, had Marlowe been thought alive.

E34 [9] Proof ([§§S34&K31]) Greene’s “Shake-scene” can’t have written the WS plays.

E35 [10] Highlighting the Occamite advantage of the Marlovian theory, through its compact ([§W28]) & smooth-timeline ([§D12]) simplicity, predictivity ([§E3]), & productivity (fn 128): the fruitfulness factor, especially appealing to a detective and-or ([§X30]) scientist.

⁴⁸All the more reason, Stratfordians realize, that such evidence best be kept from the public. For its own benefit. (Take the time to trace, e.g., the censorial history of Wikipedia’s Marlovian Theory article, at the hands of ever-watchful hairtrigger-Stratfordians.) Nonetheless, the article is quite useful for raw data (thanks largely to Peter Farey), the usual main merit of Wikipedia pages.

⁴⁹An especially obvious option for the presumed author of Measure for Measure! See above at [E16].

⁵⁰This (plus scientists’ & detectives’ bigotry-shrinkage from repeated experience with theory-contradiction by data) explains the irony of the possibility of such observers ([§X32]) perhaps being on average more likely (than too-many literati) to recognize from the available evidence (most of it unearthed by lit-scholars, note well) the truth of the Shakespeare-authorship literary controversy. (I.e., evidently, it’s more a detective case than a lit one: a non/murder-mystery.) Also, no detective or scientist risks his career for literary heresy ([§F14]). For similar reasons, one frequently finds that outsiders add a useful element to a controversy. See, e.g., www.dioi.org/vols/wa0.pdf ([DIO 10 (2000)] 20), and DIO’s collection of cases in which classicists made crucial contributions to scientific controversiles: www.dioi.org/vols/wk2.pdf ([DIO 11.2 (2003)]) p.2. Similarly, in the context of our present scientific probe, it must be emphasized that the brightest of the literati &co have exclusively (fn 81) been the daring explorers who long ago blazed the anti-Stratfordian trail and discerned the Marlovian truth before anyone else, from any other field, Ziegler & Webster amazingly doing so without even benefit of the documents that have by now made inevitable a decision in favor of Marlowe’s authorship. And, today, most serious Marlovians are literary folk who have kept alive the truth’s flame, and have of course not let the controversy diminish their love of the plays & the poetry.


⁵³DIO challenges establishements’ fakes since: [a] they matter more than outsiders’; [b] few dare to.
F1 Recall Dembo Tom Tomorrow’s deft cartoon on the oil-lobby’s brushoff of the embarrassment of 2003’s casusbelli-lie that nuke-WMDs were hidden in Iraq? As the oil-cartel army54 failed to dig up a single Iraq nuke, TomT satirized the industry’s fallback position:

Whether we find the presumed WMDs really doesn’t matter.

Unless we find them.

F2 Fast-forward to the parallel but far longer failed-search for any direct proof that William Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon was more than adequately literate. (His entire extant manuscript output is two words, “by me” atop-signature in his will.) The nonexistent mss of the most famous supposed writer in all history are the WMDs of literature: Will’s Manuscript-Data. Yet despite its bare cupboards, the Shakespeare Industry — aka the “Stratfordian” contingent of the Shakespeare Controversy — continues to try (S5&8) banishing doubt of Shakespeare’s authorship of “his” plays and (transparently projectively) slandering such skepticism as nutty. Pretty ironic, considering the mentalities (§§T&W) that people the Stratfordian church’s alibi-upholstered pews (§S3).

F3 But all such efforts have lately served only to fan skepticism’s watershed (fn 6) internet-metastasis — and appear rather desperate considering that Poets’ Corner at Westminster Abbey has since 2002/7/11 displayed a memorial window in Marlowe’s honor, with his death date written as “?1593”, accepting the question-mark that there are indeed legitimate questions as to the reality of Marlowe’s supposed 1593 death. Mass-slander is ever the last resort of cornered establishments, who (www.dioi.org/fht.html#qvhb) never anticipate how ludicrous and vicious the tactic inevitably looks when highly respected agnostics (and outright converts) start taking the rebels seriously. I.e., who but a blind fanatic would carelessly emit slander that results in his effectively calling Mark Twain a loon, Westminster Abbey a kook institution, a recent Poet Laureate (§€22) deluded, the artistic director55 of the Globe a fool, and (§A1) several Supreme Court Justices nuts?!? In 2009, it was said (http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123998633934729551.html & §S212) that no more than 2 of the 9 active justices were Stratfordians [one of them quoted more against Oxford than for WS], while 3 others never even no-comment the issue.

F4 The tourist towns, Stratford-on-Avon (UK) and Stratford (Ontario), greet these developments with the same jaw-grinding seethe as the Loch Ness community displays towards debunkers of its own tourist-fetcher, “Nessie”, aka the “Loch Ness Monster”, which has somehow — who’d have guessed? — proven just as durably elusive as Shakespeare mss. (In 1959, at Stratford, DR saw Robeson & Mary Ure bring to life & death Marlowe’s Othello: wickedly clever deceit, mendacious jealous passion, heavenly word-music — §S9] — not to mention that fiendish does-hanky-prove-panky? plot.)

F5 So the Stratfordian cult is subject to a question paralleling TomT’s barb (§F1): what was the point of centuries of intensive searches for Shakespeare proof if the resultant blank doesn’t matter?

F6 Are we to accept Stratfordian dream-world-logic: that finding Shakespeare mss only matters if we-find-them? That is, location of WS mss would help the Stratfordians; but the search’s real-world blank cannot be admitted to help the skeptics in the slightest degree. (Parallel: www.dioi.org/bes.htm#bbgg; & see below under double-standards: §F13.)

54 Oil-cartel army aka US Army & satellites, aka Coalition-of-the-Killing, bane of cartel-profit-endangering oil-blackmarketeers like Sadaam & ISIS.


56 John Paul Stevens may be an Oxford-sympathizer (much more cautiously agnostic than cultists), but his comments are to the main point (Time 2011/10/31 p.92): “I think there are good questions about a man who never seemed to have any correspondence with his contemporaries about the plays. When he passed, there were [F14] no eulogies to him, and when you visit his home and look around for evidence of a scholarly person, there are no books in the house.” JPS doubts also at NYTimes Book Review 2014/4/6; 4/17 NYTBR Letters reaction: strictly-Strat dumb&dumber (incl. usual ad-hominem).

F7 Indeed, the long search for WS mss has been so intense for over a century that (S26) several forgeries have been successively welcomed with (passing) joy: fn 163.

F8 How revealing that Shakespeare-worshipping orthodoxyologists are eager to hype skeptics’ past follies, in order to denigrate all doubt by association. Yet there appears no equal or contextual stress on the reality that repeated promotion of dubious WS-manuscript “discoveries” (§F10) and even outright forgeries (S18-26) indicates that mayhap Stratfordian loyalists suffer their own shortcomings in the area of rationality. Note J.Shapiro’s admirably honest parallel revelation at S195.

F9 And be grateful as well for the encouragingly skeptical reaction of some, to the latest (fn 163) “Shakespeare”-ms pseudo-discovery (§F8): International Herald Tribune 2013/8/13 p.1.

F10 Yet also notice the implicit degree of balance in forums that reach the public: this worthless wisp of a speculation is placed on page-one of leading newspapers. (As also other such irrelevancies & diversions: §T15.)

F11 Yet even the mere fact of the swift Marlowe-WS sequence (§A1) is systematically (§U14) non-presented to the same newspapers’ readerships.

F12 The Stratfordian-felicitous result is inevitable (§D9): even this simple, striking, tantalizingly pregnant datum is known to very, very few people. (As DR has found from several years of wide sampling-by-conversation.) With similar balance, Stratfordian J.Shapiro paints (S201) skeptic Hoffman as a “self-promoter” nutcase by mentioning a single57 failed 1956/5/1 mss-search by him.

F13 Meanwhile, Shapiro (whose book’s aim [§H19] is primarily psycho-sociological, not evidential): [a] doesn’t juxtapose this with hundreds of failed tries at finding WS mss, and [b] doesn’t quote for his readers any of the devastating content of the Elizabethan documents (warrant & coroner’s report) which Hoffman has successfully adduced. But, then, when cultish establishments circle wagons around a Shakes sacred moneycow, double standards are the same standard.

F14 A Stratfordian calling Hoffman a “self-promoter” is a classic case of aggravated calumny. After all, why did Hoffman have to promote his theory at all? Because it was & is usually met by silence or kneejerk rejection instead of rational discourse (§5) — a cohesive intellectual crime which FOREVER ROBBED Hoffman of the in-his-lifetime public acclaim he had already earned for the most important detective-achievement in the history of literary studies. Since Strats freely shrinko-analyse skeptics (e.g., §E22&227), we have the right of guesswork-reversal: the theft of Hoffman’s credit may be due largely to careercist priorities (fn 190) of English pros who sense professional danger if suspect of even entertaining (much less preferring) heresy on this sensitive issue. Thus: mass mental inertia that would disgrace an intellectually serious community (fn 47&191).

F15 Bluster’s Last Stand? Columbia English&CompLit Prof. James Shapiro’s book, Contested Will (NYC 2010) and Edmondson-Well’s Shakespeare Beyond Doubt (Cambridge U 2013) are the latest Stratfordian books, extending a long tradition of attempts to dispel all doubt by bluster, since there is no hard pro-Shakespeare evidence to work with.

F16 From the 1957 film Sweet Smell of Success, recall another classic showbiz-minimal-art promoter (§W18), as agent Sidney Falco girds-up to conjure maximal salesmanship of nothing (§V16): “watch me run the 50-yard dash with my legs cut off.”

F17 Shapiro’s pervasive question-begging attitude, throughout (§F20) his perverse exorcism-exercise, is based merely upon the uncontended fact that Shakespeare existed and claimed authorship.

57 Though Hoffman was of predominantly Jewish background, AP’s 1956/5/2 squib, on his failed-gambling Walsingham-search for mss, places him in NYC while calling him “African”. (Error? Or can he be placed high up on the roster of greats who are of black heritage?) A few years later, while spoofing Oxonianese clue-imaginings, Dora Hamblin (Life 1964/7/10) ended with a gleeful swipe at Hoffman’s minor misfire but (like Shapiro) ducks trying to answer his numerous solid arguments.
F18 S225f (vs M370 & §G): “once you begin to put Shakespeare back into his own time and place, the notion that he actively conspired to deceive everyone who knew him or met him about the true authorship of the works that bore his name seems awfully far-fetched.”

F19 Question: if Shapiro thinks the Marlovian theory is improbable, can he seriously pretend, though that’s the entire question at issue.

F20 Note that bootstrappy-go-lucky Shapiro is just assuming (§F18) that Will couldn’t pretend, but that’s the entire question at issue.

G Deep Bleep—Deep Bench. An Actor Couldn’t Put on an ACT!!

G1 Defending Shakespeare by Insulting His Own Craft. Moreover, given that acting is an artistic profession which Stratfordians acknowledge Shakespeare pursued, we can sum up the central argument of the Shapiro book (which the worshipful Forces of Orthodoxy are treating [§I28]) as a last-word lock: skeptics are ignorable loons because (§F18) IT IS ZANILY “FAR-FETCHED” TO PROPOSE THAT A PROFESSIONAL ACTOR COULD PUT ON AN ACT

G2 We haven’t encountered such deliciously straightfaced unintentional folly since 1990 when Corbin Bernsen blurted out a plug for Tom Berenger (www.dioi.org/pro.htm#czmy): “He’s a wonderful actor. And there’s almost no pretence about him.” (Our comment [20] at the time: “Hey, didn’t Reagan already pull that one on us for 8 years?”)

G3 Is an academic establishment really prepared to adopt, as a central argument, rigid insistence that a professional dissembler — and the Elizabethan-era equivalent of a loan-shark — was incapable of deceit? If so, English Dep’ts’ Stratfordian Orthdoxies may inspire questions about how much thespianism goes into their own long-running traditional pose (§C7) that they have an INFALLIBLE, 100.0000000000%/irrefutable case for WS’s authorship. (A standard establishment-sham: sham less in the belief itself, than in the winked-at for-public-consumption-pretense that it’s rock-solidly founded.) For interlude-entertainment, let’s take orthodxologists’ standard history — starting from the time Marlowe got into deep-bleep — and measure it by its lamentably neglected implications (§E19):

G4 These amusing implications begin with Tenet#One, namely, that Marlowe was 100% surely dead on 1593/5/30. But, then, we must believe that the English-writers guild instantly pulled off THE deep-bench miracle in all the history of literature: Marlowe — the Cantab literary giant, the most popular playwright of the day, and the immortal pioneer who’d introduced blank verse to the English stage — was replaced in a two-week-jiffy by a comparably mega-gifted blank-verse writer of extremely (§A1) similar style and, most felicitously surprising for a SELF-STATED neophyte (§2), immediately of the same spectacular maturity as Marlowe (§S3): William Shakespeare. But let not good fortune blind us to bad: there was only one such towering literary figure before May 30 — and only one such after. A devoutly-to-be-wished overlap-period — during which London might be simultaneously blessed with two ultra-genius writers — narrowly never quite happened: miracle & anti-miracle. (If only Hegel had got hold of this. . . .)

G5 It has been argued that the collapse of the Age of Faith began with Aquinas, who made the epochal mistake of attempting a massively elaborate reasoned argument to defend a position that neither arose from reason nor could be successfully defended by reason.

G6 Will the Shapiro book’s similar (& shamefully Oxfordian: §§H14&W29) confusion of proximity with rational impact, end up signalling the Aquinas-Moment in the history of the Shakespeare Controversy?

G7 As a successful61 veteran of numerous oldboy-upsetting controversies, DIO (like many before us) is familiar with standard evolution in such decades-long face-investment bubbles: deny as long as possible. (Which invests ever-more faces. Ever-deeper. Aolly parallel to the US’ ever-postponed debt-reckoning.)

G8 And then (§F5), when it’s realized that the Big Guys are gonna lose the debate in the long run — given the laughable-transparency (§A1) of the Marlowe—WS quick-change act — just pretend it never really mattered in the first place (www.dioi.org/cot.htm#fssn).

G9 So: is the dawn of the endgame presaged (not only by Shapiro’s Aquinian §§G5 book and Westminster Abbey’s integrity §§F2, but) by New York Times critic Ben Brantley’s frontpage International Herald Tribune article (now International New York Times) 2011/10/29-30 article which yawn-claims that he doesn’t care who wrote the plays? (Question-in-passing: If it doesn’t matter, why shun §§G7? Marlovian hypothetical aside: think Brantley’d yawn (§F1) if Shakespeare ms surfaced? Until that imaginary day, Brantley has concocted a curiously original defense: ain’t it GREAT that we know so little about Shakespeare! Lucky us. . . (Think this is a joke? Well, if it is, DIO’s not the joker.) Look it up at idem. This FRONT-PAGE article follows the tactic of ALL §§G Free Press reaction in the US to the film Anonymous: it informs the public of no facts of dissenters’ cases.

G10 Instead, the HIT’s article wastes column after column detailing BB’s personal feelings about the plays. (Another problem: the plays-outside-themselves public the few simple lines of fascinating Marlowe-suggestive facts we started with: §§A1.) This is NEWS-fit-to-print! And on page-one? Brantley’s is just the most extreme example of the blatant shyness centrists have of debating62 Marlovians. Strats’ debate-aversion carries the obvious implication that the cult itself knows that its present opinion-dominance

---

58 Diana Price (P31-42) has raised reasonable objections to the common belief that WS did very much acting. (Outside fronting.) See also §§S3. His connexion to the acting company Lord Chamberlain’s Men (or King’s Men) is primarily based upon a 1595 reference, which does not specify whether he is actor or shareholder (P31, Q417). But none of this affects the amusing contradiction in orthodoxy we are teasing here in §G.


60 Or are we experiencing the Bishop-Temple Moment? It was Temple who headed off the danger of the Church of England’s over-committing itself against Darwin. As Andrew D. White’s classic 1896 History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom put it (pp.77-78&82): “While everything was done [by religious forces] to discredit Darwin, to pour contempt upon him . . . while his followers were represented . . . as charlatans and dupes, there began to be in the most influential quarters careful avoidance of the argument that evolution — even by natural selection — contradicts Scripture. The defection of Lyell (§F2) had . . . started the question among theologians who had preserved some equanimity, ’What if, after all, the Darwinian theory should prove to be true?’ Recollections of the position in which the Roman Church had found itself [for centuries, up to the 1830s!] after the establishment of the doctrines of Copernicus and Galileo naturally came into the minds of the more thoughtful . . . [Ultimately], Temple, Bishop of London, perhaps the most influential thinker then in the Anglican episcopate, accepted the new revelation” as (www.dioi.org/article.htm#npmp) more progressive than the biblical idea of instant creation by god.

61 (How do you spoof what already reads like unexceedable spoof?)

62 All but Time’s courageous dissent: §§T14.

63 As longtime orthodoxy (among a cameadventural group of math-challenged historians), that which Poltemy first-hand outdoor-observed (not stole) the Ancient Star Catalog, was in its last stages of collapse (fn 187; www.dioi.org/cot.htm#dsc), cult goo-roo N.Swerdlow prominently urged Journal of the History of Astronomy 23.3:173-183 [1992 Nov] p.182) a shutdown—moratorium against the point even being debated, since the controversy was now “almost entirely historical”. This, in a history journal. (How do you spoof what already reads like unexceedable spoof?) Full delicious story elsewhere: www.dioi.org/det.htm#pcps.
is worn as uneasily as Marlowe wrote of Henry IV’s head (Part 2 [3.1]): if debate is meant to change opinion, there’s no other direction for Stratfordianism but down. New York Times chief theatre critic Benjamin Brantley’s 1st sentence concludes: “I don’t care who wrote Shakespeare’s plays.” He suggests this may be bold “herey”. No: it’s just an unimaginatively-all-too-typical ([G7] last-ditch burp of a frozen orthodoxy gradually melting under sunlight. But (as later at §[14] there’s an unanticipated problem here: Brantley’s very next (2nd) sentence mentions Christopher Marlowe as among the three top serious longterm contenders for authorship. Hmmm. Does BB’s claimed ([G12]) narrowness extend to ignoring logic, too?

G1 Because — unlike any other Shakespeare-authorship contender — Marlowe left an attributed corpus of mostly top-tier dramas, still read & performed today. So ([L5]): Does Brantley seriously mean 64 that no one should care ([A2]) whether or not the Marlowe and “Shakespeare” plays were written by the same man? If so, what grade would Columbia University’s Comparative Literature Dep’t give the New York Times chief theatre critic?? To follow Hoffman (H136) in quoting Marlowe’s (Stratfordian) biographer Bakeless: “The exact relationship of these two major figures is the chiefest puzzle of literary history.”

G12 On the plus side for Brantley: he is wise to the phoniness of alleged Shakespeare bios, evidently aware that rearranging ([J2]) chunks of the plays into such merely apes the Oxfordians’ fave fallacy. But to say Who-Cares to one of the grand mysteries in the history of civilization simply makes the commentator look like he’s either poising (for career-convenience) or shamefully narrow. (Of course, specialists in the arts actually are too-often afflicted with cultural narrowness, a limitation which some mirrorless literati too readily and falsely impute to scientists.) This is especially unconvincing, given that Brantley says (emph added) he “can’t get enough of figuring out and arguing about” Shakespeare’s words. i.e., he is fascinated by some 65 mysteries but finds it prudent 66 to duck The Big One, where curiosity could genuinely ([G10]) bring upon him a serious and ultimately expensive charge of heresy. Rising to the grand journalistic political heights which Brantley has achieved, requires an unerring instinct for such judicious caution — plus an ever-ready talent for justifying it. Yet again ([F13]), double-standards are the single standard.

H Frankfurter&Mustard Vs. Wizard of Ostrich: Evidence-Weights

As elsewhere here ([T]), we spy symptoms of the unself-conscious nuttiness of a cult that has made it a tactic to projectively regard all outside the cult as nuts. H1 Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter is said to have observed that: to some lawyers, all evidence is equal. But a balanced and non-bound mind will distinguish between evidences’ differing weights. E.g., the lack of surviving WS play-mss is suggestive but not absolute negative proof, as few ms pages of plays of that era have survived.

H2 Shakespeare’s title-pages are positive evidence for his authorship but (as we will see below: §[W9]), they are very far from firm proof of it. On the skeptics’ side: WS’ few extant signatures’ uneven scrawl [photos: P126] hardly suggests an experienced writer (but some can be alipeed as perhaps from illness), and his 3 signatures on his will show he signed his name with 2 different spellings on the same document, in the same minute it would take to sign the 3 pages: S228. (For legal reasons alone, one might prefer to be consistent.)

H3 The non-survival of any letter ([K8-K10, X5]) from a celebrity of Shakespeare’s renown and royal acceptance ([W25]) is even shier — since no one person could be responsible for suppressing all of WS’ hypothetical letters — but still short of rigorous proof of non-autonomy (even though all the items in-combine come pretty close.)

H4 But, as Mark Twain realized long ago: by far the weightiest and patently unalibiable ([K7]) piece of evidence (on either side) in the Shakespeare debate is Shakespeare’s will.

H5 The fact that this highly detailed document never mentions his books or disposition of mss (several of the plays weren’t yet published: P173) — or anything at all related to scholarship — is alone enough to prove that Shakespeare did not write the plays.

H6 When faced with the above unambiguous contradiction of their position (a point gainfully exploited by Blumenfeld: B230), Stratfordian heads dive for ostrich sand.

H7 Which, incidentally, puts them in no position to scoff at equally sand-headed Oxfor-
dians for their own impenetrabilities: [a] to the obvious impediment that their candidate, the Earl of Oxford, died in 1604, and [b] to the fact that their various, increasingly ([W24]) wild explanations for his anonymity can never be accepted outside a cult where rigid articles of faith only survive through (Stratfordian) level inertia, repetition, & cultist insulation.

H8 Shapiro understandably delights in detailing what happened when Oxfordianism couldn’t convince anyone much, by the stylistic and bio-parallel arguments that had originally launched it. Namely: cranks’ classic never-say-die attitude towards evidence jarring with their theory, evidence (such as inexplicable anonymity & time-line difficulties) which would convince non-cranks that their theory is so weak that there are surer bets — for how one spends the rest of one’s life — than obsessively pursuing a probable chimera. See parallel comments at www.dioi.org/vols/wab.pdf ([DIO 10 [2000]]) 2.

H9 Predictable result ([H11]): devotion into schizo-schismatic fantasy-contestland.

H10 S196: “The argument that Oxford sought anonymity because of the usual aristocratic misgivings ([K12]) about print only went so far. There had to be a better explanation for why the greatest of poets suppressed his identity. The answer was soon found: Oxford was Queen Elizabeth’s secret lover and their union produced ([L4]) an illegitimate son, the Earl of Southampton. The argument, first advanced by Percy Allen in 1933, came to be known in Oxfordian circles as the Prince Tudor theory and proved deeply appealing to skeptics already convinced that conspiracy and concealment had defined Oxford’s literary life. Looney [the virtual founder and St.Paul of Oxfordianism], while valuing Percy Allen’s

64 Doubtful. More likely BB just didn’t realize the implicit consequence of his dodge.

65 The starkly-selective curiosity-contrast here reminds one of other mass-religions, where the Problem-of-Evil (e.g., thousands of sinless babies dying together in a tsunami — along with thousands more foetuses, thereby aborted by god) is ritualistically “answered” by a selectively-agnostic pseudo-humble plea of ignorance as to god’s Big Plan. This, even while the very same aprioristshod unhumbly & rigidly (too-often outright aggressively) insists it is simultaneously un-ignorant enough to know (from the very same data-set!) — and to an unsullied certainty — that god exists. Invisibly. (DIO: What’s the difference between a believer in god and a believer in Santa Claus? One is 365 times crazier than the other.)

66 It is only right to note admiringly that BB does not repeat the now-canonical snob-n smear ([T8]) common to anti-Stratfordians, which virtually all other commentators copy from each other. (See at [V3] & P251f for exposure of this line of irrelevancy: [T7].) Which is consistent with his claim that his views are his own, thus hopefully countering some speculations on him hereabouts.

loyalty, loathed his Prince Tudor theory and feared that it would ‘bring the whole cause into ridicule.’ Freud [a fervent Oxfordian (note §U6)] hated it too, and even sent a chastising letter to Allen. To this day it has deeply divided Oxfordians.” (Allen resorted to ESP: E39.)

H11 Said divisive (§H9) Prince Tudor theory is now enshrined in the film Anonymous, the very (impedimental) title of which clued DIO to its slant the moment we 1st heard of it.

H12 Comparing Oxfordians’ shaky (§W24) presumption-alibis to the Marlovians’ lethal explanation (§M) for anonymity is just another (§§C4&K15) no-contest.

H13 The initially-exploratory and formerly-useful Oxford cause has increasingly become a sad impediment to resolution, drawing-away skeptical idealism & energy into a patently incredible cul-de-sacrosanct of rigidly-held but logically-weak alibis for anonymity, which call the title-page Stratford orthodoxy’s diversion-tactics. (The public’s gullible fascination with an endless succession of baseless proposed authors leads E33&50 to a gleeful, albeit false calculation: “Mathematically, each time an additional candidate is suggested, the probability decreases that any given name is the true author.” Including Shakespeare?)

H14 Thus, Shapiro delightedly cites Oxfordian (and Baconian) arguments in extenso. But not (§X33) those of the Marlovians.60 This, even WHILE Shapiro predicts (§T12; S217) that presently-ascendant Oxfordianism may ultimately give way to Marlowianism. Stratfordians have big-event debates with Oxfordians (§S205; E229). Seldom with Marlovians. From this contrast, it’s easy to discern which skeletal case Strats inwardly fear. And, from the present analysis, it’s equally easy to see why. The situation reminds one of US elections: the pseudo-two well-established parties aren’t getting us anywhere. So we can hope for resolution via 3rd party. Shapiro unconsciously follows the Napoleon’s dictum that sheer numbers (§S29) win wars — while forgetting that no matter how many zero-evidences one brings to bear on a case, they still add up to zero (§W26).

H15 His divert-and-conquer response to skeptics is: page-after-page-after-page, he piles onto the reader a string of lightweight pro-WS arguments (parallel to also massively [§T12] refuting just-as-lightweight anti-WS arguments) — arguments none of which would even begin to cut the mustard with Frankfurter or any other data-weight-conscious judge.

H16 Shapiro devotes long chapters — 67 pages each — to the irrational excesses of Baconians & Oxfordians, successively.

H17 By contrast, his occasional (fn 128) scattered remarks (§7, 201, 212, 217, 330, 316, etc) on the rational Marlovians add up to maybe a page or two.

H18 And (§J20) he transmits not one word from the convincing documentary basis of their case. (Though, he does credibly cite Marlowian websites in an appendix: §S316.)

H19 I.e., he knows (§H14) where the weightiest threat to orthodoxy actually lies. Shapiro says (S9) his main aim is to show why doubters doubt, so his failure to supply dozens of pages of Marlovian wackiness (parallel to his hefty doses of Baconians & Oxfordians’) betrays the awful unspoken truth: the Marlovian case alone is conspicuous for not breeding nutty theories or advocates.

H20 Yes, contemporary references61 to Shakespeare (§S223) as a playwright survive (Shapiro’s & Terry Teachout’s idea of skeptic-snuffer data); but, given that his name was on the title-pages of popular published plays from c.1600 on, this is hardly remarkable. (Alfred Hitchcock’s name is commonly spoken of in connexion with numerous films. None of which he wrote. Company procurement of plays is analogous: P298, S225.)

H21 That central issue (§J2) is parallel to the Wizard-of-Oz’ pretense: what was BEHIND the title-page curtain? What evidence exists that the title-pages were not adorned with the name of a front-man? The question’s burden-of-proof inversion is justified by a hitherto-unemphasized consideration: we have (§§I3&I13; fn 197) not one but three quite independent and mutually-confirmatory62 evidences of WS’ level of schooling:

[A] His detailed will’s failure to hint in any way at literary inclination. [B] His Latin’s smallness (§I3). [C] His totally blank record of education, especially university (P235). Price places this in context (P234): “Most men of genius . . . left records of their education . . . Even the geniuses who precede Shakespeare by a century or two . . . In the company of those dating from the Renaissance onward, [he] stands alone as a presumed literary giant with no visible means of educational support.”

I Occam & Mutual Confirmation

I1 Solution of the foregoing is a classic instance of Occam’s Razor, which asks: what is the simplest single theory that simultaneously explains the available multiple63 evidences? Answer: WS’ literacy was inadequate to the creation of the plays. By contrast, Stratfordians require three separate speculative explanations for [A] will (fn 84). [B] little Latin (§I3), & [C] education-blank (§K), and must contend in effect that the obviously consistent implication of evidences [A];[C] is just another amazing coincidence64 — like §C2.

I2 Belief that Shakespeare had sufficient education to write the plays is evidentially unsupported (fn 182), so Strats routinely claim (§K & fn 173) that the Stratford Grammar School was almost as good as college! NB: The Stratfordians’ and Folger editions’ “proof” that he indeed even went that far in school is simply: there are no school records proving he didn’t. Which efficiently transmits a measure of Strat-logic’s rigor. (And ignores §C2.)

I3 Strat scholar C.Rutter stresses that at this era’s grammar schools, Latin (E135 emph §I3), obviously consistent another amazing coincidence — like §K7) that presently-ascendant Oxfordianism may ultimately give way to Marlovianism. Stratfordians have big-event debates with Oxfordians (§P140, 195f, Q417).

I4 More than any other piece of evidence, the will gives us a firm answer: Shakespeare wasn’t the literary scholar the plays reveal their author to have been, but acted as a mask for one who was. Hoffman took the trouble to compare Shakespeare’s will to that of wealthy contemporaries, finding (H26) that WS’ is more detailed than any Hoffman saw (§110). Price’s discussion of the full revelations (§K7) of the will is must reading (P19, 146f).

I5 Standard Stratfordian retorts on the theological Problem-of-the-Will (§S50) follow: the existence of a (now-lost) inventory of WS’ possessions, which is — on no evidence — [a] presumed (though uncited in the will) to be a supplement to the will. (Though it’s more likely just someone’s later bare list of its items, or even just a copy of the whole will.) [b] Thus the (lost) Shakespeare inventory could-shoulda (§I11) contained a list of WS’ (also now-lost) putative books&emss. A classic apology-dance: drool (§§K2&I12) over the


61Like two completely independent evidences are consistent with the theory of a body-switch:
[1] The sudden (fn 122) execution of John Penry near Deptford only hours before Marlowe’s “death”.
[2] The forehead-placement of the stab-wound on the body being such as to maximize (§Q2) the area of downward blood-flow over the face.

62Like I.Newton accounting for both planets’ & comets’ motion, while Cartesian vortices explained
[1] the highly laminate structure of the ocean floor.
[3] the path of a cannon ball.

63Like see similar conjuring-up — by the waning defenders of R.Byrd’s fake 1926 North Pole flight — of supposed now-lost supplementary mss containing his Real data from the trip to alibi the fact that the handwritten sextant data in his flight-diary (which [like §I6] speaks of no other data-records) purported him 150 statute miles south of where the Missing-data mss are hypothesized to place him, to rescue his now-moribund North Pole-claim: see www.dioi.org/vols/wa0.pdf (DIO 10 [2000]) §L7 & fn 108. For a like example from the Peary wars, see National Geographic’s imaginary data-triplets from an equally imaginary “time-sight”: “Sic Transit the Paid Piper” §§B1&K12 at www.dioi.org/sict.pdf.
dream of finding the Lost-List — even while dancing the minimalist-minuet of projecting (§F1) that the lack of it (and ALL Shakespeare mss) means nothing.

17 Schoenbaum inventively tries (C305) to confuse WS’ unmentioned alleged books with his son-in-law’s library of medical books.

18 Master Stratfordian-defense strategist Jonathan Bate arouses his conversing-large with-each-other cult’s self-gratifying passion to be vindicated, by citing (§J9) two literate (less wealthy) WS-contemporaries whose (smaller) wills listed no books: poet S.Daniel & divine R.Hooker, a diversion which Twain gutted (§I14) over a century ago with a just guffaw at the implicit relative value to WS of his will-cited 2nd-best-bed versus the will-uncited mss of the 1st-best plays in the history of English drama, or their creator’s library.

19 But the easily-missed, typically (Stratfordian) unnoted sub-problem here is the same as throughout the rest (§I6) of the Strat case’s woulda-coulda alibi-fest, in which the inherently improbable is consistently preferred to the probable. (F.Crews Memory Wars NYRB 1995 p.37 marks Freud’s parallel “rashness in always preferring the arcane explanation to the obvious one”, noting also [iden] his revealing “habit of napping while his [victims] were on the couch”; E.g., [§E12, 11, §E6, §E5, §E4, §E3, §E2, §E1, §E0, §E-1, §E-2, §E-3, §E-4, §E-5, §E-6, §E-7, §E-8] & Hooker’s will attached an inventory referring to his books. All in order to a(A) oddity or bio-blank after another: Marlowe “death” method, WS’ books, mss, vita (§K6), letters, eulogies at death (even court-reference [P148-149], etc). For each oddity Strats must speculate-invent the key evidence its theory requires but massively doesn’t have, especially as regards WS’s bio (P14-19) & education (§K), where his grammar-school attendance is circularly proven (fn 173) from the very “Shakespeare” oeuvre in question. A précis of tenet-evolution here: so WS’s death meant “the genuine author of the plays would at great length fail (§I15) to exhibit literary or scholarly interests’ or [b] That the real playwright would wish to be anonymous? (Even Baconians & Oxfords have solved this question.)

18 Since we have yet to detail the gov’t’s persecution of Marlowe (§M5), each option initially seems inherently improbable. Yet one must be true. And the probability of option [a] is flat zero, leaving option [b] as valid. (A.Doyle Sign of Four Chap.6 [emph in original]: “when you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth”. Similarly in Hound of the Baskervilles Chap.3.) Aside from the suppressive influence (§S) of academic’s cultists, the failure of option [b] to catch on in academe is partly from failure to [i] explicitly ponder the comparative likelihoods of [a]&[b], and [ii] explain the true author’s excellent reason for anonymity — a failure which has led (§I12) to what Shapiro understandably calls (§S7) “endless trench warfare.”

19 What is particularly odd is that there is one famous figure who had (§E4) the only powerful anonymity-motive among the top candidates — an undeniably valid reason for staying out of sight. (The same reason that was featured in The Front.)

20 Yet most of those (both believers & skeptics) interested in whether Shakespeare wrote plays are unaware of this. (Shapiro [§H16] just skips it. And not a single one of the dozens of enraged 2011 reviews of Anonymous mentioned it.) We will shortly (§M) provide the evidence establishing the writer’s cause for disappearance; but we pause first for some sociological background.

21 Comment in passing, regarding academic-establishment-think. If for decades an entire academic field (English&CompLit) is unable to follow Price’s simple, irrefutable reasoning from Shakespeare’s will, one wonders about the validity of what its scholars do for a living: just how reliable are CompLit’s complex, speculative readings of influences&symbolisms in(to) the works which lit-Experts claim to interpret for us?

22 Would you seek solution of a calculus problem from a student who can’t add two-plus-two? Should one expect a hole-in-the-wall Tijuana clinic to cure cancer, if it can’t do the simplest surgery?

CompLit’s problem in this controversy is similar to the gov’t’s Beltway mentality: insularity and BS’ normalcy, which doesn’t work its magic so reliably outside its own tight, -threatening klan; thus the necessary resort to non-rational means (mainly censorship, shunning, & snobish insult) for fighting enemy ideas.

23 Note that when the shockingly new discoveries of Darwin, Einstein, Bohr, Rutherford were announced, they were adopted by most scientists within a decade, often much quicker. The contrast to the present case ought (fn 81) to embarrass the stubborn upholders of English-Deity orthodoxy, given that the case for Shakespeare’s non-authorship has been obvious for well over a century and Hoffman’s thorough Marlovian evidence has been published for over half a century.

24 Irony: when the Hoffman theory is finally accepted, it will be a belatedly-muched comfort to the CompLit community that he was (§E25) one of their own: a poet, not sides. (Other than §C2’s 100,000-to-1 math.) It leaves effectively-zero wiggle-room in proving that Shakespeare could not have written the plays. This is a virtual certainty which we of course cannot expect to quite achieve in identifying the true author; though, by elementary induction, we will arrive at an answer with surprisingly high surety.

25 What does it say of the English-teaching profession that it has taken it over a century to (not) understand the logic? The same pattern (fn 187) of defending-to-the-last-ditch ashaky grant-cow icon went on for a few decades among historians of astronomy regarding plagiast and data-faker astrologer-geocentrist Claudius Ptolemy. But even Ptolemy’s least-numerate defenders eventually caught on, and it’s now a dead controversy outside pop-sci pseudo-scholars.

26 Indeed once we consider eliminating Shakespeare as author, the central question that requires confrontation is: who would want to hide behind a front and why? Clearing away extraneous matters to get to the probabilistic nub here, we confront a fulerum-question. Which is more improbable: [a] That the will of the genuine author of the plays would at great length fail (§I15) to exhibit literary or scholarly interests? or [b] That the real playwright would wish to be anonymous? (Even Baconians & Oxfords have solved this question.)

27 What is particularly odd is that there is one famous figure who had (§E4) the only powerful anonymity-motive among the top candidates — an undeniably valid reason for staying out of sight. (The same reason that was featured in The Front.)

28 Yet most of those (both believers & skeptics) interested in whether Shakespeare wrote plays are unaware of this. (Shapiro [§H16] just skips it. And not a single one of the dozens of enraged 2011 reviews of Anonymous mentioned it.) We will shortly (§M) provide the evidence establishing the writer’s cause for disappearance; but we pause first for some sociological background.

29 Comment in passing, regarding academic-establishment-think. If for decades an entire academic field (English&CompLit) is unable to follow Price’s simple, irrefutable reasoning from Shakespeare’s will, one wonders about the validity of what its scholars do for a living: just how reliable are CompLit’s complex, speculative readings of influences&symbolisms in(to) the works which lit-Experts claim to interpret for us?

30 Would you seek solution of a calculus problem from a student who can’t add two-plus-two? Should one expect a hole-in-the-wall Tijuana clinic to cure cancer, if it can’t do the simplest surgery?

CompLit’s problem in this controversy is similar to the gov’t’s Beltway mentality: insularity and BS’ normalcy, which doesn’t work its magic so reliably outside its own tight, -threatening klan; thus the necessary resort to non-rational means (mainly censorship, shunning, & snobish insult) for fighting enemy ideas.

31 Note that when the shockingly new discoveries of Darwin, Einstein, Bohr, Rutherford were announced, they were adopted by most scientists within a decade, often much quicker. The contrast to the present case ought (fn 81) to embarrass the stubborn upholders of English-Deity orthodoxy, given that the case for Shakespeare’s non-authorship has been obvious for well over a century and Hoffman’s thorough Marlovian evidence has been published for over half a century.

32 Irony: when the Hoffman theory is finally accepted, it will be a belatedly-muched comfort to the CompLit community that he was (§E25) one of their own: a poet, not
thought (§132) with little evidence of the statistical insignificance that is typical of these sorts of juggling sweeps across vast and unordered (§126; vs §50) reservoirs of potential coincidences. And permutations. Such manipulation appeals to the public. And has even fooled actors Derek Jacobi & Orson Welles (Mxxvi & xxvii). But it didn’t fare well in a mock trial before a few Supreme Court justices (S205f). Professional statisticians regard such long-familiar stuff rather than entertainment as serious research. (But a godsend for helping “psychics” prove their one-hundred-percent accuracy. In predicting the past.)

J3

Practitioners of this brand of investigation discern detailed predictions of the entire history of the world in, e.g., the Bible or Nostradamus. (Prominent Oxfordian author D.Roper also wrote Nostradamus: The Truth, promoted thusly: [www.nostradamus.org.uk]: “Every word could be confirmed by true, historical evidence. To the contrary. FACT!” Only predictivity in evidence here: DR 1st posted the foregoing Nostradamus comparison 2010/6/12, 8 months after learning of Roper’s book & mentality.)

J4

Oxfordian Chaos was thereby assured. And imaginative alibis for key non-fitting evidence abounded, such as (M360; Roper p.196) for the inconvenience of Oxford’s 1604 death, years before the Shakespeare plays (in which some discern post-1604 references: S179; E43) stopped appearing, c.1611. The Sonnets were 1st published in 1609. And would Oxford (b.1550) start publishing “Shakespeare” plays only in his mid-forties?

J5

Yet a few factors do beckon as potential bases for solid induction. The author had to be someone extremely well versed in the classics (P243), presumably university-trained, and a brilliant writer. As already discussed (§E42): obviously, a candidate would be much more plausible if there were evidence that he [1] was a consummate playwright (M236; S177) and [2] had a demonstrably ironclad motive for remaining forever credibly anonymous, even when he voluntarily created a lifetime of poetic coherence and aimed at immortality 

J6

Concentrating initially upon requirement [1] (§E43), let us now ask a hypothetical time-travel question which, incredibly, seems never to have been previously posed by anyone. Over a century ago, when the search for the true author started, what would have happened (§§S25&L25) if Christopher Marlowe had been on-the-ballot?

J7

I.e., if, at the outset of the serious controversy, it had been believed that Christopher Marlowe (then thought to have been killed in 1593, before Shakespeare’s name had been attached to any published literature) were actually alive during the time-range of all the plays and thus in the running for a vote among Shakespeare-skeptics: is there any doubt that he would have been experts’ near-anomalous first choice?

academe’s awareness of Marlowe’s unique connexion to Shakespeare.) His vote would likely have exceeded 90%. This thought-experiment points up the historical tragedy of the crippled-ballot — that ultimately drove skeptics to the Sisyphian madness of Oxfordianism, starting bigtime in the early 1920s. A further crippling was evidential: non-access (until 1925) to knowledge of Marlowe’s terrifying arrest and the body-identifiers’ professional shyness. And oft-forgot: until 1925 none knew of a vital key to figuring escape’s likelihood: Marlowe’s relation to the royalty-connected-spying Walsingham. By the time uncripplings finally occurred, the Strat & Ox factions were locked into their positions. Today, with Marlowe widely overlooked, the two most popular candidates are Shakespeare himself and the Earl of Oxford. But Shakespeare was inadequately educated and not provably more than ordinarily literate. There survive a few comments of praise for Oxford’s writing, and from these seedlets the Oxford movement (believing them mere glimmers of much else) was probably born, though said praise may be little more than a few kissings-up to a rich noble. He unquestionably died in 1604 (well before the “Shakespeare” plays ceased coming out).

J8 The very existence (M236, S177) of such praise suggests that Oxford’s hype-othesized secrecy was either very slipshod or a fantasy. Anyway, of the putative plays his fans think the praises were admiring, none has been thought worthy of preservation (unless one circularly attributes the “Shakespeare” corpus to him: Roper p.87), and the long-frustrating (fn 98) lack of direct evidence that Oxford could write great plays is similar to the Stratfordians’ situation. Yet Marlowe, born 1564, christened March 7 (H37) by our Gregorian calendar (February 26, Julian), wrote under his own name several extant, still-performed plays (much in the style of “Shakespeare”: §§11-13). E.g., Doctor Faustus (Richard Burton in the 1967 film), Edward II, Massacre at Paris. Both’s plays are in the blank verse style of which Marlowe was the acknowledged establisher in English drama.

J9 See, e.g., the judgement of no less than Swinburne, who (like J.M.Robertson: H125) viewed WS as virtually plagiarizing Marlowe (Zix), and who writes of Marlowe (EncycBrit):

“the first English master of word-music” (§R6) in its grander forms. . . . The place and the value of Christopher Marlowe as a leader among English poets it would be almost impossible . . . to overestimate . . . He first, and he alone, guided Shakespeare into the right way of work; [in] his music . . . there is no echo of any man’s before him . . . .”

J10 Swinburne continues: Marlowe “is the greatest discoverer, the most daring and valiant of the creative spirits of his time. How could academic cultism get any funnier than the nonpareil self-cornering delight that Shakespeare’s children Susanna & Judith were (like his own family: P234) far from fully literate (P237-238), though Susanna could at least (like dad) write her name.82

K1 The Marlowe and “Shakespeare” plays show a love of Ovid, of whom Marlowe’s relation to the royalty-connected-spying Walsingham (1925) to knowledge of Marlowe’s terrifying arrest and the body-identifiers’ professionalslyness. And oft-forgot: until 1925 none knew of a vital key to figuring escape’s likelihood: By the time uncrippling started bigtime in the early 1920s. A further crippling was evidential: K1

K2 Price (P211-212, 240) and Shapiro (S239) discuss evidence that WS struck some . By the time uncrippling started bigtime in the early 1920s. A further crippling was evidential: K2

K3 Such evidence each has a different take on. (At Q102-103, Barber skillfully develops

K4 Marlowe was wiser than The Front’s black-listed 1950s writers in that he chose a front which an able actor.

K5 Note that — presuming he knew for-whom he was fronting — William Shakespeare was a hero not a villain of this history, in that he was (even if for presumably generous Walsingham compensation) risking his own life to save that of one of the most able artistic creators who ever lived. And at least likewise (since they knew the score) for Rob‘t Poley, Nicholas Skeres, & Ingram Frizer. Note: William Shakespeare’s front is the only hoax DR ever probed that was not harmful but beneficial — magnificently so.

K6 In any case, Shapiro’s high-school-is-enough-education dodge evades the question of whether the obvious extra-ordinary intelligence of the plays’ author — not just his degree of exposure to classics — might perchance be

K7 As already noted above (§E42), WS’ otherwise detailed will notoriously left no books and no mss (S9, P146, Mxxix), a POWERFUL, SOLID rock of evidence for which Shapiro can only offer (S50, 224, 275-277) alibi-fluff speculations, at least as “far-fetched” (S212&225) as any he attacks in his heretical targets. His main alibi (e.g., WS must’ve just thumbéd through books at bookstore[s]): §275f is so feeble that — presumably to avoid triggering astonished snickers — it is not even identified as an answer (to the will’s shocking booklessness), and is presented hundreds of pages distant from his early-on

81See Blumenfeld’s amusing comments on the matter: B158. C.Wilson (W147) on the early First Folio plays: “Henry VI, Richard III and Titus Andronicus are so like Marlowe [§U2] that it is generally assumed that he had a hand in the writing of them”. See Hoffman’s extensive quotes (H133-136) from Stratfordians who detect Marlowe in early “Shakespeare” plays. (And see Stratfordian Bakeless’ lists & rejoinders: T2:224-226, 246-247, 254-255, 261-263.) Also the Yale Shakespeare’s Editor re Titus Andronicus’ authorship: B247. (Further: §§L18&L33.) These expert stylistic detections, & the fact (fn 50) that all early Marlovians were literati, will happily serve as shame-ameliorators in case (§24) Marlovianism’s ultimate victory triggers overbroad post-game snickering (§I21&I25) at CompLitWaits. Also, English teachers F.Crews & C.H.Ward, and O’Villarejo, outdid scientists in pioneer exposures of shams by Freud & oedipal Peary (both born 1856/5/6), and E.K.Kane, resp.

82C71 claims that university was primarily for professions, not literature (though Marlowe went a common route, pursuing classics & theology: B33), while admitting that some of the best writers did indeed go to Cambridge or Oxford. (E.g. Raleigh, Greene, Marlowe, Marston.)

83See §I3. Note oft-cited (e.g., P212, S239, E84) evidence that Shakespeare didn’t know geography: The Winter’s Tale refers to Bohemia’s seacoast. DR wondered at first if possibly this was Thebes’ Boeotia, misprinted. But Mark Anderson (a leading Oxfordian) provides a brilliant alternate explanation (M66), insufficiently recognized: during the period 1575 to 1609, Bohemia’s King Rudolf II (in whose employ astronomer Tycho Brahe died in 1601) ruled a tiny chunk of seacoast on the Adriatic.
passing acknowledgement (§9) of the will’s non-mention of books.\(^{44}\) Like dodge: [§34.]

**K8** Shapiro’s Teachtout-chapter, using Shakespeare’s fame as an argument for his authorship, only raises (§§H3&X; S2, P114&301) the question of why no one would have preserved a single letter by the most prominent man of English letters. But, then: did any ever exist?

**K9** There is an addendum to this issue. Shapiro cites (S224) George Buc’s written note that (to his inquiry) Shakespeare attested that a minor 3rd party play was by an obscure minister: Buc “knew Shakespeare well enough to stop and ask him” about the matter (emph added). But why does Shapiro (like his source) assume the exchange was verbal and not written? Is even Shapiro aware of the obvious answer to the question concluding our previous paragraph? Note that this is Shakespeare’s only surviving comment on authorship; raising two revealing questions: [1] Why is it about someone ELSE’s plays? [2] And in someone ELSE’s hand? — a situation as glaring as a skyrocket, advertising Stratfordian evidence’s scranniness.

**K10** Of course, most of the skimpy surviving documentary information about WS has to do with money-lending. Even there: no WS letters. This is obviously peculiar. Even more so in the case of his debtor Richard Quiney, who wrote a 1598/10/25 letter TO loan shark Shakespeare, which survives today in the Quiney papers. (Photo at C239.) But the same archive contains no letter FROM his famous lender in connexion with the same transaction, nor any other. (The file contains plenty of letters-received: E125. But none from WS.)

**K11** Diana Price highlights the unevadable point and places it in lethal context (P149 & P230; her emph):

All of [WS’] undisputed personal records are non-literary, and that is not only unusual — statistically, it is also a virtual impossibility [on the hypothesis that he was a writer].

Over seventy personal records survive for [WS] but not one reveals his supposed primary professional occupation of writing. Indeed, the only evidence that proves [WS] wrote anything is six shaky signatures. [His] documentary evidence further suggests that he was ill-suited to a literary career. He is a man of no recorded education. He appears to have been uncomfortable using a pen.\(^{45}\) His documentary trail is bookless, and his will has not a trace of literary sensibilities in composition or content.

**K12** Escaping Cult-de-Sacred DeadEnd. Now to requirement [2] of §§E44&15: motive for anonymizing. Oxfordians and others have devoted much advocacy “creativity” to justifying and getting the popular debate ever-deeper into their shared&now-canonical hypotheses.

**K13** Author-anonymity explanation-jests (§W26) include: [a] fear of retribution for veiled critical portraits of lords (Mxxxiii); [b] shyness of mundane publicity (P133, 218, 222; S196) or [c] association with the plebeian theatre world. Marlowians alone constitute the skeptical faction that neither buys nor needs any of this.

**K14** History knows of numerous cases of persecuted authors hiding behind pseudonyms or fronts, but how many did so because they’d poked fun at a fictional character designed to resemble a real potentate? Even mass-murderous Czar Nicky 2 didn’t have Rimsky\(^{86}\) executed for his Golden Cockerel’s King Dodon (thinly disguised Nicky as dodo-bird): the Czar simply impeded the opera’s production. (Note S177 on Tudor-era censorship.)

**K15** The whole point of criticizing in fiction (oft via jesters) is to evade a persecution which Oxfordians must ahistorically assume Oxford feared, for serious plays they assume he wrote, while Marlowians have thoroughly (§M12) proven their man’s persecution on charges of an undescribed, not assumed.

**K16** Shapiro makes (S226) a trenchant point against the Oxfordians’ central fear-of-persecution-for-dramatic-insult explanation of their candidate’s supposedly needing a front. Shapiro asks: why bother? — why not just publish anonymously (§P9), as most plays of the era were?

Note that, if aimed at Marlowians, the same argument is much weakened by the context of Marlowe’s 1593 arrest: recognition (§M5) of his highly refined writing style (§M7) in heretical public material may have helped lead to his May 18 arrest, an experience that could have suggested post—“death” use of a flesh&blood theatre-world frontman, serving as a lightning rod to focus attention away from himself ([§P10&K3] and help squash simmering (§L7; D95&K106) suspicions that he was still alive — a requirement peculiar to his situation. Obviously, such a concern applied neither to Oxford nor to any other candidate for authorship of WS’ corpus, since their styles were publicly little-known.

## L

**L1** The 4 yr gap 1594-1598, during which we have no record of Shakespeare’s name being publicly connected to any play (though his poems were noticed in 1594-1595: S235), is a minor mystery (fn 208) for all sides. Regarding plays, Marlowe adhered to Shapiro’s simple plan (§K16) for several years following his 1593 exit. Possibly he hoped (Q388-393) during this period that he would receive a royal pardon.

**L2** Shakespeare’s name was not associated with any play until 1598, when Love’s Labour’s Lost, Richard III, & Richard II were published & promoted as his (S227). But why would allegedly pushy (§T2) actor and money-lender-Shylock\(^{87}\) Shakespeare for years forgo the sensational double-talent publicity and extra gate he could (§S6) have gained by announcing his authorship of the very plays he was performing in?

**L3** Shakespeare’s 1593&1594 dedications of poetry (Venus & Adonis and Rape of Lucrece, resp), to the wealthy young Earl of Southampton (§H10), established a front-in-case-ever-needed (§L8&S15). Webster hypothesized that the young earl’s friendship was a comfort to Marlowe in exile. The 1594-1598 silence may simply reflect belated hermetic adoption of the plan Shapiro has suggested, after realization that the 13’ gap was a dangerously narrow giveaway (though only for the very few who knew the Brawl’s date), which hopefully wouldn’t been noticed until after Marlowe’s death — when it would eventually help make the truth obvious.

**L4** Shakespeare’s 1593&1594 dedications of poetry (Venus & Adonis and Rape of Lucrece, resp), to the wealthy young Earl of Southampton (§H10), established a front-in-case-ever-needed (§L8&S15). Webster hypothesized that the young earl’s friendship was a comfort to Marlowe in exile. The 1594-1598 silence may simply reflect belated hermetic adoption of the plan Shapiro has suggested, after realization that the 13’ gap was a dangerously narrow giveaway (though only for the very few who knew the Brawl’s date), which hopefully wouldn’t been noticed until after Marlowe’s death — when it would eventually help make the truth obvious.

**L5** The 1597 disappearance of WS’ name may (B237f) relate to the same year’s “posthumous” publication of Marlowe’s “incomplete” (of course: he’s dead, get it?) Hero & Leander. The soon-after (N69) “posthumous” completion of it by poet G.Chapman is suspected by some (T2:112) to evidence the hand of Marlowe (who is listed as sole author in the 1600

\(^{44}\) The huge separation in Shapiro’s book between Problem-of-Booklessness (§9) and its biographical Solution-Alibi (S224) is particularly funny because WS’ will is central enough that it’s in the (wonderfully clever) title of his book! — Contested Will. Note that at one place Shapiro argues (S50) that Shakespeare did own books (& falsely claims that skeectics contend [contra P234-235] WS was illiterate), while elsewhere arguing (S224, 275-277) that he didn’t need to. Where there’s no evidence, a theologian will cover all bases.

Price notes (P129, 302) that Ben Jonson’s personal library ran to hundreds of books. As his excuse for why WS (richer than Jonson) had to browse bookstalls (!) to read his sources, Shapiro claims (S224): “Shakespeare must have been a familiar sight [there], browsing through titles — for he could not possibly have owned all the books [see P242f] that through his plays.” (See also S275.) Again, dream-up-Evidence-as-needed-Shapiro’s main (amusingly ironic: §§3) put-down of alternate theories is that they are too speculative (§F18). . . . (And don’t miss the Shapiro speculation’s sleight: WS couldn’t have owned all-the-books-used? No, the issue is whether he owned ANY books.)

\(^{45}\) Note some Strats’ resort even to graphology (E92f), despite the Shakey basis.

\(^{86}\) And it didn’t hurt Rimsky’s position that he had in 1892 supplied young Czar Nichy Nicky a love nest for his paramour, the multiply-endowed prima-ballerina Mathilde Kschessinska. (See Rob’t Massey Nicholas & Alexandra 1967 Ch.2 [Dell ed. p.23].)

\(^{87}\) Was the Merchant of Venice’s money-lender Shylock a black in-joke caricature of forelockless loanSharkspeare? (Did Marlowe, like Walter Scott and U.S.Grant, write from debt? [To WS?])
reprint: H159). Majority scholarly rejection of this judgement typifies the import ([G11]) of arriving at a valid resolution of the WS-authorship controversy, because it is not unreasonable to suspect that the Marlowe-Chapman question is another case of textual analysis being powerfully influenced by Stratfordian insistence that Marlowe was dead in 1598. Bakeless is concerned (T1:185) by the issue: “A final puzzle is when and why Marlowe asked George Chapman to complete his poem, Hero & Leander. Chapman can hardly have talked to Marlowe after the stabbing” — so Bakeless speculates pre-death request. The more obvious explanation is of course off-limits.

L6 Also 1598: a book by Oxbridge-educated (S235) Francis Meres slandered Marlowe (T1;148) & simultaneously (B234, S235-236) launched the then-novel myth of Shakespeare having authored numerous plays: a dozen — not one had been attached to his name before 1598. So WS' play-authorship totals: zero-to-12 overnight!

L7 It is a provocative coincidence that 3 key items all occurred during the very same year, 1598: [a] Hero & Leander’s publication. [b] WS’ curiously belated public debut (allegedly [[S10] delayed 10?]) as a title-page playwright, and [c] Meres’ sudden first public recognition of WS as not just playwright but prolific playwright for years past.

L8 Did a passing 1598 rumor-suspicion (that Marlowe had survived) abruptly require multiple-alleying? (Or did the 1598 alleviations just trigger each other, to some degree?) H&L reminded the public of Marlowe and his superlative style, right as plays in that very style were appearing anonymously in London — so a long-prepared ([L4] diversionary front made more necessary than more necessary than previously).

L9 Or did the hypothesized rumor suggest the need for an “incomplete” poem’s publication to emphasize (fn 163) the perception that Marlowe was gone, thus he & WS were two separate writers? This was the time when the Earl of Essex’ rise against England’s ruling powers [the Cecils & Walsinghams] was unstably cresting, accompanied by a spate with Marlowe’s mentor Raleigh. A possible factor independent of the foregoing speculation: an inferior completion (by H.Petowe) of H&L had appeared in 1598 (T2:109-111); perhaps Marlowe was so offended by this unexpected result of his fake death, that he (or intermediary) then asked Chapman to publish the extensive (Q433) real completion.

L10 In a particularly funny example of imperial arrogance, a Stratfordian goo-roo (whose comments are taken as if they constituted evidence, by the cultists devoutly [fn 133] dominating Wikipedia’s WS&Marlowe articles) claims — contra the successful 3-century secreting (1593-1925) of the arrest warrant & coroner’s report — that there is no way that the secret of (a front) could succeed in “gossipy” London. (I.e., a plot’s existence can only be accepted [fn 198] if it leaks & fails!) When Wilkie Collins’ Count Fosco is told that crime-will-out, he replies:91 “Yes — all the crime you know of. And what of the rest.”

L11 Note the parallel Brit deepsixing — for over 1 1/2 centuries — of the file that proved that England had stolen from France’s Urbain Leverrier priority-credit for the immortal, near-magical 1846/9/23 perturbational discovery of the planet Neptune: position predicted by brilliant mathematical analysis.

L12 Returning to our Strat goo-roo ([L10]): he’s denying the possibility of secretion even WHILE for decades he&his have managed — despite the existence of a gossiper or two in the modern western world — to keep a tight secrecy-lid on the publicly-unknown actual evidence ([C7]) for Marlowian authorship. (The very passion Stratfordians exhibit in censoring and slanting coverage [reviews, encyclopedias, etc] betrays their private awareness of [Z23] of how dangerous Marlovianism is, when openly compared to Stratfordianism.) With equally sharp logic, the same Expert scoffs at the idea that anyone would give up credit for the plays — evidently expecting a man-wanted-for-torture would crave glory more than his life. And his fingernails. (Similarly, Strats quote [E3&278] as evidence of how dangerous Marlovianism is, when openly compared to Stratfordianism.)

L13 Those who profess to (unreasonably: fn 91) rank gossip-leakage — which they’ve committed-on not to have occurred — higher than Occamite logic, for evaluation of mysteries, may be startled at the implications (however uncertain) of the following items:

L14 Given that Deford is a Thames port on the Continental side of London, and that Marlowe had already ([E9]9) done Continental intelligence work, Marlovians reasonably propose (e.g., B219; Q4&218) that on 1593/5/30 he embarked on a ship for the Continent. Which renders tantalizing an item ... on that day, according to local Deptford legend, Marlowe accompanied some companions on a visit to a ship. (Nathan Dews History of Deptford . . . Deford 1883 p.124.) Now, the legend does not recall it as an escape ship, but rather the famous Golden Hind (which he evidently had occasionally visited earlier as well, for banqueting) — Drake’s Earth-circumnavigation-vessel, by then retired as memorial & tourist-magnet, in dry-dock at Deford. But one may trying-factor in oral centuries-old traditions’ notorious capacity for distortion94 In one potential direction: maybe the whole legend is false. But in the other: the mere fact that Marlowe&co are gossip-recalled as having been seen going onto a ship on the very day of his “death” is strikingly accordant with Marlovian theory.

L15 Another bit of gossip dates from c.1681, indicating that if anyone asked WS to write something down, WS pled hand-pain! The tale is relayed with proper caution in Price’s undeservedly obscure book (now . . . §the unaltered text’s implication is consistent with WS’ crude surviving signatures ([H2]). Price adds that perhaps Marlowe was so offended by this unexpected result of his fake death, that he (or intermediary) then asked Chapman to publish the extensive (Q433) real completion. Of all other candidates, a situation which has by now (for all controversies) become typical of pseudo-populist Wikipedia in its inevitably-degenerate later life: www.dioi.org/mot.htm#mwti.

L16 In a particularly funny example of imperial arrogance, a Stratfordian goo-roo (whose comments are taken as if they constituted evidence, by the cultists devoutly [fn 133] dominating Wikipedia’s WS&Marlowe articles) claims — contra the successful 3-century secreting (1593-1925) of the arrest warrant & coroner’s report — that there is no way that the secret of (a front) could succeed in “gossipy” London. (I.e., a plot’s existence can only be accepted [fn 198] if it leaks & fails!) When Wilkie Collins’ Count Fosco is told that crime-will-out, he replies:91 “Yes — all the crime you know of. And what of the rest.”

Summer circular-orbit ephemeris, see www.dioi.org/vols/w91.pdf (DIO 9.1 11 [1999]) Table 1 & its citation at Scientific American 2004 Dec (“Stealing a Planet” p.98). Thanks to these researches, Leverrier’s primacy in Neptune’s discovery has by now generally accepted at last.

92 E.g., such Biblical transformations as: [a] Rhino into unicorn (e.g., Num.23.22, Deut.33.17). [b] Jesus nailed to a ‘T’, later becoming a cross. [c] Confused hybrid-occultist myth — mish mash of prophesy-fulfillment & more dreams than the rest of the New Testament — evolving into Matthew 2’s geographically-goofy Christmas Star tale (fn 0), a legend which weirdly has magi-from-east aiming into Matthew 2’s geographically-goofy Christmas Star tale (fn 0), a legend which weirdly has magi-from-east aiming — which came on whenever he was asked to wield a pen (P127): he “was the more to be admired [because] he was not a company keeper lived in Shoreditch,
would not be debauched, & if invited to writ; he was in pain.” (Watch Shapiro deftly skim this item at S50.)

L16 Finally: There survives a 2nd-hand recollection of an apparent leak of the secret of Shakespeare’s 1594 appropriation of Marlowe’s 1st (§S10) post-Delafield play. (This early in Marlowe’s anonymity, perhaps the eventual routine [see reconstruction-speculation at Q424] of Marlowe’s transmission of his plays had yet to be smoothened.)

L17 Edw.Ravenscroft, who’d in 1678 staged Titus Andronicus, billing it as by Shakespeare, recanted in 1687.

L18 Ravenscroft said (T2:259, emph added): “I have been told by someanciently conversant with the Stage that it was not originally his [WS’], but brought by a private friend to be Acted, and he [WS] only25 gave some Master-touches (§S26) to one or two of the Principal Parts or Characters.”

L19 This interpretation might accord with Greene’s sneer at pushy “Shake-scene” (§S27) and perhaps at occasional ad-lib or pseudo-ad-lib “bombast” (idib) by a playwright wannabee (Q422) actor whose bombastic voice was uniquely prominent (“only . . . in a country”) for shaking the scenery. (NB: Greene’s upper-case for “Shake” does not have to refer to a proper name, since he nearby [§S27; H35] also capitalizes “Crow” & “Tyger” & “Player”.)

L20 Such interpretations are anyway less incredible than the now orthodox Stratfordian position (§S24) that Greene was upset at hypothetical 1592 entirely-WS-composed plays’ competition.

L21 Oddly, Bakeless (idem) claims Ravenscroft’s reference to privacy eliminates Marlowe & others since they were well-known not private—forgetting that in 1594 Marlowe if alive was as private as could be.

L22 Understandably (S196), few scholars have been or ever will be convinced that anyone (who was not under the torture-threat that kept Marlowe hidden) would — on such bases as Oxfordians propose (§K13) — spurn credit for decades of dedicated artistic achievement, obviously the center of his life’s enduring work. If a hypothetical noble hypothetically eschewed the plebeian theatre, he could have his plays performed at that day’s several private patrician theatres. (§W5; M255, 275, 317; B86; R90; E44-48.) Some plays were even performed at court (§W5; Q294).

L23 Question: do Marlowe’s plays sound plebeian? OK, they contained mayhem for the pits (and nobles likely enjoyed same, too). But the language, grace, and beauty contained in the plays are more consistent with a world far above the street. And who was backing Marlowe? — the Walsingshams, one of the richest and (T1:91) most cultured families in Europe.

L24 The common alibi that the author of the plays would have been ashamed (§K13) of their creation is one of the most ludicrous of the many alibi-myths that have been generated out of the several non-Marlowian cults’ fantasy-cornucopias (fn 68) for explaining their candidates’ shyness. (It has also been asked why an author would choose the name of a broker-moneylender50 as his cover: S208.) And, if retribution-fear (§K12) was a factor, why would the non-peerage actor Shakespeare be more immune from such?

L25 However, before unalloyedly condemning these arguments’ over-enthusiastic (e.g., §L27) promoters, empathize with and be grateful for those valuable pioneer revisionists (e.g., Twain), who had creditably perceived Shakespeare’s fraudulence.

50This item naturally got Ravenscroft smeared as a liar (T2:259); yet it is consistent with a formerly common but lately less fashionable supposition (C153) that Robert Greene’s 1592 Groatworth rage was at actor WS for tampering with his & others’ plays (§S25). (Q377 portrays Marlowe complaining of the same interference at other hands.)

50Speculation: money-lenders (fn 87) need enforcers. Skeres&Frizer appear to fit the type. Was it they who originally linked the 2 parties? If WS was deeply involved in the theatre world, the hypothesis is superfluous. Another possible connection: Farey has located Marlowe to Shoreditch in 1589 & 1592 (www2.prestel.co.uk/rey/biog.htm), where Shakespeare also lived (§L15).

L26 Given the mistakenly-restricted spectrum of likely suspects, early skepticism — fatefully (§J6) but at-the-time-understandably skipping Marlowe — were simply going with what seemed the best explanations possible at that time for the true writer’s mysterious shyness. (See below for analogies in the sciences: §W22; also fn 196, where wise scholars did not jump precipitously into a weak theory merely because of [fn 140] passing lack of any better alternative.)

L27 In 1955, US poet Calvin Hoffman dropped a slow-acting bomb onto the debate by proposing that Christopher Marlowe’s death was just as fictional as those in several of the very plays we are discussing (e.g., Romeo & Juliet 5.3, Winter’s Tale 5.3). Hoffman’s was the 1st Marlovian publication to appear following the 1925 discoveries of the prime documents suggesting Marlowe’s survival: the arrest warrant and the coroner’s report. Thus it was the 1st Marlovian case that was so strong as to be irrefutable. But both Strats & Oxfordians were by then far too locked97 into their long-established theories to listen.

L28 The political center scoffs that Marlovians’ faked-death idea is “far-fetched” (§F18; S212). Eliot Marshall comments (2014/5/3): how is a spy-ring conspiracy to save Marlowe improbable, when the same members of the same ring had already ([JN]2) pulled off the most important, delicate, & successful conspiracy in the pre-Enigma history of England?

L29 Shapiro personally denigrates Hoffman (S201), all the while not even telling readers what Hoffman’s evidence is (§J7; S212), though aware of it ([JN]13, H14, S36; S227). And, perhaps sensing sudden danger from an unexpected quarter, the competitive Oxfordians generally won’t (even when mentioning the theory of fake-death: M274) mention Hoffman at all.

L30 Question: Why must Oxfordians be so SURE that Marlowe’s undeniably fishy disappearance was a murder not an escape? There’s no evidence that justifies such adamancy. And there are a flock (§P7) of obvious objections to it. But: Oxfordians’ blindness must be TOTAL to the Marlovian evidence — to the obvious implications of the (admitted: M274) oddities of Marlowe’s “death”, to the checkable similarity of his style to WS’ (against which the Oxfordians have nothing at all to put in competition), to the provocative nearness of the 1593 Marlowe—Shakespeare two-week seige. The rejection must be 100.00%, leaving no room whatever for doubt of Marlowe’s elimination. Why? Because (§R3): if Marlowe wasn’t dead, Oxfordianism is. (And so is Stratfordism: §JR4.)

L31 After all, the Oxford case has always been at bottom an obsolete-since-Hoffmann well-who-else-coulda (§J1) process-of-elimination, claiming Oxford had, more than other candidates (§66); “perfect background, really. He was clever, well educated, well traveled.”

L32 This and Looney’s ever-more imperialistic (§J7; S194) style-arguments for Oxford constitute the actual longago origin of the Oxfordian movement, arguments so feeble and uncontagious that they necessarily in time became (due to this very feebleness) massively, cultishly encrusted with fanatically-compiled pseudo-evidences, ever more87 tenous

97 An astronomical analogy: Wm.Herschel discovered Uranus in 1781 (the year George III lost a colony but gained a world) and on 1801/4/17 discovered the major Uranus satellite Umbriel. But after his saw Umbriel until 1811, no one else saw it. Then, following the rediscovery, it took (www.dioi.org/cot.htm#kiod) so long to establish Umbriel’s orbit well enough to back-compute its 1801/4/17 position accurately (to verify Herschel’s priority), that by then Lassell’s name had been attached for decades to the discovery. Such cement having long since solidly set, Lassell’s mis-priority is still occasionally listed in publications, even 40 after DR’s orbit math had precisely (www.dioi.org/cot.htm#hwdw) established that Umbriel was right where Wm.Herschel reported it, while Mt.Palomar’s Charlie Kowal simultaneously verified for DR that there is no star of comparable brightness at the spot in question.

98 From the beginning, it became increasingly obvious that the raw Oxford case was making few converts. Since as early as 1921 arch-Oxfordian J.Looney pronounced “Loney” for obvious reasons) had in frustration (§J7) issued an expectation that was unrealistic for any of the vying parties (which is why the controversy’s solution must arise from Occam’s Razor: §W30), complaining (§I94): “circumstantial evidence cannot accumulate for ever without at some point issuing in proof.” (Similarly, more recent Oxfordian-despair dream-hopes for [S201-202] “a miracle” or “some dramatic break-
L33 When the theory of Marlovian fake-death is pseudo-met by today’s top Oxfordian, Hoffman is not cited (M274-275). Instead, we are told (with utter Oxfordian certainty) that Marlowe was killed not saved — this in a murky evidentiary context where the only certitude is the lack of certitude (§R2). Note in the following Oxfordian quote how close the writer comes to the obvious actual solution but out of preconception fails to see it (emph added):

The murder was a hit job.¹⁰⁰ None of the [three Walsingham] agents was ever punished because they were only carrying out the orders of powerful forces who could have been brought low,¹⁰¹ had Marlowe lived long enough to complete his testimony for the Star Chamber. In addition to being a secret agent, Marlowe was also the only serious literary competition Elizabethan England could offer Shake-speare. . . . Marlowe’s Tamburlaine, Doctor Faustus, and Edward II reigned¹⁰² above all other works yet produced for the London stage in popularity and acclaim. . . . [See also T1:190.]

On February 6, 1594, the London printer John Danter registered [anonymously Titus Andronicus], the first published Shake-speare play-script, a blood-and-gore fest worthy of Marlowe’s nightmarish vision. . . . Unknown forces, perhaps [Oxford’s] new and settled married life [DIO: the wedding was 1591, not 1594], perhaps¹⁰³ the impetus of Marlowe’s [1593] death had stoked [Oxford’s] creative fires. [DIO: While attention is diverted to 1594’s Titus Andronicus, no mention of 1593’s Venus & Adonis following Marlowe’s exit by only 2 weeks.]

L34 This, just a few paragraphs after citing (M274) Occam’s Razor! — presumably the last principle which chronology-juggling Oxfordians would want anywhere in the vicinity when going up against Marlovianism’s simplicity, unfurled chronology, and devastatingly solid documents (§§E13-E15 & T13).

L35 The openminded scholar lets the evidence teach him. E.g., www.dioi.org/vols/wk0 (DIO 20 [2012]) fn 4 n. The foregoing quote is thus a textbook case of the very reverse. L36 Is Marlowe’s post-1593 survival unmentionably far-fetched? Well, let us see — by examining the evidence which the most prominent cultists refuse to tell anybody about. E.g., hard Marlowian evidence — the fact that the sole known identifiers of the body were fellow spies and professional deceivers (§E13) — is met by mere speculation that the judge or the jury could not be fooled, though no evidence is produced showing that any of them knew Marlowe. See Nicholl’s sensible observation at fn 171. One Strat could-conda easily even dream that they would have dug up the body if anything were later suspected. (Taking time out from dealing with the thousands of bodies streaming past, as plague [fn 171] gripped London. . . .) The Straits’ preference for speculation, shaky (§§28&W16), and even contradictory (§W15) evidence is also evident elsewhere here (§I11). All of this is amusingly ironic in light of Stratfordian surety that its cult is solidly grounded, while Marlovian theory is mere “fringe” fantasy (Wikipedia’s drumbeat mantra).

through ‘.’) For a cause whose evidence had always been near-vanishingly thin, said call-for-proof set-soldiers-for-Oxford upon their still-vibrant mission of searching for ever more parallels, even cryptograms (§J2), parapsychology (§H10; S197f), etc — all of it inadvertently testifying primarily to the weakness, over-complexity (S194f), and a priori implausibility of Oxfordianism’s essential case.


¹⁰⁰See §P8. Again (§E12): had Marlowe actually been hit-snuffed, wouldn’t the killers have learned on-site that a stab in the forehead doesn’t kill instantly, if ever? ¹⁰¹§M11.

¹⁰²Fn 202.

¹⁰³§L33.

M Thought-Experiment #2: Stripped-Down Survival-Odds

M1 Our next (§H12) thought-experiment (presumably not original with DR) can be an eye-and-ear-opener for those too-long stunned in the mythology of any of several cults (P10) built upon inconsiderate reasoning on the authorship question.

M2 Let’s start by forgetting about the Shakespeare Controversy. Forget that Marlowe’s survival has the attraction that it would (§X2) solve the greatest literary mystery ever.

M3 Set that entirely aside. And instead just try independently gauging the odds on Marlowe’s survival, strictly in isolation, strictly on the biographical and documentary evidence which Hoffman and more recently (B211) David A. More and Samuel L. Blumenfeld have revealed. We are about to see that the likelihood of his survival is far from zero, a probability which we initially, temporarily and crudely, here set for purposes of argument at roughly 50%, an a-priori-shockingly high figure, but one which will (by the time we get to §N, and recall-ponder the significance of BAIL [§E21] on a charge of treason) seem reasonable, perhaps even too timidly conservative. Of all parts of an escape-scheme, bail was by far the most unlikely; yet its reality is attested. And if it happened, anything could.

M4 The key events all occur in 1593 May, in the context of the growth of the ill-fated (§L9; M273, 334; B202, 216) Essex challenge to the power (§§R1-107) of the anti-immigrant “Dutch Church Libels” (B212), appeared around London, written in an extraordinarily literate style (with reference to Marlowe’s output: §P4; S213), Marlowe’s once-intimate friend, fellow writer Thomas Kyd was arrested 1593/5/12 (H60-61) and tortured (so horribly that he died in 1594), soon spilling blood-and-gore fest worthy of Marlowe’s nightmarish vision. . . . Of all parts of an escape-scheme, bail was by far the most unlikely; yet its reality is attested. And if it happened, anything could.

M5 On 1593/5/18 a warrant was issued (B216) for Marlowe’s arrest (§J18) for atheism, A CAPITAL OFFENSE. (In the wake of the Catholic powers’ near-miss 1588 Armada, England was paranoiaically sniffing out & snuffing out all religious dissenters.)

M6 E.g., after (§X39) Marlowe’s “death,” pastors issued vindicative, even gruesome sermons (T1:1430) on atheist Marlowe’s much-deserved fate.

M7 Background: When in 1593 April seditious placards, the anti-immigrant “Dutch Church Libels” (B212), appeared around London, written in an extraordinarily literate style (with reference to Marlowe’s output: §P4; S213), Marlowe’s once-intimate friend, fellow writer Thomas Kyd was arrested 1593/5/12 (H60-61) and tortured (so horribly that he died in 1594), soon spilling blood-and-gore fest worthy of Marlowe’s nightmarish vision. . . .

M8 The most detailed indictment (quoted in full at H66-67) was by an implacable enemy of all parts of an escape-scheme, bail was by far the most unlikely; yet its reality is attested. And if it happened, anything could.

M9 In Holland in 1592, Baines & Marlowe had been co-investigating (§§S28&W16), and experienced torturers’ skill. Given that the Libels were signed [Cecil’s] spies conveniently went abroad [east of London, on the Thames’ south shore] where [Cecil’s] spies conveniently went abroad and returned and could freshen up at Eleanor Bull’s safe house before making their way to London? . . . Shouldn’t Marlowe have been at [T.Walsingham’s] estate, available for appearance at the Star Chamber in London at a moment’s notice? His constant availability to same was explicitly ordered in his presence and in the May 20 arraignment document (H64): he was “commanded to give his daily attendance on their lordships.”

¹⁰⁰Bakeless (T1:114) says Kyd only fingered Marlowe after his death, a sequence rendered unlikely by the latter’s very arrest, and experienced torturers’ skill. Given that the Libels were signed by Walsingham’s agents (B216) or “hard Marlowian evidence” — the fact that the sole known identifiers of the body were fellow spies and professional deceivers (§E13) — is met by mere speculation that the judge or the jury could not be fooled, though no evidence is produced showing that any of them knew Marlowe. See Nicholl’s sensible observation at fn 171. One Strat could-conda easily even dream that they would have dug up the body if anything were later suspected. (Taking time out from dealing with the thousands of bodies streaming past, as plague [fn 171] gripped London. . . .) The Straits’ preference for speculation, shaky (§§28&W16), and even contradictory (§W15) evidence is also evident elsewhere here (§I11). All of this is amusingly ironic in light of Stratfordian surety that its cult is solidly grounded, while Marlovian theory is mere “fringe” fantasy (Wikipedia’s drumbeat mantra).

¹⁰¹§S27 (N47, 391), though Hoffmann (H66) makes it 1593/5/29. Immediately after receipt (5/30), Marlowe was “killed” in Deptford, at the guest-house (apparently transit-house through’).) For a cause whose evidence had always been near-vanishingly thin, said call-for-proof set-soldiers-for-Oxford upon their still-vibrant mission of searching for ever more parallels, even cryptograms (§J2), parapsychology (§H10; S197f), etc — all of it inadvertently testifying primarily to the weakness, over-complexity (S194f), and a priori implausibility of Oxfordianism’s essential case.

¹⁰²Fn 202.

¹⁰³§L33.
of Eleanor Bull (who, notably, had court connexions: F).

M11 Marlowe was a longtime operative for the Walsingham family’s spy ring. (Geoffrey Rush played a-powerful, resourceful Protestantism-guardian [§27] Francis Walsingham in the 1998 film Elizab.) Marlowe thus had friends (B200) who were wealthy & potent; also routinely superdevious ([§20]; T1:91). So: did they arrange a fake death, to protect Marlowe from torture that might ([Q10] reveal secrets that would endanger his associates, as Kyd’s testimony had already undone Marlowe?

M12 There is no question of Marlowe’s relation to the Walsinghams. The May 18 arrest document specifies (H64, B216) that Marlowe be §3 searched for at Thomas Walsingham’s estate. The temporal coincidence of his “death”, so soon after his arrest, is at least provocative. (But to Shaprio, not enough to cause even a mention of any of this evidence.)

M13 Once we realize (from the will alone) that Shakespeare is out of the running, then: if Marlowe is assumed alive, an expert vote would be virtually unanimous for Marlowe, so the modest 90% value we floated earlier ([J7]) was set too far from 100%. I.e., the probability that he is the best candidate as WS-author is effectively equal to the probability that he lived past 1593. We next turn to evidence that will likely convince many that our preliminary rough estimate ([§M3]) of said Marlowe-survival-odds (during above Thought-Experiment #2) was also considerably too low.

N Cloak&Dagger. Theory-Interlude on Marlowe’s Purported Death

N1 Suppose you were arranging a fake stab-death of Marlowe. Step One: witnesses will be reliable. (As the saying goes: a man who can’t be bribed, can’t be trusted.) All three of the ([§18]) slippery men in the room when the “killing” occurred were of the Walsingham circle (B218-219); Robert Poley, Nicholas Skeres, & Ingram Frizer.

N2 Poley & Skeres had been key (W146, N150f, M273, B42&70) in undoing the 1586 Babington plot by Catholics trying to overthrow Queen Elizabeth in favor of Mary Queen of Scots, whom Liz1 in 1587 ordered beheaded (for said plotting), triggering the 1588 Armada. As a reality-check here, it’s worth asking: for schemer-spies of such awesome, delicate, and historic international ability and courageous daring, is it really “far-fetched” ([F18]) to believe that they could pull off a standard cloak&dagger body-switch to protect their spy-ring? Interlude:

N3 Even the relative amateurs of the 1949 film The Third Man almost succeeded with a fellow-spies-witnessed fake-death-… substitution ploy, masterminded by a hunted spy (Orson Welles in the film) desperate to dodge elimination. (The author of The Third Man, Graham Greene, was — like Marlowe — a combination of writer and spy.)

N4 A prior and more famous (though differently motivated) case of fake death is that of Lazarus, which also involved witnesses who were colleagues ([www.doi.org/rel.htm#fpv]) of the “corpse”. Less remotely ago: the centerpiece-ploy in Puccini’s 1920 Tosca is a fake death. (Note that the opera’s surprise-ending is possibly unique in the history of theatre, namely, a fake-fake death.)

N5 And pseudo-death plots continue in more recent fiction. The 1967 Columbo pilot “Prescription Murder” employs a substitute bod (which isn’t even dead) for a fake suicide. (Note that the opera’s surprise-ending is possibly unique in the history of theatre, namely, a fake-fake death.)

N6 Some will question the relevance of “mere” fictional fake deaths to this case, forgetting that the schemer at its heart was a professional fictionist. Anyway, faked deaths also occur aplenty in real life. (Farey has compiled a much fuller list than here: F.) On 2014/2/1, CNN carried news of the capture of banker-commun Aubrey Lee Price, who’d swindled victims of tens of millions, before pretending he’d suicid in mid-2012. In the mid-70s, glam-rocker Brian Slade disappeared and for the next decade was thought probably dead. (See the 1998 film Velvet Goldmine.) Militarily-stellar Marine SSgt Arthur C. Bennett, when about to be arrested for various crimes, faked his death near Las Vegas on 1994/2/3 by subbing a body in his camper-vehicle and then burning it up. As credulous (or lazy) as the Elizabethan police (who evidently thought that Marlowe had suddenly transformed from a violence-shy ([N15]; N86-87) writer into a vicious aggressor, probably was seeking an inevitably-painful but unsure suicide-by-brawl), the modern Nevada cops for years deemedit credible that a suicide’s preferred method would be roasting himself!

N7 Returning to 1593: which is more of a challenge? Saving-hiding a single private individual? Or ([N2]) saving an entire nation? (Francis Walsingham’s dedication to keeping the Catholic empire at bay was inspired by his 1st-hand witnessing the 1572 massacre of Huguenots in Paris, where he was stationed as England’s Ambassador to France.)

N8 Let’s list all the ingredients required for a scheme to (1) rescue Marlowe & (2) convince his enemies that he was dead so ([X38]) they’d stop even looking for him: N9 Witnesses that can be trusted by the spy ring ([§N1]).

N10 Marlowe cannot be passively attacked but instead must attack the killer, Walsingham. He’d need an escape-ploy, to preserve his creativity. (Though Hoffman argues that T.Walsingham was determined to save his lover.) Today, we see prosecutors “indicting up” a chain of offenders. The Walsingham power-clave may have feared that its enemies were torturing-up: torture A to get testimony on B, then torture B to get something on C, and so on to the top. Marlowe’s “death” served the prospectve chain.

N12 Aka Ten Little Indians. The last survivor among the victims is urged to commit suicide, by the argument that anyone found surrounded by 9 corpses will hang anyway. Hitherto-unnoted Slight-Puzzle: the problem, since any couple found among 8 corpses might stimulate a mite of police skepticism, too.

N13 Readers are encouraged when in Vienna to visit the Third Man Museum (http://www.3mpc.net), open only on Saturday afternoons, an entertaining & enlightening labor-of-love collection of memora-… includes the original zither that played the film’s haunting hit song, weekly live demonstration of a projector of the period, 1950 movie-posters and record-sleeves from dozens of nations (reflecting the surprise international success of film&song), as well as photos, letters, & maps of mid-1940s Vienna including a US Army 1944 map (used for B-24 Liberator bombing of Vienna) displaying Adolf Hitler Platz & Hermann Göring Platz.
N11 A seemingly minor detail of the coroner’s report (¶7; N17): Poleys & Skerres seated on either side of Frizer. (Why the bunching? Didn’t the table have more than one side?!) Thus, “in no wise could he take flight” (N84). This, along with Frizer’s back being turned to Marlowe, has the look of pre-planning for a (successful) plea of self-defense.

N12 A new question. Marlowe carried a dagger (I48, Q353), so: why (¶7) did he need to grab Frizer’s? Obvious answers: [a] Frizer must be daggerlessly defenseless at brawl-start; [b] the dagger to be produced for the coroner must match the shape of the terrible Deptford blood-flow wound (¶¶N12&Q1): 1 inch wide & 2 inches into the skull, N13 But this had likely been hammered (¶Q5) into John Penny’s corpse — just before shouts of HELP-HELP — presumably by Frizer. Thus, to match the wound and to disgrace Marlowe as an attacker of an unarmed man, only one dagger must be in-play at Deptford. N14 Yet all the foregoing requirements together force a two-stage (thus doubly improbable) scenario, namely, that Marlowe grabs Frizer’s weapon and attacks Frizer (from behind), but Frizer grabs it back and kills Marlowe!

N15 A-priori-far-fetched? Obviously. Yet, all four elements of our required-scenario are found in the official coroner’s report (T1:156, H77-78, B219-220), which was recovered in 1925 (T1:151) by Hotson — who perhaps hoped thereby to squelch Webster’s then-fresh 1923 public heresy (¶U3)? As Stratfordians (e.g., T2:216) perversely like to pretend of Deptford’s events. The play’s final scene depicts the recent 1589 death of France’s King Henry III, whose army was on the verge of attacking Paris and who’d recently (1588) snuffd the Duke of Guise, chief 1572 Catholic mass-murderer of the Protestant Huguenots. Vengeance-bent Catholic friar J.Clément stabs the king with a dagger dipped in slow-acting poison, but Henry grabs the dagger from Clément and stabs him to death with it.15 Sound familiar? Of course! — it’s the Paris edition of the fantastic blade-switch ploy of the Deptford “brawl” (¶N14) — finally perfected & effected on 1593/5/30 to save Marlowe’s life. But Marlowe isn’t done with the blade-switch device, and all of us who have seen the last act of his Hamlet (c.1601) have watched it play out before us — without realizing that we are sharing a resuscitation of the grand moment when Marlowe’s skill at fiction saved his life by seeming to write his last act.

O Playwright Proto-Scripts Own Switched-Blade-Brawl “Death”

O1 About the beginning of 1593 (fn 113), Marlowe was first reported (H58) to the gov’t as a seditious (and [H58-59&67] all-too-convincing!) proponent of atheism. (Rob’t Greene had 14 made this accusation cynically in a 1588 work: H58, B83.)

O2 Given his high political connexions (including perhaps having been tutor to a claimant to the throne: N340-342), Marlowe would immediately have learned of this and recognized the attendant danger to his very life. Hero & Leander anticipates (T1:185 & T2:114) his imminent death. (On pre-May awareness of looming danger, see also Barber’s learned if inevitably delicate speculations at D100.)

O3 It is possible (¶16) that Marlowe started seriously rush-prepping his WS-as-front scheme as late as May, when he suddenly saw trouble immediately ahead: (perhaps acting definitely only from the 5/18 date of the arrest warrant), with the hope of releasing a “Shakespeare” work, Venus & Adonis, before disappearing (its brief dedication could have been written almost immediately) — to make the desired duality more convincing — but simply couldn’t get it onto the street before a more-sudden-than-expected flight was triggered by his terrifying 5/18 arrest by an unsailing Privy Council.

O4 Marlovians (myself included) have hitherto at least implicitly assumed that sneaky Poleys &co (or the Walsinghams: Q198 [like Q258]) concocted the fictional scheme that saved Marlowe. But, wait a minute. Of the Walsingham spies involved here, which one was a professional concocter of fiction? Who else but the seasoned playwright of the lot: Christopher Marlowe himself? Does anyone on any side deny that a plot-device pro like Marlowe could AND WOULD think up without help a scheme — an illusion — aimed at making possible an escape from imminent fatal torture? (Though effecting it required resources made possible by his connexion to the Walsinghams.) After all, the plays are dense (B337) with schemes, switches (¶E16), deceipts, plots, poisonings (fn 120; B153, 275), fakes, betrayals. In a word: spyseat.

P Arch-anti-Marlovian Nicholl’s Misdating & Marlowe’s 5-Act Act

P1 Massacre at Paris was staged on 1594/1/30 (evidently for the 1st time), 8 months after Marlowe vanished. See T2.71, where biographer Bakeless shows better familiarity with calendar-practice (¶P4) than B131 or (¶P3) Nicholl, but worse arithmetic.

P2 The play was left unpolished (fn 121) by a suddenly-scrummaging Marlowe. Instead of the usual 5 acts, the play is in 20-some scenes. And this carries a valuable but hitherto-unperceived insight into his play-construction process. The strict rule for Elizabethan playwrights that all plays be in 5 acts was artificial! — or at least it was for the top playwrights of them all. The fact that act-bounds were not set as he wrote shows that he was 1588: Walsingham had witnessed up-close, as British then-Ambassador to France. The massacre goes a long way towards explaining why Walsingham would later go to extremes (¶Z27) to keep England permanently Protestant.

117 entirely Marlowe’s invention. In actuality, of course, Henry’s bodyguard cut down Clément instantly. (Note that the assassination occurred only 4 before Marlowe’s play brought it to stage-life.)

119But did Ziegler sense (Z293) the Hamlet switch’s Deptford echo?

120Both Henry III & Hamlet died from slow poison on the blade used. (In Marlowe’s Tamburlaine 5.1, degraded Turkish ruler Bajazeth lamb-pentamentically ill-wishes Tamburlaine luck in upcoming-battle: “And every bullet dipt in poison’d drugs.”) We note in passing that many Marlowe plays involve regicide (presumably reflecting England’s awareness of the Shanokin of Elizabeth’s position), e.g, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, Edward II, Richard II, Henry VI, Richard III, Hamlet, Massacre.
adding said bounds after not before the planning and even (at least in the case of Massacre) virtual completion of his plays.


P4 But at N41, 170, 225, & 286, he (§P1) mis-dates to 1593 January the 1594 Jan premiere of Marlowe’s last play, Massacre at Paris, failing to understand that Philip Henslowe’s reference to its performance on “January 30, 1593/4” (T2:71) means our 1594.12 Jan not 1593 Jan. This error leads Nicholl (at N41&286) to propose that the (1593 April) Dutch Church Libels (signed “Tamburlaine”), and ultimately leading to Marlowe’s arrest, which cite the massacre, were partly inspired by a theatrical performance of Massacre at Paris (which inconveniently hadn’t actually yet occurred).

P5 Note: If Nicholl is nonetheless right in his intriguing if speculative proposal that the play helped inspire the Libels’ threat to treat Dutch immigrants as amially as Paris treated the Huguenots, then their author had private access to the play. This would restrict the likely suspects to Kyd or Marlowe himself, promoting a popular cause: anti-immigration — of which Marlowe’s mentor W.Raleigh was the sole prominent advocate in the gov’t (N37&290-293, B213). Note that Martin Luther also nailed rebellion to a church door. And he did so at Wittenburg, Germany, which was (some decades later) the university of the real Prof. Faust, protagonist of the most prominent play in the acknowledged Marlowe oeuvre. And what German university was attended by Hamlet (1.2)? — protagonist of the most prominent play in the “Shakespeare” oeuvre.

P6 Given the pat story (§N8) of Marlowe’s alleged Deptford demise, one can understand why Marlovians disbelieve the slippery 1593 Deptford “witnesses” (§S18) — and suggest (§E12) that the body seen by the coroner was someone else’s.122

P7 Oxfordians agree that the Walsingham spy-clique was indeed plotting, but propose that murder was a sure way to silence Marlowe. (This approach’s logic must naturally dance carefully [e.g., §L33] to explain away the coincidence of Shakespeare’s immediately-after appearance!) But how effective would a spy ring be if its members were killing each other whenever danger arose?!

P8 And why the big show (§N8), with witnesses, elaborate alibi-for-kill, coroner, etc. — when murderers could just disappear Marlowe (à la Pinochet’s Argentinia), or (even simpler) have an anonymous goon mug&kill him on a lonely pathway and leave him there — just as Banquo was done-in by Macbeth (3.3).

P9 Hence N328 realizes, forcing him to a quite speculative hit-conspiracy (§L33), which requires (see similarly at fn 45) merging enemies Essex & Cecil, etc.

P10 The very fanciness of Marlowe’s “death” has an obvious implication:

P11 The disappearers’ aim was to end his persecution (§N5) by falsely convincing the world that he was beyond the law’s reach: POSITIVELY dead. And it worked for 362 years — until Calvin Hoffman brilliantly induced the full essential truth in 1955.

122 Some — including a courtroom-style mock hearing (now appended to the DVD of the 1991 film Edward II), E33, and R.Barber’s brilliant & epochal work (Q2&68) — portray the stab as into the eye. (Which would support an attractive Barber theory: fn 44.) Quite possible. But the coroner’s report (official version at least) has it “mortal wound over his right eye of the depth of two inches.”

123 A minor oddity in Barber’s work: torture-fleeing Marlowe’s nocturnal arrival on the Continent is given (Q4&7) as when the Moon was seen at 3rd quarter and the Sun barely short of the Summer Solstice. (S.Solstice was at 1593 June 11 Julian, about 17 Local Apparent Time.) This corresponds to conditions from about quarter past Local Apparent Midnight to dawn on June 11 Julian (England) or June 21 Gregorian (France). Did a wanted Marlowe really linger nearly 2 weeks before fleeing to the Continent? More likely, there’s merely a calendar problem here. Having just “died”, Marlowe would start across the Channel perhaps late on May 30 Julian, and might reach the Continent about the early morn of June 1 Julian or June 11 Gregorian. But the book’s calculations were made for June 11 Julian. (It wasn’t quite fully dark during Marlowe’s Channel flight. Sun never more than 10° below the horizon, & a bright gibbous Moon was 1/2-way from 1st quarter to Full.) In addition to a far less trivial instance here at §P, we find another parallel mixup (www.dioi.org/jha.htm#q8hj) by the Journal for the History of Astronomy & the Royal Astronomical Society’s Vice-President, revealed at www.dioi.org/vols/w11.pdf (DIO 1.1 [1991]) 18-9 [fn. 17]. Similarly: able Spitzbergen explorer Sir Martin Conway’s confusion, about Henry Hudson’s calendar, at Rawlins Peary . . . Fiction [1973] p.16.

124 Curiously, the body was stabbed in a hard place: the skull. Murder-specialist Colin Wilson says (W145) a real attack would be more effective (and much more likely) at torso or neck. Were Frizer’s 2 shallow scars in his own scalp pre-arranged to justify his required “counter”-stab to the head?

Q7 A Disarming Consideration. Another question is obvious but seldom raised (H83): after grabbing the dagger, why would Frizer have to stab an unarmed man? (Especially with skull-penetrating super-violence.) Why kill him, thereby inviting arrest? This is a scheme-weakening but unavoidable consequence of the plotters’ revealing restriction (§[N12&N13]) to having but a single dagger in play. Others have also asked: wouldn’t snugly-adjacent (§[N11]) Poley & Skeres have been able to intervene and calm down the alleged fugitives?

Q8 The most obvious of the several peculiarities of the Marlowe “brawl” has always been why Marlowe — & Frizer! — would be stabbed in the top of the head. Such questions are part of a classic case of inductive reconstruction.123 The head-stab seems very odd for an actual brawl (doubly so when doubled); but when we entertain the theory that the face-altering brawl & death were staged as part of a scheme that substituted a body other than Marlowe’s, it makes sense that the way science advances: find the cohering theory that fits the formerly formless evidence. (See §§X1-X3&X8-X29.)

Q9 So Hoffman’s claim that Marlowe survived isn’t far-fetched at all. There is no sure (§X2) guarantee that the theory is true. It’s not its kook, despite Stratfordians’ insufferably snobbish (§[T11]) shun-attempts to paint it so.

Q10 Marlowe and his also-vulnerable (§[L33]) but also-agile fellow spies were presumably in a state of try-anything desperation, with him under the shadow of the Tudor rack. Q11 But he was backed by powerful, rich allies and a raft of slippery co-spies, who were capable of brotherly teamwork to save one of their own preciously rare species.

So, were someone to ask whether his “death” was a classic espionage ploy for entering him into what we may dub a Nonwitness126 Protection Program, most,128 of us would deem the probability far lower. From now on, as already noted (§M3), the odds are probably far better than 50-50, even before we get into the spectacular inductive profit (§[X31]) the theory will provide in the Shakespeare Controversy; which starts to segue us to a startling segue (§S).

R Cultists Need Marlowe Dead More Than The Star Chamber Did

R1 Advocates for other authorship candidates consistently betray their fears that Marlowe survived by over-faking surety that he didn’t. Why do Strats keep calling the idea “absurd” — and “far-fetched” (§L2n), “fantastic” (§[S23]), “preposterous” — pseudo-confident remarks identically translatable: he’d BETTER have died, or we’re cooked. Are all these chaps really this innocent of what a resourceful espionage ring (Walsingham’s) was tops in the world: (§Z7) and his fellows can pull off under emergency (§M5) conditions? Have they not read anything of the daring schemes that litter the history of politics,129 espionage, & war? (Would they disbelieve the astonishing 1942 Doolittle Raid or Otto Skorzeny’s improbable 1943 rescue of Mussolini if there weren’t on-site film of each?) So: why the religious Stratfordian adamancy (even from mild Strats: §§U4&S23), unqualifiedly insisting that the obviously-at-least-possible is not merely improbable but flat-impossible?

R2 What reason, other than I-can’t-have-been-this-wrong-this-long pride130 can explain Stratfordians’ eternally immutable131 insistence that that an obviously non-zero, non-trivial

probability must be declared EXACTLY zero132

R3 Obvious answer: All competing factions — including Stratfordians — know and thus fear the lethal conditional (which they all understand but never speak: §[S31]), one of several indicia (§[H9]) that Marlovianism is their secret nightmare:

If Marlowe lived on after 1593, then he created Shakespeare’s plays.

R4 Anyone who’s followed the authorship debate can check his memory: has he ever read a Stratfordian state: OK, so maybe Marlowe did get away — but, even if he did, he didn’t write Shakespeare?

R5 No. Too ridiculous even for Stratfordians. Why would going incognito-via-alias halt Marlowe’s creativity? It never had before, during his years of previous aliases for international espionage (§M9).

R6 As Barber emphatically emphasizes (Q211, 290, 374), Marlowe LIVED33 to create the exquisite beauty, drama, & word-music (§J9) he had been granting humanity for years before 1593.

R7 Yet after 1593, we have not the miracle of two such voices. (If only)134 No, there is — immediately (and as maturely as ever: §[S11]) — still but one. (How things do stay the same. . . .) It is the obviousness of this point that elucidates the otherwise inexplicable passion various cults display in decreeing135 Marlowe’s non-escape and death to be ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN.

S Invisible Shakespeare — Defending Will by Contradicting Him

S1 The Neat Temporal Marlowe—Shakespeare Handoff. Once we start examining the foregoing in the Shakespeare-authorship context, Marlowe’s survival appears less a speculation and more a perfect potential resolution (§X2) of that long-intractible mystery.

Then, on top of the at-least-substantial possibility that Marlowe escaped, we learn that “Shakespeare” 14 appears publicly as a writer immediately afterwards: merely 13 days (or less) after Marlowe’s “death” (C175-176m), issuing a dedication of Venus and Adonis which calls the poem his 1st work. (See §173. Silly contradicted at S234-235, over sixty pages distant — without mentioning the reader in conflict.)

S2 The poet’s exact words: “first heir of my invention.”136

S3 Further: this WS 1593 poem’s creation (like plays following) is so obviously beyond a neophyte’s ability that Shapiro — credibly evidencing his expert sensitivity to literature’s sophistication — must hypothesize (S226) that Shakespeare had been INVISIBLY writing for most of a decade! (See §[S10]; and §S235 refers to 1598 as “a decade/into his career”.)

I.e., Shakespeare (secretly) started playwriting back in c.1588. Shapiro does not notice or mention that the 1st play Marlowe wrote unassisted was premiered in 1588: Tamburlaine.


127 See §S23.

128 The worst of Shapiro’s several (§H17) key misjudgements on Marlovianism is the astonishing claim (S211-212) that the sole reason anyone would believe in Marlowe’s survival is just to make him into Shakespeare. The kindest interpretation of this charge is that Shapiro is confusing Hoffman’s original impetus to check out Marlowe’s fate, with the strength of the argument he’s seemingly-wildcutting curiosity ultimately developed so fruitfully (§X & fn 200). The case that Marlowe escaped obviously now stands on its own (quite independently of the motive for its 1955 unearthing), and stands much more strongly than Shapiro’s “evidence” for WS’ authorship.

129 Franklin Roosevelt: “Nothing in politics happens by accident.”

130 See www.dioi.org/vols/w93.pdf (DIO 9.3 (1999)) §A2 [p.120].

131 §R7.

132 Fn 135.

133 Active Stratfordians can empathize by considering how much Shakespeare-worship is their LIFE (§L10). I.e., if they were banished, would they stop reading the plays?

134 §Z3.

135 E.g., due to Stratfordian plants (www.dioi.org/aha.htm#vmh) among the WP Administrators, the Marlowe page on Wikipedia was long edit-proof (“protected”). It is lately guarded by watch-list Strats who automatically eliminate analytical edits offensive to Stratcult dogma. The censorship is so immediate that it reminds one of the Center for Disease Control’s swiftness in plague emergencies. After all, the longer heresy is posted on Wikipedia, the more likely it — godf’bid — could infect and corrupt some naïve, vulnerable reader who lacks the Higher Wisdom of his betters and thus might be led into the paths of Error. How like any faith. See historian W.E.H. Lecky at www.dioi.org/vols/w11.pdf (DIO 1.1 [1991]) §1 fn 17 [p.8]. NB: There is no question-mark beside Marlowe’s official Wikipedia 1593/5/30 death-date, a 100.000%-certain declaration (contradicting a minor institution like Westminster Abbey) which — given the weird circumstances of the Deptford event — only a fanatic (§L33) could make.

136 Emphasized at §R20. Speculative aside: does “first heir of my invention” use the last word just in reference to alleged creativity? Or additionally to Marlowe’s fabrication of a masterful front?
S4 Double-standards again (§F13): Stratfordians cannot accept Marlowe’s escape partly because he was invisible after 1593 — even while its wholly-invented (and WS-contradicted) Shakespeare-the-invisible-1588 playwright seems as real to the cult as, well, as real as the virtually-invisible (§K3) post-1593 Shakespeare-as-playwright.

S5 Yet, in his super-ironically titled (and strictly Stratfordian) “Documentary” life of WS — which as for all WS “biographies” — recovers not a single DOCUMENT he wrote, S.Schoenbaum speaks of the period 1591-1592: “if the Queen’s [troop] had Shakespeare . . . we do not know definitely of any plays he wrote for them.”

S6 Note that the §S3 speculation of 1588 writings by WS is Stratfordianly presented as fact; this, while on the previous page (§225) Shapiro accuses his critics of speculativeanity. He concludes simply: “It is implausible that WS was trying to publish, but only by 1594 was his dramatic talent recognized with the anonymous printing of Titus Andronicus. Comments: WS was wealthy and (as a prominent sometime actor and theatre-investor) well-connected enough to get a hypothetical 1590 play half as effective as *Titus Andronicus* performed and published as his own if it were his. Are we being asked to assume (§§S14&L3) that WS spurned the potential extra publicity for himself (and the theatres he is presumed to have performed in) that would follow from announcing that he was author of plays he acted in?

S7 As usual (§L20), it is conveniently forgotten that Shakespeare himself said (§S2) that his 1st work was 1593.

S8 No evidence — public or private — survives, attaching any work to Shakespeare’s name prior to 1593’s poem V&A.

S9 Not for any of twelve successive plays — until the retro-announcements of 1598 (§L2).

S10 Specifically: Shapiro is claiming (§S3) that WS was writing plays for 5-6 years before 1st publication (anonymously) of *Titus Andronicus* in 1594 (§L17). Notice how close this estimate is to the 1587-1593 temporal bound (§L7) of Marlowe’s acknowledged solo writing career! — i.e., “Shakespeare” (born same year as Marlowe: 1564)137 appears out of the blue with a style just as mature as Marlowe’s — and at the same time.

S12 A further welcome testimonial to Shapiro’s literary expertise is that he senses the right quantity of time (5’-6’th) — even if oblivious to the obvious conclusion from it. (In 1593, Marlowe had been writing plays on his own138 for 6’, having effectively completed *Tamburlaine* by 1587: B46. We note that Oxfordians [e.g., R87] propose that the WS plays of the 1590s were actually written much earlier: yet another of their time-line problems — being met as usual by ad-hoc alibi-thesis: www.dioi.org/mus.htm#wmv.)

S13 Shapiro smoothly passes off *Titus Andronicus* anonymity as irrelevant to the authorship question. There was indeed plenty of anonymity in play-production at the time (though less so for plays of the rare quality Marlowe produced: B131), since most authors were selling plays for money not glory.

S14 However (§L3): Strats believe that WS sought glory in acting. So (paralleling G10) there is an obviously-unnecessary consequent in Shapiro’s (shall we say Far-Fetched?) explanation (§§6) of the earliest published WS plays’ maturity: *are we supposed to believe that WS would turn down stage ultra-glory from 1593 (or even [by Strat-think] 1588: §S11), all the way to 1598 (§S9) by refusing to admit that he was writing some of the plays he acted in?* And we note a 1591 Strat contention (§225) that Greene called WS a pushy “upstart . . . Tyger” whose “conceit” & “bombast” supported an inflated sense of his own uniqueness (§S27!)

S15 Anonymity left it open for a wealthy arts-patron or speculator to adopt material, E.g., *Venus & Adonis* was originally registered (B230) anonymously on 1593/4/18 (during the period when Marlowe was planning [§O2] his escape into permanent anonymity) before V&A’s soon-after dedication claimed it for Shakespeare.

S16 Perhaps front-launch was supposed to occur prior to disappearance (and was too far along to be stopped when Marlowe was nabbed?), but the sudden swiftness of events in late May left insufficient time for that (§O3). If so, this failure could have led to putting the front-scheme on hold (until really needed) from 1594 (§S10 to 1598 (§L4). Many of the plays eventually published in the 1623 First Folio (including *Romeo & Juliet*) had not previously been publicly attached to WS’ name.

S17 Notably, the 1621-1623 project to publish the scrupulously edited, invaluable First Folio of the 36 “Shakespeare” plays was engineered by Edward Blount, the literary executor139 (T1:90, T2:222; B262) of Christopher Marlowe.

S18 More astonishing obtuseness is found in the standard biography of Marlowe, which (e.g., T2:216) accepts unqualifiedly a STRICT (§R) Stratfordian requirement: that Marlowe died at Deptford, even while owning that the three witnesses to said death were not exactly saints.

S19 According to Bakeless’ Harvard Press bio of Marlowe (T1:183): *those who identified the facially-mutilated corpse* were “scoundrels . . . Friser was a swindler by whose schemes Sir Thomas [Walsingham] seems at least once to have profited. [H.DeKalb’s researches found (H84) that Frizer had a long record of being a tool in illegal Walsingham schemes.] Poley [who may have attended Cambridge Univ long before Marlowe (T1:171)] was an adulterer and a spy. Skeres seems to have been a jackal for both. . . . Where we find records of one we frequently find another of the three associated with him. Is it not odd that they shall all be together at Marlowe’s death? . . . And is it not stranger still that the Walsingshams so frequently [e.g., T1:91] appear in connection with Poley and Friser? And is it not strangest of all that they [the Walsinghams] remained on friendly terms with the man [Frizer] who had killed their friend?”

S20 Indeed, Frizer was legally acquitted with uncommon speed (T1:100); Bakeless adds further (T1:170) “It is startling to find Frizer doing business for Thomas Walsingham the day after his pardon for Marlowe’s murder. It is still more startling to find him obviously doing business for Lady Walsingham twenty years later.”

S21 *Marlowe-biographer Bakeless says all these things (see also D84) and chronicles in detail (T1:154, 166-182) the slippery bios of the trio, “perjuror Poley, cutpurse Skeres, and the swindler Friser” (T1:183).

S22 He adds sharp doubts that the wound would kill or that the quarrel was over a bill (allegedly causing Friser to be stabbed unfatally from behind), astutely asking (T1:183): who argues with his back turned? Yet he claims to trust — and is it not stranger still that the Walsingshams so frequently [e.g., T1:91] appear in connection with Poley and Friser? And is it not strangest of all that they [the Walsinghams] remained on friendly terms with the man [Frizer] who had killed their friend?”

S23 [a] Was Bakeless so convinced (perhaps by his own of-course-infallible lifetime of textual analysis?) that Marlowe wasn’t Shakespeare, that he MUST disbelieve Marlowe’s survival? For, again (§R3): if *Marlowe survived, Shakespeare was he.*

137 It’s possible that Shakespeare’s close similarity in age was a point in his favor when Marlowe was (if you will) casting for an ideal front, thereby obviating the possibility that a critic might sense that the poetry Shakespeare was publishing didn’t fit the front’s age.

138 *Dido Queen of Carthage* (1585-1586) was co-written with Thos. Nashe. We do not know of any more Marlowe collaborations. (See §L5.)
Marlowe Invented Shakespeare

Also (caps added): “the ONLY Shake-scene in a country” sounds like someone at the very same speculators call everybody else’s theories “far-fetched”! To repeat for emphasis: the playwright-in-1592 chronology founded upon this foggy item — conspicuously contradicts (§S2) Shakespeare’s own clear chronology. Yet it is holy writ among ALL Stratfordian orthodoxologists, including Folger-edition prefaces. Strat-preference is, indeed, inexplicable even to imagine (much less actually encounter) funnier irony, or a better demonstration of where the nuts actually are in this controversy — a point we next examine.

**S30** Words such as “Player”, “bombast” ([L19]) and “Shake-scene” seem far more indicative of an actor than as the subject of Greene’s scorn.

S31 The suggestion that Shake-scene could bombast-out a verse “as the best of you” (emph added) is consistent with an alarm-warnng to London’s playwrights “union” that an outlaw-interloper (a mere player!) is pretending to be as able as they at verse (hardly what one would say of a professional playwright).

S32 Those being warned of the interloper would include WS — were he the Stratfordian vision of a seasoned playwright ([§10]).

---

See T2:223; P45f; Mxxx, 235, 257-259, 317; B8&184.

142 Empir orig. The “Tyger” dig is a play ([W11]) on a line (discussed at T2:221f) in *Henry VI* Part 3 (1.4): “O tiger’s heart wrapt in a woman’s hide!” (Source-play *The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke*.)


144 Open to accepting “Shake-scene” as WS, Price succinctly sums up *Groatworth* on “Shake-scene” (P47): “an attack against an untrustworthy actor who is also a money-lender and . . . a paymaster of plays.” And a dreadful writer: P50&55.

145 For one thing, WS was only intermittently in London, as shown by Price (P32-42). Also Barber ([K3], Q252, 303, 366, 417, 428, 430), who notes that this allowed him to avoid adulators, questioners, and requests for re-writes.

146 Students of cults will recognize the chronology-jugglers’ resemblance to Freudian shrink-turned-astronomer I.Velikovsky’s 1950 *Worlds in Collision*. (See Ira Wallach’s satirical “Worlds in Collusion” in his 1951 *Hopalong Freud*.) Also, the sudden 1622-1623 editing and printing of numerous hitherto unpublished plays is hard to reconcile with action by Oxford (d.1604) or WS (d.1616).

147 The trigger for the *First Folio* issuance may have been Marlowe’s final health-decline, since he was a heavy smoker (T1:128) now nearing 60.°
Spat's True Naïfs: Reliable Expertise as Thespianism-Pinnacle

T1 We begin the process of identifying which side actually shows symptoms\(^{148}\) of crankitude, by analysing the rationality of leading Stratfordians, ultimately\(^{149}\) revealing some unexpectedly establishment-embarrassing parallels to the Evolution-is-creationism debate.

T2 Recent ever-more-robust anti-Stratfordianism has inflamed frustrated Strat stalwarts to new heights of arrogant mass-smears. Their loathing of rebellion is now becoming aggressively adorned with shrinko-detective-work to spot megalomania they just know is hidden within the skulls of anyone doing evidential detective-work on the controversy — oblivious to the self-evident contradictory irony. And sanity-contest.

T3 The proffered psycho-analysis doesn’t begin to hang together logically, but that doesn’t discourage several prominent counter-revolutionaries from adopting some variant of Stratfordian psycho-analysis to portray as kook all doubters of crumbling orthodoxy, unaware of the irony — in the context of Strats smearing Marlovianism as “fringe” ([fn 35\&185]) — that most philosophers of science regard psycho-analysis ([\$V12]) as pseudo-science (though hopefully not resorting to normative insult like “fringe-science”), a view unwittingly bolstered by the following unhinged Stratfordian tantrums. From the already-cited ([\$E27]) 2010/4/17 article by Wall Street Journal drama critic Terry Teachout:

In a saner world . . . nobody would give [doubters] the time of day, there being no credible evidence ([W3]) whatever to support their claims. . . .

zanies ([\$V13]) whose theory-mongering has blighted the world of legitimate Shakespeare studies. . . . It doesn’t surprise me that such lunacy has grown so popular in recent years. To deny that Shakespeare’s plays could have been written by a man of relatively humble background ([\$V12]) is, after all, to deny the very possibility of genius itself. . . .

T4 Reality-interjection into this typically coochead Stratfordian rant: Marlowe’s father was a cobbler (B13\&16), so Marlovians (alone among major WS-skeptics) are affirming the very proposition (that the “plays could have been written by a man of relatively humble background”) which Teachout is in his article’s very title claiming that anti-Stratfordians are “Denying” ([\$E28]). (The ubiquitous 1959 Folger Library editions of the plays prefatory disseminate a blanket condemnation of all Shakespeare-doubters for allegedly arguing that “only a noble lord or equivalent in background could have written the plays.”)

T5 Dr. Teachout continues his upside-down shrinko-analysis:

The mere existence of a Shakespeare is a mortal blow to the pride of those who prefer to suppose that everybody is just as good as everybody else. . . . [Shakespeare] is the only major artist of any kind who has attracted such attention. Any scholar who dared\(^{150}\) to suggest that Bach’s work wasn’t by Bach or that Rembrandt wasn’t by Rembrandt would, I trust, be handled thereafter with the academic equivalent of padded tongs.

T6 In other words (though Teachout’s words are already plenty clear enough): dissenters should be treated as Untouchables ([V]).

T7 Comments (before discussing the issue of shunning ([\$V11])):

Note the sly shuffle of two quite separate issues: sober consideration of the relevant — no documentary background for WS — is set aside in favor of slanderous and fantastic psycho-obsession with the doubly ([\$T19]) irrelevant: WS’ low origin.\(^{151}\)

---

\(^{148}\)§\$H&V4.

\(^{149}\)§W.

\(^{150}\)\$ST2&V.

\(^{151}\)Does any Stratfordian even contend that Oxfordians show standard symptoms of snobbery? Do Oxfordians bar non-nobles from their homes & clubs? Do they talk only in the King’s English? (Has any baron of the Free Press even considered requesting such evidence before engaging in mass-slander-slinging?) With the internet’s oncoming new danger to Stratfordian orthodoxy, it seems that centrists have abandoned all standards of logic & decency in their frantic Charles-Martelian desperation to hammer & hurl back the pagan barbarians ([U27]).

\(^{152}\)The ban of the plagiarist is copying another’s errors. Thus, our film-critics’ virtually universal repetition of the uninformed (§V19) and patent ([V3]) fallacious mass-libel (that skepticism of WS’ authorship is proof of snobbery or envy), has exposed the majority of the press’ chosen opinion-makers on the subject, as just a mob of herdable ([www.dioi.org/che.htm#crbh]) pack-animal pretenders.

T8 To wit: if you think evidence of educational background is relevant to the authorship of the most famous literary corpus of them all, you are an elitist snob (a charge which attempts distorting many skeptics’ educational argument into a class argument).

T9 Indeed, said inclination places you beyond megalomania ([\$V2]). The same baseless snob-slander has also been copied into Shapiro’s International Herald Tribune 2011/10/17 review of the equally baseless Oxfordian-schismatic 2011 film Anonymous.

T10 Likewise, Newsweek’s 10/24 p.24 Simon Schama review (fn 38). Likewise, the New York Times’ A.O. Scott at International Herald Tribune 11/2 p.12. Comments: It’s ironic to find writers defending Shakespeare from a charge of plagiarism — while committing its essence themselves.\(^\) Note (Nicholl [E29] and B.Brantley are the creditable exceptions.)

T11 Given [a] that the English lit world is itself an exclusive club (where card-carrying membership requires no [spoken]) doubt of Stratfordianism), & [b] the know-it-all airs ([\$Q9]) of every one of the current media critics (happily excepting Brantley), it’s a lair to watch shaming ([\$T5]) Stratfordians call anybody else a snob. (Is this primarily hypocrisy? Or just projection?) These o-so-superior critics’ perversion of a reasoned argument (which we happen not to agree with), that . . . symptom of Oxfordians’ snob-elitism and conceit, is pure shrinko-analytic gas — this from cultists who can’t stop branding other people as cranks.

T12 The 2011 reviews reveal embarrassing innocence (fn 38) of the Marlowe theory — and-or lump it falsely with cases it plainly is multiply distinct from ([\$V12]) Stratfordianism’s 2010 knight-in-shining-orthodoxy, I Shapiro, already stilly did likewise — outrageously deeming the Bacon & Oxford candidacies (S4) “the best documented and most consequential . . . [and] most representative”. Thus, he may steal away ([\$J27]) without ever confronting the elemental power ([\$D16]) of the Marlovian case, which he himself realizes ([\$H14]) looks to perhaps be on the verge of dominating WS-skepticism.

T13 It’s weird to the point of risibility to watch pathetically documentless Stratfordians demanding documents of anyone. Regardless, among the vying parties, Marlovians alone can document ([\$D14]) a solid case based largely on ms & s (not just printed material): The key documents that bear on the authorship controversy are (in chronological order):

1. The daunting 1593/5/18 arrest warrant for Marlowe.
2. The coroner’s 1593/6/1 report on Marlowe’s supposed death.
3. Shakespeare’s 1593 June dedication of Venus & Adonis, calling it his 1st work.
4. The invaluable (Strat-recovered) 1593/6/12 diary entry that is the 1st record of purchase of Venus & Adonis; indeed, the 1st appearance of Shakespeare as an author. [Shakespeare’s 1616/3/25 will.

T14 While Time’s interview with skeptical Justice Stevens (fn 56: not published in a drama or review dep’t) is a welcome if limited exception to the 2011 anti-ThoughtCrime orgy of the Free Press’ reaction to WS-skepticism, the public is yet again generally being protected, naturally for its own good — and for its purity of thought (e.g., keep-trusting-the-English-establishment) — protected from ever learning of this issue’s cover-items, plus the craft ([\$S20]) of the witnesses to Marlowe’s “death” and WS’ shocking maturity upon the subject, as just a mob of herdable ([www.dioi.org/che.htm#crbh]) pack-animal pretenders.
We do not insist on agreement with the implications of these data and those further listed at our §A1 outset (though the data at least imply a reasonable if not ironclad-proven case for Marlowe—WS), but we do condemn the (snobbish?) arrogance of those who refuse, decade after decade, to lay these data before the public with anything like the prominence given to Brantley’s utterly un-news-worthy personal reminiscences. (From this front-page [§§G9-G12] article, we learn way more about Brantley’s biography than about the bio of any of the figures in the Shakespeare controversy! Just one more example of the malleable tactics of censors who wish to appear benignly non-censorial.)

I.e., newsmen have every right to conclude what they will from data, but are they justified in suppressing data that favors another side, on the implicit ground that these data do not matter? Are they justified in royally making that evaluation & excision FOR the reader (see cover & §S40), while never letting said reader even know of his data-deprivation? Again (§D7), the upshot is that most people (including the supposed experts regularly being trotted out to repel heresy) who hold strong opinions on the Shakespeare controversy, don’t even know facts (§T4) or recognize logic (§G11) essential to it. Prior to the film Anonymous, our Free Press’ excuse for suppressing Marlovian data was but-is-it-news? (This, from newspapers that print recipes, horoscopes, comics, etc.) So now that the controversy is news, these same establishment-catering newspapers print fossils’ opinions, slanders, and (§G10) personal ruminations instead of central evidential fact. The Marlovian case: persecution for heresy, spies, stabbings. Was it Murder? Or Escape? Boooorriiiing. Who’d be interested?

Teachout in-sum: his argumentation typifies Stratfordians’ ignorance of the Marlovian evidence.

After all, it is embarrassingly obvious (§V3) that Teachout’s central argument collapses upon realization that Marlowe’s origin is just as low (§T3) as Shakespeare’s. I.e., the most prominent Stratfordians (with the learned & welcome exception of Nicholl: E30) don’t even know something that basic to their own fave smear-argument. Most regular-folk Stratfordians are little more than loyal clones who believe largely because they are impressed by the Authority of the lit-establishment; thus, it is worth asking: what is the value of a verdict upon a controversy, when it is rendered by a clique whose judgement and slander is founded on false data?

Most Stratfordians seem naïve about how much ghostwriting and fraud go on in various of the arts.

This is an inevitability on a planet where celebrities are much rarer,153 richer, & pushier (§S27) than creators. Are Teachout&clo beyond our help in this area? We can only try.

The authorship (§T5) of Bach’s Toccata & Fugue in d has been questioned, and at leading museums the number of “Rembrandt” paintings that have been reclassified (into “from-the-school-of” ambiguity) is comparable to those which have not (yet?).

Vermeers may now be as costly as Rembrandts, yet the most art-critic-energizing “Vermeer” of all turned out to be (www.dioi.org/bes.htm#hvxm) a modern forgery154 by

153 The freshest instance is hilarious: Fox News’ Bill O’Reilly — never previously known as a Lincoln specialist — suddenly in 2011 began Billing himself as senior author of a book, Killing Lincoln, on the closing days of Lincoln’s presidency. That is, as a specialist not only on Lincoln but specifically on his 1865 April doings. It was obvious from the start that the book’s prime creator was the “co-author”, who’d realized that adding a celeb’s name to the cover of his book would juice its sales enough to make it worth dividing the proceeds. (Half of something is better than all of nothing.) The truth (put from spectaculatorially on 2011/12/16 (20:15 EST) when O’Reilly, bloviating on his deep grasp of Lincoln’s mind, informed the audience of FOX that one of the best evidences of Lincoln’s judiciously slow-but-surely undoing of slavery was his issuance of the (1863/1/1) Emancipation Proclamation after the Civil War, i.e., 1865 April. (FOX News is futilly False-Or-Xaggerated; but it and O’Reilly also more than occasionally provide a refreshing alternative to the usual Lib-Central menu served up by the other nets.)

154 See New York Times 2011/12/4 p.1 (or www.dioi.org/pre.htm#tlqj) for the latest exposure of the inability of toppe art promo-hustlers (whose bag of shams includes calling themselves “critics”) to discern real from fake, not to mention their provenance-checking slovenliness. And see New York Times 2013/5/26 pp.C1-2 for surprise revelation that the most iconic of Jackson Pollack’s dribblings (“One: Number 31”) bore large additions by a later hand, a pollution which ALL the alleged Pollack experts — those genii who claim superiority to the rest of us through their elite spiritual throbhood-resonance with his unique doodle-puddles — had somehow never discerned. A year before this exposure, appeared the unintentionally hilarious Susie Hodge book defending “modern art” from the common reaction that a clutz or a kid could do as well. The book, entitled WHY Your Five Year Old Could NOT Have Done That (UK 2012) selects — as its ultimate Pollack — this particular work: innocently raving on about it (pp.70-71, emph added), interjecting coconut overtones reminiscent of the competing crank field of astology: “Fraught with energy, tension, and drama . . . dense, interlaced mesh layers . . . exploring both Surrealist automatism and Jungian psychoanalysis . . . directly from [Pollack’s] inner self, which, in turn, was connected to larger forces in the universe.”

Hodge’s book’s fn (154) promotes “modern” art, which is simultaneously [1] a CENTURY-OLD con (e.g., PUCE: joke; www.pollack-exhibit.com); [2] a fiscal chain-letter; and [4] a fiscal chain-letter. Revealing the sham of its title, the book frequently admits that indeed a child could-have-done-that, but ever alibiing that the kid wouldn’t have understood the subtlety of the “artist”. (See, e.g., pp.86, 115, 157, etc, esp. p.66 on Barnett Newman’s tape-strip-zip prank: “intellectual” & “metaphysical”.) Hodge quotes Picasso (p.109): “It took me four years to paint like Raphael, but a lifetime to paint like a child”. Soooo — is her book’s title implying that Picasso’s child-transformation failed to fool an expert (in art & youth) as subtle as herself? (Following a chimp’s 2013 internet art-contest win, for his tongue’s 1)
pseudo-ancient “Songs of Bilitis” turned out to be a prank upon over-arrogant German classicists, the texts actually written by France’s Pierre Loyius, assisted by friend Claude Debussy’s musical setting — a work still deservedly admired on its own considerable merits.

T26 Are we to suppose that Elvis wrote his songs? That Dear-Abby wrote all her advice-columns? (When her sister Ann Landers’ competing column was detected in plagiarism, it was blamed on her stability.) That Shakespeare the great (not his court’s flutist-confoant J.Quantz) entirely composed his flute concerti? That Mozart’s 37th Symphony was not (as we now know) mostly written by Michael Haydn? — though a copy exists in the hand of Mozart (typically pristine: analogy noticed at P199), who was an entrepreneur and star-performer. (Like Shakespeare, known artistically in Stratford as actor, not writer: S242.) One of skeptics’ best points when questioning Shakespeare’s authorship is that the actors were struck (P171: B233, 245; S239; Q417) by the spotlessness of the play-copies they worked from. Jonson (C258-259; P197; S240): “Shakespeare “never blotted out line”.

T27 During DR’s researches on polar history, he learned that almost no famous explorer wrote his own popular books or magazine articles. Cases known to us (actual writer in parentheses): Peary (Elsa Barker & A.E.Thomas), Byrd (F.Green & C.Murphy), Balchen (Corey Ford — as told to DR by Balchen himself). Reidar Wisting, son of Amundsen’s companion Oskar Wisting, told us that Amundsen’s South Pole was just as ghosted as Peary’s North Pole, the main difference being that the latter trip was a 1909 hoax which was never-universally accepted until near Peary at the North Pole: Fact or Fiction? (D.Rawlins, Wash DC 1973) induced the 1st non-conspiratorial solution of Peary’s capstone fraud (pp.150&158).

T28 The problem of credit-appropriation is as old as creativity itself. In antiquity, we have not only Claudius Ptolemy’s no-longer controversial 137AD theft of the 1025 stars of Hipparchos’ 128BC legendary catalog (fn 187), but Pliny’s 77AD exposé (Nat.Hist. Pref.21&23) of the commonness of plagiarism even by the best-known writers. Syenies, Bishop of Kyrene, 3 centuries later (Letters 1926 ed. A.Fitzgerald p.238) compared plagiarism with stealing grave-garb. (But, some famous modern religious leaders have, instead of opposing plagiarism, actually engaged in it: e.g., Ellen White, M.L.King, etc.)

T29 Even in the field of architecture, we find the legend that the 3rd century BC Alexandria lighthouse’s designer Sostratos, knowing that Pharaoh Ptolemy II would (typically for royalty) take all the credit for the structure, placed his own name159 at its base, covered with plaster fragile enough to be sure to flake away after Ptolemy’s death.

U Preferring Debatable Evidence to Undebatable

U1 All of the foregoing cases should be kept in mind whenever a Stratfordian decrees to insensitivize-you (see, e.g., Wikipedia’s orthodoxy-doused articles on the case) that sensitive-he can tell that it’s obvious-beyond-any-need-for-discussion that Marlowe and WS have styles so distinct that the case-is-closed (in WS’ favor) on that basis alone.

U2 So we are supposed to forget that for centuries numerous orthodox scholars (§§10-J12) easily discerned (Q413) Marlowe’s hand in early Shakespeare plays?

U3 Thus things stood, right up until doubts of Marlowe’s death (e.g., Archie Webster’s scarly-prominent 1923 article, &culminating in Hoffman’s 1955 book) sent the Stratfordian case tumbling (§US) into ever-more-insistent denial.

U4 A creditable exception is (nonetheless-adamant-Stratfordian) Jonathan Bate who says160 “Shakespeare was very, very deeply involved with the whole life of the theatre. Whereas the various aristocratic candidates that have been put forward . . . came from a completely different world and had a completely different kind of preoccupation when they


159 DIO has honored this play by a similar one: try superblowing-up the Postscript diagram of the Alexandria Lighthouse at www.dioi.org/vols/web.pdf (DIO 14 [2008]) p.4.

160 See www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/show/muchado/forum.

were writing. Because Marlowe was a professional man of the theatre, it’s in that sense that Marlowe is the one sort of theoretically plausible candidate, at a kind of stylistic level.” (However — against the most obvious logic [§E13 & fn 140] — Bate naturally just has to add [ibid]: “But the evidence that he was actually killed in that brawl is incontrovertible.”)

U5 As their aneana becomes ever more publicly obvious, some Strats seek snatched-from-jaws-of-Hersey rescue via too-delicate statistical tests (e.g., E100-110), comparing writers’ styles where one can (§U7) achieve disparate results by choosing among criteria (e.g., usage-rate of “ne’er” [E107] or even hyphens) and-or samples, discounting anomalies by plumbing a pool (E106f) of alleged collaborators with WS (but not with Marlowe, though [unlike WS] we know he collaborated [with Nashe: fn 138]), Comments: U5 — that unambiguous codlusions with cases were rejected via false claims of a lone “Fatal Flaw” in it; 3 examples in successive centuries: 19th century: Darwin’s massively evidence-backed theory of natural selection was condemned for conflicting with a teleological view of the universe (Sir John Herschel scoffed: “the law of higgledy-piggledy”), which has withered away since among the enlightened.

20th century: Wegener’s continental drift theory was long rejected despite plain indicia in its favor, due to lack of mechanism (Darwin, too: §W22), an impediment later found illusory. 21st century: It was discovered a decade ago that the ancient Greeks mathematically exploited vast eclipse-cycles to fix the mean motions of the Moon, its apse, & its node, all to an (undisputed) accuracy of 1 part in ordmag a million or better. Though the method is the only anciently attested one, & though the solution’s math & eclipse-choice are unchallenged, semi-numerate cultists last-ditched anyway via (since-sunk) classic Fatal-Flaw Dreamup. These 3 parallels to the —WS case emphasize a key lesson (§W16): never reject a theory with numerous obvious, potent, & Undebatable161 evidences recommending it, just to cling to old orthodoxology by fixating-depending entirely upon one debatable item (e.g., §§S28), since said glaringly-isolated supposedly-Fatal item may ultimately melt away.

For wide sampling of Strats going for the unlikely instead of the likely, see §111 citations. (Pseudo-scientist Freud was similarly constituted: idem.) Of course, maranic Strats’ most-insisted-upon Fatal Flaw is: Marlowe dead-sure in 1593. U7 [2] StratStylometry162 like OxCryptograms, is the refuge of a case in such trouble, it craves misralusion by steroid-injection-ex-machina. (See: fn 40’s citations; DIO 1.1 4 pp.28-29 “more fiddle factors than the New York Philharmonic”; DIO 2.2 §5 [A.3.)

U8 [3] Unlike Wikipedia’s Strats, most experienced scholars (on both sides) regard style-tests-by-computer as ambiguous, laying little or no stress upon them. (Edmondson&Wells prefer Debatable Evidence to Undebatable §3, as the Strat case’s weakness becomes better known.

161 This surprise finding was backed (www.dioi.org/thr.htm#xfsv) by 6 frustratingly-ineluctable evidences on the new theory’s side, including its method’s known ancient use (Almajest 4.2 & 6.9). Immune to all 6, establishment cultists fixated instead on a lone cuneiform-based counter-argument, which collapsed immediately upon close examination; the fine print lurking behind its original eminent 1955 publication’s sloppy extrapolation had not been recognized until 2002: www.dioi.org/thr.htm#fj

162 Preference for debatable over undebatable lives-on near-unanimously in the farcal history-of astronomy community, e.g., taking seriously pseudo-Aristarchos’ anciently-bungled work Sizes & Distances, which has the Sun 2° wide, though no less than Archimedes says the real Aristarchos made it 1°2 (which is accurate). Far funnier details at www.dioi.org/vols/web.pdf (DIO 14 [2008]) §L2. [C.

An obvious problem for stylistemic tests: since public perception (§L9) that Marlowe survived could alert (for himself & maybe even more so) for others, he post-1593 might change (like M.D., as the Strat case’s weakness becomes better known.

See www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/show/muchado/forum.}
Why resort to shaky, diffuse (§U5), & complex statistics, when simple stats (§§C1-C2) provide a clear result? (See also on this subject T2:216-217 & 228. And note the obvious: if doing word-counts at all, one must compare plays near 1593; and be cautious about what’s being compared to what: see Rob’t Harris Selling Hitler 2001 ed. p.180 !)

This diversion returns us to Frankfurter’s observation (§H1) on unequal evidence-power, as we ask: why continue endlessly — and fruitlessly (§U27), since no specialist is converted by such studies — arguing ambiguous subtleties of comparative writing styles, by which the most strident and arrogant Stratfordians pretend they can decide and definitively end the authorship controversy simply by the loudness of their surety and insult (note Bakeless’ comments at T2:223-224), when we can — instead of hyphen-counts — judge by: [i] the load-bearing near-identity (§Z4) similarly justified in less-bloated, writing styles (obvious to all), and [ii] other inevitably-unavoidable points, which we next enumerate.

[1] The Marlowe & WS styles are nearest to each other than to their contemporaries. [2] Shakespeare’s echoes of & allusions to “other” contemporary writers are (fn 68) strictly nil except for Marlowe. (E37 says this could mean [a] CM just influenced WS, not [b] CM wrote WS’ works. Which doesn’t explain echo-fidelity — item [5] below — & doesn’t note what disqualifies the probabilities of theories [a][b]; why only Marlowe’s “influence”? [3] Shakespeare’s 1593 writing was just exactly (§S11) as chronologically mature as Marlowe’s 1593 writing. How can an arguable style-test-by-computer, of unknown potential bias, compare with the unarguable, agreed-to (§S3) fact of equal maturity?

[4] Similarly (a point whose significance is so upfront-obvious that it’s oft overlooked as a bit of evidence): Marlowe was the only Elizabethan-era playwright as steadily successful with audiences as “Shakespeare” (obvious to all). and mood is the ultimate arbiter and thus definitively close and exclusive to each other. (Try your own poll: ask a random sprinkling of folks you run into, even those already doubting Shakespeare’s authorship, whether they know that “Shakespeare” appeared just DAYS after Marlowe vanished: you’ll find that if the already-wised-up number isn’t virtually zero, it’s exactly zero. Follow-up poll: does the 13th datum give you pause as to WS’ authorship? Most reply positively, so censorship alone can staunch heresy’s spread. That’s why hysterical Strat-profs [E234&278] prominently beg to have the Westminster Abbey question-mark removed.)

So what we have is a remarkably close and exclusive Marlowe-WS fit on multiple counts — but (§U19) not quiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii close enough for the superior Stratfordian nose. To return to the real world of legitimate debate: given that the Stratfordian religion has so lost

harass & border-collie Wikipedia’s Marlovian Theory article. Virtually all academically serious combatants either ignore such studies or (e.g., C156) deem them inconclusive. To be fruitful, stylometry-consultants should reverse field (www.dioi.org/gad.htm#mdnyb): instead of using Marlowe-vs-WS differences to test if Marlowe was WS, see what happens if it’s assumed true, to follow Marlowe’s evolution 1585-1623 (& possible post-1593 style-ploys).
its cool that it unhinged (§V2) rages at any departure from its creed and is even prepared to exile heretics (§VI), can one seriously trust such an exciting cult to possess the balance and neutrality that are required to reliably render such ultra-fine judgements?

U19 Anti-Stratfordians’ reasonable questions regarding WS’ education are counter-logically (§V3) warped into a fantasy that all doubt is just megalomaniacal (§V2) snobbery. But hold on: who’s the ultimate in-denial snobs here? If it’s crazy to deny the plays’ authorship to a usurer-actor with no education-vita, then how much megalomaniacally crazier is it to deny it to a low-born (§IV) scholar whose hard-wrought pre-1593 literary achievements took him to Cambridge, and on to London where his plays were within at most a week (§U4, U18, Z4) of being the equal of “Shakespeare”?

U20 Style-Priests. For those genuinely seeking to solve the Marlowe case, keeping in mind that the debate centers on a dead body, let’s recall what ought to be obvious (though inevitably anethema to the Stratfordian cults who seek to own the discussion), a point we emphasize from the start (§B2) and throughout:

This is a police case more than a literary one. So it is more likely to yield to police-types than to literati. (Most Marlovians are both.)

U21 The very fact that Stratfordians must lean so heavily on a style-argument simply reveals the weakness of the rest (the detective part) of their flimsy case. Literati naturally find their own Expert stylistic comparisons definitively more compelling than the Fantastic-Farfetched-Preposterous idea (§R1) that one of the smartest people who ever lived just might find a way to decline the Star Chamber’s invite to a torture-fest, by escaping.

U22 But has it occurred to Stratfordians that a proscribed writer who was hiding from vicious holy fanatics by being supposedly dead just might (in 163) alter his style slightly to make it less readily recognizable? More undeniable, a genius is likely to evolve as he matures. Ted Hughes (Poet Laureate 1984-1998): “The way to really develop as a writer is to make yourself a political outcast, so that you have to live in secret. This is how Marlowe developed into Shakespeare.” (Quoted at Qv. See also Qv. 190). Even jail can stimulate, e.g., John Bunyan & Hitler. Or political threat: Stalin—Shostakovich’s 5th. Finally: did Marlowe now have more undistracted time on his hands than previously, allowing him to craft better plays than ever? As of the end of 2013, Wikipedia’s Strat-polluted article on the Marlovian theory emphasizes literary subtleties as the ultimate Disproof of heresy, treating as if it were evidential fact Stratfordians’ opinion that the 2 authors’ comparative styles & worldviews show they cannot be the same person.

U23 Gee, if you merely exile a guy for life,163 why would his worldview change? What a mystery! As Webster realized, exile170 is a recurring theme in the Sonnets — who could possibly know why . . . ?

163Marlowe surely reacted better (§U22) than neighborhood-protector George Zimmermann (possible brain-damage victim of Knockout-Gamer—black-icon Trayvon Martin) to a permanent life-of-exile — due in GZ’s case to kilowages of vicious racist death-threats — both men ending up hiding permanently out-of-sight for the crime of trying to do good. But, then, Marlowe had high connexions and historically unique literary talent — and did not suffer Zimmermann’s psychologically crushing sense of utter abandonment by all, due to media-persons’ Dembo-sluthhood or fear of becoming death-threat hate-targets themselves. Both men were aggressively pursued by their respective gov’ts. Even 20 after Martin’s vicious attack and months after GZ’s vindication by meticulous jury-trial, GZ belives (perhaps wrongly) that the US Justice Dep’t is still trying to dig up some basis for (effectively) double-jeopardy. Racists keep emailing him death-threats by the thousand, even helpfully outing his family’s address (miming foetus-huggers’ tactic against abortion doctors), as a prominent Hollywood did anonymously in 2013 Nov. Having in 2012 dishonestly tried&llynched GZ, before a jury overturned its premature verdict, the Free Press might have considered post-trial atonement by protecting GZ from mob-violence. Instead, his former media-voice-lynches now just recommend he “disappear”, Questions: Any wonder Marlowe did just that? Any surprise that GZ is as suicidal and combative as Hamlet (fn 25)? If GZ obtained a convincing substitute body, is there any doubt what his next move would be?

170§E10. Of course, if we are talking philosophy not related to Marlowe’s exile, one has such a huge array of potential correlations as to weaken (§J2) the significance of potential arguments. But we can
**V UNCLEAN! UNCLEAN! — The StratLion’s Gummy Roar**

**V1**
Stratfordian Teachout’s “padded tongues” rant (§T5), delivered in felicitously incantatory rage at the ThoughtCrime of mere disagreement — _overly recommending the shunning of heretics_ — blurs out the dirty secret of soft academe’s purported “free discourse”: the contemporary academic world is rife with cliques who shun (§W20) those who dissent from the views of archons who control funds, appointments, conferences, and promos. Fearing loss of such patronage (§C4), the lumpen-rabbitariate — and those many newspaper reporters (§T10) who so readily confuse pols with scholars — are laughably easy (fn 152) to herd into believing or at least spouting the sacred tenets of archon goo-roos. This reality — as well as (§G12) the scholarly narrowness (and logic-power non-enormity) of the mass of literati — helps explain how something as obviously false as Shakespeare’s authorship has survived for over a century after the emptiness of WS’ will and educational vita sank it (logically), as some of the most intelligent leading 19th century writers quickly (§J1) realized. Papal-bullying, potential shunning (§S23), cliquishness, “tremendous fear” (fn 41 {S6}), and mental limitations (see at fn 51 pointed _NYTimes_ analyses by J.Tierney of other DIO opposites’ parallel cultist stubbornness) have reduced Strat intellectual mobility on the Shakespeare Earth’s shape & Occam’s razor to a great as to _get all proposed significance to the of-added attached apparent Unanimity-of-Experts.

**V2**
Contemptuous Stratfordian psychoanalytic savvy similar to Teachout’s blanket smear of skeptics have also seized the able if over-selectively cynical modern playwright-screenwriter David Mamet (whose excellent films include, e.g., _Verdict 1982, House of Games 1987, Glengarry Glen Ross 1992_), in his 2002 book, _Three Uses of the Knife_, as quoted by David Aaronovich at pp.237-238 of the latter’s generally sane and useful _Voodoo Histories_ (2010), where Aaronovich approvingly sums up Mamet’s position: “The purpose of the [anti-Stratfordians], and by extension the purpose of their readers, is somehow to make themselves greater than even the greatest poet, partly, of course, by making him lesser.” (Edmondson similarly at E225.) Aaronovich then quotes Mamet (emph-caps added here on creationism — for amusingly ironic reasons soon [§W] to be in evidence):

> They invert the megalomaniacal [see [T9] equation and make themselves not the elect, but the superior of the elect. . . . They . . . consign the (falsely named) creator to oblivion and turn to the adulation of the crowd for their deed of discovery and insight . . . They appoint themselves as “eternity” — the force that shall pass on all things . . . The anti-Stratfordian, like the flat-eartherand the CREATIONIST, elected himself. . . . God

172 Denmo’s demonization-smearing of Ralph Nader since 2000 involves similarly fantastic speculations of egoism. See the laughably vicious attacks by DemSoldier Eric Alterman, among others, exhibited (strictly for jawdrop upchucks) in the 2006 film _An Unreasonable Man_, all of which ignored how thoroughly “populist” Dem congressmen and Obama have (by domestic & foreign extraction) vindicated Nader’s warning that the two parties are a single insatiable, greedy & corrupt monopoly.

173 Aaronovich shares a weakness common to other pop-writers who launch whole books against irrationalism: the eventually-kneekjerk assumption that current-establishmentarians-are-always-right. (By contrast, Colin Wilson is that rarity among survey-writers who has dug beneath the surface of the generally-accepted: §X32.) A similar tendency affects the Shakespeare entry of Tom Burnam’s generally fun 1981 debunkfest, _More Misinformation (p.172)_, which — with by-now-familiar (fn 171) confidence — states that “It is as certain as the absence of written records [P23] that the young Shakespeare went to Stratford grammar school.” Underlying reasoning (unashamedly overt at E141f): no one who wrote the WS plays could’ve been uneducated. But: the very point at issue is whether he wrote said plays. A perfect circle. Like §J2.

174 But, ironically, an admirably ever-evolving Mamet later commented (FNC 2013/11/11 21:47EST): “The essence of science is doubt . . . follow truth wherever it leads.”

175 On Earth’s shape & Occam’s Razor, see fn 191, 196, 201.

176 For almost unspeakably hilarious irony, compare this remark to §W.

177 Extreme irony: §S40. Mamet’s man—god joke is as deliberately bizarre as the plot-heart of the

---

**And Stratfordians attack (e.g., [§T3]) doubters for evidenceunsupported speculation?!”**

**V3**
The consistent theme of our lynchmob trio of outragedly-abusive Stratfordians is that Doubters deny Shakespeare out of envy! Obvious problem here: why, then, do the same Envious doubters heap praise on their candidate for genuine authorship? Poof goes the whole libel. (See [§T18].) And how much emotional and intellectual balance would it have required to realize that?!?

178 Moreover: far from denying-scoffing ([§V12]) at the reality of standout-genius, Marlovians are the most genius-glorifying of all the vying parties to this controversy. I.e., their discovery that Marlowe wrote “Shakespeare” means that the dominant English dramas of c.1600 were not written by two men but by ONE sole unique genius — even while he (at least early on) also carried out delicate espionage operations. Marlowe was obviously one of the most brilliant men in the history of the world — and another long-suppressed victim of religious bigotry, in the tradition of Aristarchos and Darwin.

**V6**
Must we conclude that anyone so bright, penetrating, & truth-seeking MUST ultimately run afoul of the mass of humanity, and its herders (fn 152)?

179 While collaborative (§W12) theories of the plays’ authorship are becoming the latest Stratfordian fashion, Blumenfeld makes the important point (B343) that “it was Marlowe’s forced isolation that precluded any collaborative effort. And that is why the plays in the _First Folio_ stand out as the miraculous work of an extraordinary genius working alone. And that is why we must know who he was.”

**V8**
Since so many prominent Stratfordians pretend to Infallible Taste — while treating the Lessfortunate as idiots with no right to an opinion — our puffed-up would-be-LitPopes are inviting challenges to their... kick in the brains and have nothing but their own haughty pretenses to blame for our present occasional shirt-unstuffings.

180 As to the Stratfordians’ snob-smear: the WS plays were clearly written by an extremely educated author. The Marlovians produce plenty of evidence that their candidate has an extensive and top-echelon background such as to _get all proposed significance to the of-added attached apparent Unanimity-of-Experts_.

181 Despite our disagreement with Oxfordians’ reasoning, even they do not deserve such sloppy slander. Look at the back&forth in Wikipedia’s “Talk: Christopher Marlowe” page. A 2004/9/21 entry contests Marlovians for evidence—makes Marlowe’s authorship probable (as against merely more probable than would be the case in the ratio’s absence) for _reasons of_...

---

**1984 film _Amadeus_, in which Salieri plans the murder of Mozart (a ludicrous rumor, P given wide currency by Rimsky’s Pushkin-based opera _Mozart & Salieri_ in order to defeat god for sheer pleasure of pride. (The more credible murder here may be _Amadeus’_ own idle in killing the popularity of serious music by replacing dramatic, powerful Beethoven with gracefully but relatively bloodless Mozart, as the current public’s Generic Classical Composer. An awful irony, since one of impresario Mozart’s prime accomplishments was his key part in expanding fine music’s audience beyond the aristocracy.)

175 Despite our disagreement with Oxfordians’ reasoning, even they do not deserve such sloppy slander.

179 Look at the back&forth in Wikipedia’s “Talk: Christopher Marlowe” page. A 2004/9/21 entry condemns Marlovians for “crusading against purported blindness of professors who actually spend their live [sic] studying Shakespeare [sic].” An earlier entry (by M.Tinkler) on the same page challenges anyone to read both men and still believe they’re not different people, expressing (§C7) utterly unqualified certainty of his expertise on what is for many a subtle issue; but, he explains: he took a careful smart in the brains and have nothing but their own haughty pretenses to blame for our present occasional shirt-unstuffings.

180 An odd-hominem’s smears are insufficient justification for going somewhat ad-hominem in return; — by checking out the psychology beneath the smears.

181 As to the Stratfordians’ snob-smear: the WS plays were clearly written by an extremely educated author. The Marlovians produce plenty of evidence that their candidate has an extensive and top-echelon educational pedigree, while there is no evidence that Shakespeare had any education at all. (Though he presumably had enough to be able to read scripts.) Whether the ratio of evidence—makes Marlowe’s authorship probable (as against merely more probable than would be the case in the ratio’s absence)
may be reasonably disputed; however, there is an item here that is not disputable: 
The education-evidence ratio is a point on the Marlowe side of the evidence-scorecard. 
Again, not necessarily a controversy-ending point. But a point.¹⁸¹ Those unfamiliar 
with the true emotional fragility of the superficially-secure Stratfordian establishment will 
perhaps find it revealing to compare how each side reacts to the opposition’s point. We 
answer the Jonson-praise point (fn 181) soberly, analytically, contextually (in fn 70), and by 
noticing its minor relative weight versus pro-Marlowe points.

V11  By contrast, the education-ratio point drives leading Stratfordians to hysteria.

V12  Their reaction is to psycho-analytically (§T3) convert this unambiguous (if limited) 
Marlowe evidential advantage into a charge of bigotry (§T7): a fantasy that skeptics 
seriously raise the possibility of genius-out-of-nowhere (§V14) among the under-educated, 
a morally-reprehensible (§V15) prejudice on the part of those who have committed the 
heinous crime of merely having more evidence² of their candidate’s education.

V13  And, again: keep in mind that this bilious bilge issues from a muddled Stratfordian 
establishment that claims that it’s the doubters (§T3) that are crazy.

V14  We now present our 1st analogy (of a flock yet to come: [W]) from the Darwin-vs-
creationism history, where only Darwin’s side does have any coherent scholarly evidence at all. 
A rough equivalency to the Mamet-Aaronovitch-Teachout tantrums would be: 
a religious nut sneering at an evolutionaryist for defying (and thus supplanting) god by basing opinion 
on geological data, rejecting Intelligent Design-out-of-nowhere & the nothing-but-faith-based 
(§V12; www.dioi.org/mot.htm#dlsb) Biblical version of creation.

V15  This is a grievous sin because faith is morally (§V12) superior to reason. 
(Just as Stratfordian faith in the possibility of creative genius from the uneducated, is morally 
superior to an elitist strawman.)

V16  That no traditional church actually goes quite this far only shows how remotely 
beyond-the-pale Stratfordianism has inevitably become, due to its Quixotic challenge of 
taking a virtually non-existent (§G3&S28) evidential armory into battle against growing 
heterodoxy. The Stratfordian lion’s roar is backed by large and elaborate mane.

V17  But no evidential teeth: §F15.

W  Strat Kook-Hounds as Lit-World Sore-Thumb Creationist Kooks

We recall (§V2) that Mamet compared anti-Stratfordians to creationists. It would be almost 
impossible to make a less felicitous choice of kookery, to compare Marlovians to — for 
reasons we now enumerate:

W1  It is standard among anti-evolutionists to attack Darwinians by harping (§T3) on the 
(inevitably!) fragmentary nature of the evolutionary record.

W2  The familiar complaint (§W22): “missing links” in said record. Similarly, Strat-
fordians (who meanwhile plead antiquity of records to alibi holes in their own arguments' 
supporting data) sneer that the skeptics can’t explain all details (§W22, S225) of the 
mechanics behind a hypothesized Shakespeare imposture.

¹⁸¹ Just as Ben Jonson’s 1630s praise of WS (P197, S240) can be acknowledged by Marlovians as 
one of the best points on the Strat side, though for lack of detail one can’t be sure how much it was 
based on personal interaction. The affection expressed may’ve been a try at convincing readers that the “malevolence” 
others saw in Jonson’s oft-brutal criticisms of WS’ work was imaginary, for he protests 
no-no-actually-he-“loved” WS.

¹⁸² Stratfordians’ blistering outrage and baseless speculations (as to WS’ education) were all analysed 
and gutted in 1955 by Hoffman at H8f, who perceptively describes these religious fanatics’ automatic 
a priori evidential approach — one which is obviously evil in the sleight performed by the mind-
behind the boilerplate preface to all 1959 Folger Library Shakespeare editions, which transforms (§2) 
the unsupported possibility that Shakespeare went to Stratford Grammar School into such certainty 
(expressed 24p earlier) that any contention to the contrary is monumentally “perverse” and unqualifiedly 
“false”. Look it up.

W3  Where the parallel to creationists becomes most amusingly obvious is on the point that — like creationists — the missing-link-demanding Stratfordians (§W1) don’t even have 
any hard evidence to link.

W4  The geological-historical record of Darwinian evolution (fn 170) is a series of fossil 
layers over time. Marlowe’s record, from grammar school, King’s School, Canterbury 
(entrance 1579/1/14: H38), to Cambridge University (B23) in the mid-1580s, and on to 
London up to 1593, is a series of gradually maturing scholarly work known to his colleagues: 
translations (of classical works that breathe in the “Shakespeare” corpus) as well as poems 
& plays that are near-universally recognized (§U4 & fn 81) as resembling² those of WS.

W5  Creationists reject evolution in favor of a sudden miracle by a blithely unpedigreed 
(§V14) god who is (on no evidence) posited to have existed for a long time prior to 
the creation-miracle (and to invisibly script later human events). Stratfordians posit 
a Shakespeare who also (§V12) comes out of nowhere² with zero known educational 
uptick at the debut (for a poet: Hxiii) advanced age of 29 yet nonetheless is overnight 
artistically at the top of his field. For the next two decades.

W6  The only communicable evidence (www.dioi.org/rel.htm#dxj) for god’s existence is: 
lots of people believe god exists. Likewise, absent any proof that Shakespeare wrote 
plays, Shapiro is reduced (§§F17-F18&I29) to the same religionist logic that also convinced 
pre-curtain-drop Ozians their Wizard was real: Shakespeare was a writer since lots of people 
believed² he was a writer. (Today, on the other hand, we all know Shakespeare was a 
writer because lots of people believe he was a writer — 400’ of Litworld Progress.)

W7  Shapiro is driven into this embarrassing corner because of a long-notorious ab-
scission of their candidate’s education.

W8  All Shapiro can do is quote (S235f, P112) several admirers of (what they believed 
was) Shakespeare. (Today, on the other hand, we all know Shakespeare was a 
writer because lots of people believe he was a writer — 400’ of Litworld Progress.)

W9  This clear connexion (once-routinely-stipulated-to: §J12) may become increasingly denied by 
ever-flexible (§J10&U3) and frustratingly evidence-bare Stratfordians as Marlovianism comes on. 
²B341, P255; “miracle of genius” (C71).


Be ing-believed-for-being-believed is as philosophically deep as famous-for-being-famous celeb. 
As with other religions, if we believe in Shakespeare’s authorship because their mentors and funders do. 
Several Wikipedia comments on the controversy use (apparent: [V1] near-universal EnglishProf orthodoxy as if this sociological fact constitutes a reliable 
comparative test of theories. Stratfordian entries & edits on Wikipedia are obsessed with stigmatizing 
Marlovianism’s logical argument as “fing” (§C10) and accepted-by-no-one in litwit circles, as if this is 
evidence, when it is only evidence for Stratfordianism’s logical anemia: what cult would need to keep 
repeating ad nauseam its numerical success at holding hereys in check, if it possessed convincing 
lodging counters? (Is the boasted unanimity starting to crumble? See StratMogul sweat at E201-214.)

¹⁸⁶ Diana Price tabularly shows that of 25 comparable WS-contemporary writers (incl. WS) he is the 
least documented: not even an obit at his 1616 death (P301), a fact with the obvious implication 
that many of his contemporaries had long since discerned (X38; Q394) that he was a front and-or a 
frontal (§V2) that Mamet compared anti-Stratfordians to creationists. It would be almost 
as with other religions, if we believe in Shakespeare’s authorship because their mentors and funders do. 
Several Wikipedia comments on the controversy use (apparent: [V1] near-universal EnglishProf orthodoxy as if this sociological fact constitutes a reliable 
comparative test of theories. Stratfordian entries & edits on Wikipedia are obsessed with stigmatizing 
Marlovianism’s logical argument as “fing” (§C10) and accepted-by-no-one in litwit circles, as if this is 
evidence, when it is only evidence for Stratfordianism’s logical anemia: what cult would need to keep 
repeating ad nauseam its numerical success at holding hereys in check, if it possessed convincing 
lodging counters? (Is the boasted unanimity starting to crumble? See StratMogul sweat at E201-214.)


¹⁸⁶ Being-believed-for-being-believed is as philosophically deep as famous-for-being-famous celeb. 
As with other religions, if we believe in Shakespeare’s authorship because their mentors and funders do. 
Several Wikipedia comments on the controversy use (apparent: [V1] near-universal EnglishProf orthodoxy as if this sociological fact constitutes a reliable 
comparative test of theories. Stratfordian entries & edits on Wikipedia are obsessed with stigmatizing 
Marlovianism’s logical argument as “fing” (§C10) and accepted-by-no-one in litwit circles, as if this is 
evidence, when it is only evidence for Stratfordianism’s logical anemia: what cult would need to keep 
repeating ad nauseam its numerical success at holding hereys in check, if it possessed convincing 
lodging counters? (Is the boasted unanimity starting to crumble? See StratMogul sweat at E201-214.)

¹⁸⁶ Diana Price tabularly shows that of 25 comparable WS-contemporary writers (incl. WS) he is the 
least documented: not even an obit at his 1616 death (P301), a fact with the obvious implication 
that many of his contemporaries had long since discerned (X38; Q394) that he was a front and-or a 
frontal (§V2) that Mamet compared anti-Stratfordians to creationists. It would be almost 

¹⁸³ This clear connexion (once-routinely-stipulated-to: §J12) may become increasingly denied by 
ever-flexible (§J10&U3) and frustratingly evidence-bare Stratfordians as Marlovianism comes on. 
²B341, P255; “miracle of genius” (C71).

W9  The prime testimony for the Christian god is contained in a holy book, the Bible. The prime reason people believe Shakespeare wrote the plays is the First Folio of 36 plays, published in 1623, 7 years after Shakespeare's death, with his name on the title page. Shapiro thinks that this and prior quarto title pages are conclusive (S225): "overwhelming evidence". (We have already presented a vast array of cases where title-pages [and the like] credited non-authors: §§T23, T27-T28, fn 153&187.)

W10  Yet, as with the Bible, there are improbabilities & contradictions. Henry VI is in the Shakespeare-titlepaged First Folio, but (B156, 184) all 3 parts were written in 1591, 2 years before WS's 1st work (§S2). (Some Strats insist [E92, 115, 133] several other WS plays were crafted-and-or staged before 1593.) Henry VI Part 1 was theatrically performed that year. (It's little known that Shakespeare's most famous line [4.2] is — sadly? — less a recommendation than a spoof of Jack Cade's commie rebellion against Henry VI: "let's kill all the lawyers." But DIO knows you can't kill a lawyer. After all, what's to hammer the stake through?)

W11  Indeed, by 1592, Greene had seen (fn 142) its Henry VI Part 3 on stage. (Though, Stratfordians interpret Greene in their own way: see S234-235 or any WS play's 1959 Folger Library Shakespeare edition preface.)

W12  But, again: this is well BEFORE the 1593 work Shakespeare himself (§S2) calls his 1st. (As we saw at §J12: even orthodox scholars recognize Marlowe's hand in Henry VI.) Moreover, Strats are now into the new fals shh theory (e.g., S240; E88&106f) that various WS plays were collaborations (§V7), which, since no collaborators are cited in the First Folio, means they accept that its title page, their prime-exhibit evidence, is untrustworthy.188

W13  The time-line matter brings us to another analogy with the evolution qws-debate. Evolution is testified to by time-ordered geological layers. So creationists unashkably cling to shaky caks, to try throwing doubt on that order.189

W14  Similar desperation (§§35), accepting junk-evidence in order to re-arrange WS's life-chronology, has produced one of the funniest among Stratfordian Verities:

W15  Despite Shakespeare’s own statement (1st work in 1593: §S2), the StratCult insists (even while rightly scorning Oxfordian cryptology) that Robert Greene’s entirely cryptic 1592 attack is somehow 100.000% SOLID proof that Shakespeare was a playwright then. (Not even the editor of the modern critical edition of Groatsworth agrees with them: P46. And Wells has here inteligently disinted from StratHer overcertainty: E74.) We repeat (§S28) for emphasis: this ultra-Shakey 1592 item is Stratfordianism’s SOLU documentary evidence that Shakespeare wrote plays ere 1593. (So cultists will never relinquish their Special Perception of the identity of Greene’s wrath-target. Contra Shakespeare: §S2.)

W16  AS WITH CREATIONISTS, flimsy evidence is ever preferred190 over clear evidence (e.g., §L36), even for central tenets. Recall also a parallel StratCulist pseudo-obtuseness: preference (§U13) for delicate, laborious, murky statistics vs simple, solid, crystal-clear statistics.

W17  Analogous to the foregoing Frankfurttian imbalance is Strats’ obsession with applying uncommunicable faith in textual-arguments, instead of basing overall judgement of the case upon verifiable facts, a blindness already discussed elsewhere here (§U20).

W18  One of the most revealing analogies to creationism is seen in the projection of haughty certainty (§G3) — the intensity of which is inversely proportional to the evidential support for it, because intensity is the only sharp arrow in the quiver. (When the evidence for one’s case is strong, no need for resort to arrogance, smear, threat, and censorship.)

W19  Which leads to the next Stratfordian resemblance to creationism: suppression of heresy. In 1925, Tennessee actually outlawed the teaching of evolution in classrooms. (Even today, US high-school students are protected from all but the briefest acquaintance with it.) And what is the only effective weapon for countering Shakespeare-skepticism? Banish it from the classroom (Mxxvi, 411).

W20  Even current-top Stratfordian Shapiro agrees it’s been “taboo” there for years (§§D7K&V1), due to (S5&S8) “the decision by professors to all but ignore the [Shakespeare] authorship question”. Irony: the unacademic creationists are less illiberal than the effete perfessors. The former only try to control secondary education. The profs, on the other hand, try to keep their censorship (and cocksure archonal sneering, to inhibit curiosity & heterodoxy) intact all the way through college, grad school, and beyond.191

W21  In addition to psychological, epistemological, political, & philosophical parallels with creationism, we may also compare again Marlowianism’s growth to historical cases, especially (other) scientific investigations.

W22  E.g., when Darwin 1st proposed evolution in 1859, the case for it was crippled (L26) by limited knowledge, not just from religious preconception (§U6) but for the same reason (ibid) that Wegener’s later drift-theory was initially rejected: there was no known mechanism to explain the proposed only-fragmentarily-glimpsed (§W2) evolutionary process. Several bungled attempts were made to do so. (But not even creationists go as far as Shapiro, by using these ancient cases to devalue Darwin.) Finally, Mendel and the science of genetics filled the void, BUT not that, due to its coherence, the Darwin theory was (like Relativity) accepted quickly among scientists well before experimental proof appeared.

W23  Many who promote (§C6) decision of the WS controversy by stylometry (in-hermanently) are yielding to a familiar (§U6&W22) temptation: Repel Error with one definitive Impregnable-Impediment-Test (which, for style-stats, few on either side are accepting as such), while in Marlowe’s case ignoring the also statistical — & Occamite91 — power (§X) of unarbitrary, uncomplex FACTS (§A1) which are consistent with Marlowe’s survival. (Farey’s stylometric studies are strong, and importantly neutralize determined Strat consultants’ incessant statistical pseudo-solutions of the case.)

W24  For decades, the Shakespeare Controversy suffered the same paroxysms (L26) as the evolution-vs-creationism dispute, since no known theory was able to convincingly
explain why (B6) the true author would hide, or to identify a candidate who unquestionably had the talent and track-record to show he could have written what WS obviously couldn’t. Strange theories (§H6) were bound to fill the vacuum. Some Oxfordians’ excuses for their hero’s putative shyness: poetry too homosexual; or plays too embarrassing to actual nobles unflatteringly depicted; or playwriting too declasse even after playwright-death (M374)? After the nobles’ deaths, too? — Essex (M316), & Cecil (S177).

W25 Hmm. If actors&theatre were so untouchably low (§L24), how (§L22) did it happen (S231-234) that actor Shakespeare was invited to perform Henry IV Part 2 before the queen? — who was also treated to a performance of Love’s Labour’s Lost (B235).

W26 The complexity, multiplicity, and hypotheticality of these fickle excuses (§K13) for Oxford-anonymity happily serve to bring into relief another clear superiority for Marlovianism, where one plain and strong explanation (Marlowe as fugitive) explains anonymity for all “Shakespeare” post-1593 writings: poetry and plays. Very simple (§A1), esp. compared to Oxfordians’ page after page after page (§G6) of shaky lawyerese argumentation.

W27 Anyway, the convincing-candidate public-vacuum vanished in 1955, when Hoffman’s startling, detailed solution vaporized at a stroke the very NEED for such ornate and patently desperate alibis. (Close parallel situation at: www.dioi.org/cot.htm#mlnp.)

W28 This put us in a position where (§D7) just a few lines of raw evidence (§A1) are now more convincing than the Oxfordians’ voluminously-endless succession of arguments.

W29 Cluesniffing High. These require whole hefty tomes, each running hundreds of pages of pile-on (§H14) clue-sniffing&gluing. (One runs 900pp! §S204.)

W30 Fitting Conclusion. Darwin-Marlowe vs Creationism-Stratfordianism grants us a final parallel here that appears less cut&dried than those just enumerated. But it should be the most compelling of all (especially to those of experience94 in historical — or police [fn 50] — detective work). In such work, we look for COHERENCE: simple Occamite neatness of fit (§§X4-X22 & fn 196) to multiple clear evidences and the broad resolution of what previously seemed independent, uncrackable mysteries.

E.g., the power of Darwin’s idea, “Natural Selection”, is its neat simultaneous solution of disparate mysteries.195 Likewise for Marlovianism, as our next section (§X) will show.

W31 I. Togetherness. As apt prelude, we list items showing an Occamless feature of the Strat brain, namely, keeping oddities far apart (vs our inclusiveness when seeking solutions to multiple puzzles): [a] The will’s non-literary nature isn’t usually faced together (§§I1&I13) with the devastatingly consistent fact of WS’ zero education-vita. [b] Or his Latin-smallness (§I3). [c] Contra our C2 odds-multiplication, Strats (e.g., fn 30; E29&34) won’t cite the arrest—Death 12th coincidence in conjunction with the Death—WS-debut 13th coincidence, despite their joint temporal proximity. [d] Strats’ weird theory of WS’ invisible but ever-improving 1588 play-writing (§§S4&S6) isn’t merged with their shaky reading of Greene’s 1592 cryptic pamphlet as attacking WS, because (§S34) Greene’s expert scorn negates WS-improvement. [e] And said reading implies that Henry VI-admiring Greene couldn’t think itudent Grenwe WS wrote it. [f] Same reading posits 1592 WS plays, never near mention of WS’ contradiction of such (§S1). [g] Strats’ disbelief that WS was putting on an act isn’t (§G) disturbed by familiarity with their own insistence that he was a major actor. [h] Shakespeare’s implicitly-assumed years-long shyness (§S14) isn’t juxtaposed with Strats’ (mis)identification of Greene’s conceited-bombastic Tyger (§S14) as WS.


193M381: “There is no single ‘smoking gun’ document that leads one inexorably to [Oxfordianism]. Instead, one builds the case upon a [looooomong] series of facts and observations that, when put together like pieces of a puzzle, produce an overall picture that becomes difficult to deny.”

194 The research world’s dullards (§Q8) reject all theories that are not attested (e.g., on works’ covers). But the pioneers whose inspiration underlies great academic progress seek the hitherto-unseen fertile theory (§X32) that solves a range of problems all at once and thereby turns chaos into order.

195 Why do lower creatures lie in lower geological layers? Why do men look like apes? How can a chance process produce survivability-progress?

X Occam in Action: Single Simple Theory Vaporizes Mystery-Nest

X1 For the Shakespeare controversy, instead of obsessing on surface indicia, it is wisest to gauge the inevitably-incomplete evidence by just Occamly (§D15) asking:

1. what is the least complicated theory which simultaneously
2. ties-together & explains the most outstanding mysteries?

X2 And the brilliant, initially-risky, Ziegler-Webster-Hoffman theory — that Marlowe’s death was a shamlet and that he was thenceforth fronted-for by a non-literary businessman & sometime-actor — is the linchpin that has proven productive (§E39):

X3 i.e., it has elucidated matters beyond those that initially triggered (§E2) the theory, seamlessly sewing together a variety of mysteries; neatly and reverse-Hamletly (1.2)merging their separate histories into the solid flesh of a reality that at last makes sense. Let us illustrate by now listing several of these mysteries.

The Mystery-Nest:

X4 Why are there no Shakespeare mss?

X5 Why no surviving letters (§§H3, K8-K10) of such a supposed (fn 58) stage-celeb?

X6 Why did the literary world ignore his death? (By contrast with Marlowe’s mixed obits, e.g., H68-74)

X7 Why would a real killer stab someone in the head instead of the torso?

X8 Why did WS’ maturity (upon his 1593 debut) be — according to the leading Stratfordian (§11) — almost exactly the same as Marlowe’s?!

X9 Why is his will that of a non-literary person? (S11) clue-sniffing&gluing. (One runs 900pp! S204.)

X10 Why did WS’ maturity (upon his 1593 debut) be — according to the leading Stratfordian (§11) — almost exactly the same as Marlowe’s?!

X12 And (§S10) as a remarkably mature poet for a beginner?

X13 Why did the plays end up published under the name of an alternate creator’s anonymity? Why is his will that of a non-literary person? (S11) clue-sniffing&gluing. (One runs 900pp! S204.)

X14 Why did we find a mutually-confirmatory double-negative blank (§X15) as a remarkably mature poet for a beginner?

X15 Why did the plays end up published under the name of an alternate creator’s anonymity? Why is his will that of a non-literary person? (S11) clue-sniffing&gluing. (One runs 900pp! S204.)

X16 Conversely, why is there positive evidence (§S13) that Shakespeare was not educated?

X17 Why is this will that of a non-literary person? (S11)

X18 Why was the style of the plays so Marlovian (§§17, 16, & 18)?

196 In the context of Stratfordianism’s complex, richety, and downright inventive ($S10) juggling of fact and chronology (vs the uncomplex Marlovian segue), we return to the example (fn 191) of an equally Occamite situation regarding ancient estimates of the radius of the Earth (fn 201), one which is analogous to the Marlovian case’s spareness — and is deliciously ironic in light of David Mamet’s un-

197 Likewise for Marlovianism, as our next section (§X) will show.
X19 Why were their allusions to “other” playwrights so exclusively (in 68) to Marlowe?
X20 Why was the “WS” First Folio published by Marlowe’s literary executor (§17)?
X21 If Shakespeare was a beard for a genuinely great playwright, why (§D16) would the true author have to hide?
X22 Most spectacularly of all, the Marlovian theory chronologically sews together (§A1) the careers of Marlowe and “Shakespeare”, with the seam fixable at mid-1593.
X23 We conclude our Occam section here by asking: what is the value and coherence of Stratfordianism vis-à-vis the foregoing items? Answer: none. As a theory to explain the mysteries cited, Stratfordianism is simply sterile — elucidating not a one.
X24 Park-Your-Brains-at-the-Door Dullards. Recall our two requirements (§E42) for spotting the correct candidate: [a] he wrote plays like Shakespeare’s & [b] he had strong reasons for vanishing. Marlowe is not just an ideal fit. He’s the only fit. But there are plodding (§E15), it-says-here scholars in all academic fields, who cannot use theory, induction (§Q8), logic, or imagination to move beyond texts, official accounts, or other surface indicia. Given their cults’ common entrance-requirement, DIO calls such folk the park-your-brains-at-the-door club.
X26 If the real world accorded with their fundamentalist faith, then all truth would be found in a book (or a coroner’s verdict).
X27 Scientists have enriched knowledge by instead (fn 191) seeking, sifting, and testing theories, no matter how things appear to be, on the surface (§C10), thus eventually stumbling upon such anti-intuitive discoveries as, e.g., light-waves, the 1st Law of Isaac Newton’s Relativity, round Earth (fn 72 & 201), geobiomobility, stars not on fire but nuclear. (Note that Marlowe’s Hamlet’s 2.2 missed Ophelia on the last two!) X28 The discoverer keeps searching open-mindedly until finding the key (§X1) that fits—unlocks the available data.
X29 Further, valid mystery-solving theories often fruitfully (§E35) explain further mysteries. That is what every scientific pioneer has known — Aristarchos, Kepler, Hooke, Faraday, Darwin, Planck, etc. The embarrassing contrast to soft academe tells us plainly why science has moved ahead so fast and so far, vs certain other academic fields.
X30 But one needn’t be a scholar to accomplish such solutions: police detectives approach mysteries similarly (and do so far more often than we academicians), dealing with cases where contradictions in what appears on the surface require inducing coherent (zero education-record, small Latin, & non-lit will), Stratfordians require three separately designed excuses to try explaining-away their evidential embarrassments, each alibi independently odd enough even in isolation, but laughably improbable in-combine.
X199 By contrast, theorist, energetic trail-chaser, & Marlowe-death-believer C.Nicholl concludes his 1992 book (N344) by scoring the Marlovian theory of fake death, calling it “no kind of trail at all.” Not only false (as Peter Faye, David More, & Ros Barber have shown), but a classic case of unrealistically wishing for such explicit missing-link documents that such would certainly (fn 91) have doomed Marlowe &co had they lacked. Domitianus, last of the Caesars, complained that nobody was going to believe in the plots to assassinate him until one succeeded. He ruled by terror for 15 years before his dream of cred was gorily realized.
X200 Robert Hooke & (elliptically) Isaac Newton discovered gravity’s inverse-square law by comparing terrestrial gravitational acceleration upon nearby objects vs that upon our Moon — a theory which turned out to be astonishingly seminal (fn 194), when it then was found that this originally narrowly-based law also accounted for ALL the planets as well, thereby explaining Kepler’s 3 Laws; thus, a plenitude of knowledge (and eons of celestial motions) issued from one tiny but potent gravitation law.
X201 For another geographical analogy, we return to the above-cited (§X27) issue of the Earth’s shape. The Earth LOOKS flat, doesn’t it? It took doubt, experiment, synthesis of scattered clues, and going beyond superficial indicia for the ancients to realize that it was nearly a sphere, with a radius of a few thousand miles. This simultaneously explained ships’ vanishing over the horizon, the shape of solutions from scattered evidence.
X31 To anyone of inductive bent, whether in police work, science, or philosophy of science, Hoffman’s solution to the Shakespeare Mystery is a rare delight (§Q11) in its neatness as well as the many clarifications & satisfactions it simultaneously produces: all flowing from a single simple and plausible theory (just as all from Dido to Tempest flowed from a single genius), said theory being that Christopher Marlowe — strange as it may seem to clemental Strats — had chosen to escape and thereby decline otherwise certain torture and execution. (A seemingly natural but novel speculation: was Bible-expert & atheist Christopher Marlowe one of those who helped create the lofty King James Version of the Christian Bible? — which states it was “set forth in 1611”, the year generally thought to be that of the premiere of WS’ final play, The Tempest, despite being emphatically emphasized that both of the books most likely to be found in pre-3rd-millennium English-speaking homes, the Bible & “Shakespeare”, were completed the same year, 1611?)
X32 Stratfordian Nightmare. Fruitful simplicity (§X3) is why no amount of suppression & derision can dampen Marlovianism’s appeal to the brightest scholars, e.g., Colin Wilson (who 1st brought Hoffman to our attention: W144f, 344f). As noted at §P14: It’s a communal crime that Hoffman didn’t live to see academe freely debate his discovery.
X33 But its ultimate triumph is inevitable among independent informed scholars (if not the general public or academe’s litwit-PhD-chain echo-chamber). Perhaps even imminent: it will only require one popular adventure film (preferably starting [N2] with the Babington plot, Mary’s shortening, & the Armada) based on the Marlovian theory, to crack Stratfordianism’s longtime lock on the forums that determine consensus. And some eminent Stratfordians know it ([H14]).
X34 Marlowe’s Afterlife: Continuing in a World of Alias. Before we plunge into DIO’s (largely superfluous) speculations on Marlowe’s fate, an update-note-commendation is in order. Don’t miss Ros Barber’s inevitably speculative attempts to reconstruct pieces of Marlowe’s post-1593 life: 2012’s The Marlowe Papers.
X35 Any reader reluctant to accept that Marlowe went incognito after 1593, must consider that name-shiftiness (§R4) is standard stuff for spies. Which brings us to the obvious answer to the mystery of Marlowe’s later life: he naturally went right on being undercover — escaping the Star Chamber by simply taking on at least one more alias (or possibly an earlier-established one), in a career that was perhapspaunched with them.
X36 Yet the only Marlowe false name that survives had nothing to do with political unrealtistically wishing for such explicit missing-link documents that such would certainly (fn 91) have doomed Marlowe &co had they lacked. Domitianus, last of the Caesars, complained that nobody was going to believe in the plots to assassinate him until one succeeded. He ruled by terror for 15 years before his dream of cred was gorily realized.
left us the treasure of the CM-WS plays.

Publication of the entire Marlowe&WS theatre corpus together (in 204) as *The Complete Plays of Christopher Marlowe* may ultimately usher-in realization that all these dramas were the creation of a single mind. And one hopes that celebrations of the anniversaries of Marlowe’s birth and of the Westminster Abbey memorial window’s dedication, will be occasions for leading newspapers to FINALLY do their duty to that public enlightenment they claim is their mission, by bearing the excruciating expense of devoting a few dozen lines of type to disseminating the bare facts (§A1), which readers may then consider, as to whether they establish the likelihood of Marlowe’s authorship.

**X38 Out-of-Body Pioneer.** The foregoing is largely detective-analysis. But there is also a human aspect that asks for deeper consideration.

To escape being hounded for the rest of his life (§S5&N8X), Marlowe resorted to a fake of extreme ugliness: stabbing a friend from-behind, being then bested in combat, and thus dying in a common brawl. Perhaps the Deptford scenario was selected partly because it was so humiliating that it implausible that anyone would even tolerate (much less connive-in) so disgracing (fn 26) his legacy and name. The public205 didn’t realize that “Marlowe” was henceforth merely his former name. Did Marlowe’s writings ever hint at the truth? Hoffman believed so, remarking (H148-149) that of all the ordmag 1000 characters in the “William Shakespeare” plays, only one is named just “William”: an uneducated hick who, in a disconnected passage in *As You Like It* 5.1 is jibed-at by a character called “Touchstone” (i.e., the genuine article)206 as follows [translating Latin *ipse* as I-myself], appearing to describe the very passing of mss from creator to unlearned front (and implying that such ghosting was an open secret among writer fellows): “Art thou learned? [No, sir.] Then learn this of me: to have, is to have; for it is a figure in rhetoric that drink being poured out of a cup into a glass, by filling the one doth empty the other; for all207 your writers do consent that [I myself] is he: now, you are not [I myself], for I am he.”

**X39 Following 1593/5/30, Marlowe had to become Shakespeare.** No one could write such glorious, dramatic word-music absent pride of creation. With his own name and person widely pilloried (§M6), compensation came anew with pride felt privately in plays now bearing the name of his new persona (“What’s in a name?” *Romeo & Juliet* 2.2), plus the joy of gaining praise208 for his pioneering creations.

**X40 The transference thus effected would pioneer in yet another fashion: the most extreme of its type, ever, for an artistic creator — the nearest a poet could approach in-reality to living the myth of out-of-body experience.** It would be presumptive here to attempt fleshing out the precise way Marlowe adjusted-to his strange fate. (Hopefully, his dramatic heirs will make attempts on the screen.) But the reader may on his own ponder Marlowe—Shakespeare’s situation: gratefully appreciating his determination to go on conjuring-up and crafting dramas which are universal by their creator’s out-of-body empathy with humanity. And, through one’s own mind-travel, imagine being in his externally lifetime-dammed but internally and eternally exalted place.

---

205 In fairness to Elizabethan observers: note (§E7) that the 1593 public had no access to the arrest warrant or coroner’s report. At www.dioi.org/hay.htm#wyt, see a similar situation for contemporaries’ gauging of the 1861 I.I.Hayes polar hoax.

206 Touchstone is better known (to those examining the authorship controversy) for the line: “it strikes a man more dead than a great reckoning in a little room” which is generally understood [N72] to be a reference to the alleged end of Marlowe: from an argument over a reckoning (bill) in a room at Deptford. The same play repeats (3.5) Marlowe’s most famous attributed poetic line (§A2): “Who ever loved, that loved not at first sight?” (See Stratfordians’ take on this at N73.)

207 This can be grist for those who think the literary community knew Shakespeare was no writer. Likewise, the modern ghostings cited earlier ([T26&T27] were all in-circle-known but seldom publicly leaked even though many didn’t involve danger to anyone (as the Marlowe & HUAC cases did).

208 Possibly such factors contributed to the decision c.1600 (§H20) to start putting Shakespeare’s name on quartos.
shone with VERY nearly the same dazzling blanc hue. And, whenever one was shedding its beautiful light upon the world, the other never was (§R7).

Z4  Note Well: Unaware of atmospheric extinction’s diurnal variability, ancient gooroo equivalents of Stratfordian alibi-flexibility might have noticed that, near the horizon, Eosphoros’ redness wasn’t quite the same as Hesperos’, and might’ve used that TINY difference to reject the HUGE equivalences. See above at §U10.

Z5  Advice on Appropriately Approaching a Religious Mystery. In BardBeard, we are concentrating primarily upon induction based on solid facts and simple reason, rather than groping through the fog (in 163) of literary analysis. (Though [§311] we do not ignore the latter — indeed adding 2 surprise finds from Marlowe’s plays: §[O5&P2].) Whether this approach is a debit or advantage in demystifying the Shakespeare “mystery”, readers will hopefully decide for themselves. This entails taking Received-Opinion and media-promoted Experts’ evaluations only as seriously as they deserve (www.dioi.org/bes.htm#bmmx). From what we have seen above from Strats, that’s a definite Not-Verily.

Z6  Anyway, resort to experts is no way to avoid personal responsibility for your opinions — because you are alone responsible for your choice of experts. So: why not use your own intelligence (instead of a brain-double or mental-backseat-driver) to independently and evidentially choose a theory, instead of choosing which Expert to abjectly surrender your mind to? Stick with such discipline, and you’ll eventually arrive at the mental freedom of being your own expert. Good hunting.

Z7  The Walsinghams. Francis Walsingham was history’s “first spymaster”. (Colin Evans Great Feuds in History 2001 p.21) From Joel Levy Secret History 2004 (p.92); helping to defeat the Armada was to be Francis Walsingham’s last great service for his queen [Liz1] . . . but his legacy was priceless . . . . [because of] the impact Walsingham’s skilful use of subterfuge and secrecy had had on European power politics, and the extent to which his hidden hand had steered the ship of the English state safely though the dangerous shoals of 16th-century religious conflict. By foiling plots against Elizabeth’s life and helping to defeat the invasion threats of Spain and France, Walsingham had ensured the Protestant future of England and sown the seeds for her challenge to Spanish domination in Europe and the subsequent emergence of Britain as a global imperial power. Without his shadowy machinations the history of Europe and the world would have developed very differently. The Counter-Reformation might have triumphed throughout Europe and the colonization of the world would have been a largely Franco-Spanish affair. One man had genuinely changed the course of history.

[Note: J. Meyer’s alternate view: www.dioi.org/jp00.pdf.]
To find that the same family also hugely changed the course of literature should make those who value liberty and culture all the more grateful to the Walsinghams.


Thanks to Keith Pickering, Peter Farey, & many others for valuable advice & assistance.
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Contributors should send (dependable photocopies of) papers to one of the following DIO referees — and then inquire of him by phone in 40 days:

Robert Headland [polar research & exploration], Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge, Lensfield Road, Cambridge CB2 1ER, UK; tel (44) 1223-336540.
Keith Pickering [navigation, exploration, computers, photography, science ethics], 10085 County Road 24, Watertown, MN 55388; tel 952-955-3179; fax 952-955-2398.
E. Myles Standish [positional & dynamical astronomy], Jet Propulsion Laboratory 301-150, Cal Tech, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109-8099. Ret. Tel 864-888-1301.
Richard Richardson [ancient eclipses, ΔT secular behavior], Department of Physics, University of Durham, Durham DH1 3LE, UK; tel (44) 191-374-2153.
Christopher B. F. Walker [Mesopotamian astronomy], Dept of Western Asiatic Antiquities, British Museum, Great Russell Street, London WC1B 3DG, UK; tel (44) 171-323-8382.

A Fresh Science-History Journal: Cost-Free to Major Libraries

DIO — The International Journal of Scientific History
Deeply funded. Mail costs fully covered. No page charges. Offprints free.

- Since 1991 inception, has gone without fee to leading scholars & libraries.
- Contributors include world authorities in their respective fields, experts at, e.g., Johns Hopkins University, Cal Tech, Cambridge University, University of London.


- Journal is published primarily for universities’ and scientific institutions’ collections; among subscribers by request are libraries at: US Naval Observatory, Cal Tech, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, Oxford & Cambridge, Royal Astronomical Society, British Museum, Royal Observatory (Scotland), the Russian State Library, the International Centre for Theoretical Physics (Trieste), and the universities of Chicago, Toronto, London, Munich, Göttingen, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Tartu, Amsterdam, Liège, Ljubljana, Bologna, Canterbury (NZ).

- New findings on ancient heliocentrists, pre-Hipparchos precession, Mayan eclipse math, Columbus’ landfall, Comet Halley apparitions, Peary’s fictional Crocker Land.

- Entire DIO vol.3 devoted to 1st critical edition of Tycho’s legendary 1004-star catalog.

- Investigations of science hoaxes of the – 1st, +2nd, 16th, 19th, and 20th centuries.

Paul Forman (History of Physics, Smithsonian Institution): “DIO is delightful!”

E. Myles Standish (prime creator of the solar, lunar, & planetary ephemerides for the pre-eminent annual Astronomical Almanac of the US Naval Observatory & Royal Greenwich Observatory; recent Chair of American Astronomical Society’s Division on Dynamical Astronomy): “a truly intriguing forum, dealing with a variety of subjects, presented often with [its] unique brand of humor, but always with strict adherence to a rigid code of scientific ethics, . . . [and] without pre-conceived biases . . . . [an] ambitious and valuable journal.”

B. L. van der Waerden (world-renowned University of Zürich mathematician), on DIO’s demonstration that Babylonian tablet BM 55555 (100 BC) used Greek data: “marvellous.” (Explicitly due to this theory, BM 55555 has gone on permanent British Museum display.)

Rob’t Headland (Scott Polar Research Institute, Cambridge University): Byrd’s 1926 latitude-exaggeration has long been suspected, but DIO’s 1996 find “has clinched it.”

Hugh Thurston (MA, PhD mathematics, Cambridge University; author of highly acclaimed Early Astronomy, Springer-Verlag 1994): “DIO is fascinating. With . . . mathematical competence, . . . judicious historical perspective, [&] inductive ingenuity, . . . [DIO] has solved . . . problems in early astronomy that have resisted attack for centuries . . . .”

Annals of Science (1996 July), reviewing DIO vol.3 (Tycho star catalog): “a thorough work . . . extensive [least-squares] error analysis . . . demonstrates [Tycho star-position] accuracy . . . much better than is generally assumed . . . excellent investigation”.

British Society for the History of Mathematics (Newsletter 1993 Spring): “fearless . . . on the operation of structures of [academic] power & influence . . . much recommended to [readers] bored with . . . the more prominent public journals, or open to the possibility of scholars being motivated by other considerations than the pursuit of objective truth.”