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The present DIO volume is not our first adventure\(^2\) in bringing math & science to bear on wider culture. E.g., proving that “key-Liberaed” 12-tone music is actually 29 times less free than tonal: www.dioi.org/mus.htm#ttrc.

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 Myles Standish 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 can be made clear in merely a single paragraph, because Marlovianism’s central evidence is clear & spare, while those of Stratfordians & other cults are opaque, complex, & sprawling.

---

\(^1\) See §§M11-M12. In 1633 playwright T.Heywood deemed Marlowe “the best of poets in that age”.

\(^2\) Some skeptics discern (fn 58) surprisingly sparse evidence of WS as actor. On the stage. E.g., proving that “key-Liberaed” 12-tone music is actually 29 times less free than tonal: www.dioi.org/mus.htm#ttrc.

---

\(^3\) Chronology at §§M5.§F3.

\(^4\) §§M5§S23. Colleague T.Kyd’s recent fatal ordeal (§M7) made torture a quite tangible prospect.

\(^5\) §§M11. For the Walsingham’s epochal role in world history, see below at §Z7.

\(^6\) An expanded version of this work appeared in www.dioi.org/mus.htm#ttrc.

\(^7\) Interpreting Christmas Star tale as court Chaldeans’ horoscope snuffs geographical anomaly: fn 94.
A2 WHY IT MATTERS

Did the passionate youth who immortal...[Marlowe Hero & Leander]

Who ever loved, that loved not at first sight?

and dreamt of Trojan Helen from time-affair

[Marlowe Doctor Faustus 5.1]

Was this the face that launched a thousand ships

And burnt the topless towers of Ilium?

later invent24 “playwright” Wm.Shakespeare and project his own suicidal damned-exile25 despair into the entreaty 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 big-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 shows Marlowe 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, dated27 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-ahed-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 phoned first28 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#jptm) 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 §U2. On suicide, see iconic Hamlet (3.1): “To be, or not to be”.
27 At §P4 we detect the toppe anti-Marlovian scholar misdating Marlovian’s final theatrical premiere through his own calendaric naïveté, thereby undercutting 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&N13) 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 powerfuly-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.30005) his arrest & “brawl” were (§M5) 12d apart, and

b) During the c.90006 (1586-1611) when CM or WS wrote, the gap between CM’s vanishing and WS’ debut (by V&A’s publication) was also less than 2 weeks: 13 days ($§1$).

C2 Segue-Squared. Simple division (30007/12d, 90007/13d) 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 108 of a percent OF a percent. Another way to put this: it is 99.999% certain30 that the slimmness 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 temporally-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/wa0.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 for himself (without resort [§Z6] to choosing or having to trust purported 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 [§§D6U22], eminent jurists §§A1, F3, J2, fn 56), & world-class authors’ own literary-manicized lit-circle dissent into silence (§X15): circle done, sordidly, to choosing or having to trust purported experts, and whose unlikelihood we sense even before doing the high-school math of fn 29?

C5 The Zaniest Theory of Them All. Since the Strat center’s chant (§§T3) is that doubt of WS’ authorship is kook (see [§§W4 who’s really nuts in the WS war), we will isolate the craziest of all Shakespeare-controversy assumptions, namely, that the Walsingham’s ultimo (§Z7) agile-spy-masters, rich and (§§J7&N19) shady operators at the power-pinnacle (fn 107) of the realm, patron, friend, and (§M12) boarder of Marlowe — would have simply sat idly by, while he, the greatest playwright and poet on Earth, was destroyed forever. Equally ridiculous: that a person so imbued into the cult. (See §§E17&N15) would simply sit still (relax-&-enjoy-it?) and make no attempt to escape looming Star Chamber torture.

29 Odds: (30007/12d)·(90007/13d)-to-1, or ordmag 100,000-to-1 (www.dioi.org/cot.htm#rdmg).
30 Further extreme-probability discussion 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 for suspecting a necessarily immediate escape: the immediacy is undeniably consistent with Marlovian theory. Which Nicholl attacked decades before the 13th gap’s recent surprise-realization sandbagged his cult. (See §§E17, N15) by apply “apparent” to hard dates & self-evident odds? Because he knows that, if the data are true, he’s buried himself irrevocably into the improbable (§§M12) side of the controversy?
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-tile 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 (§M7); defaced body (§Q1); ultra-shady (§S18) & partisan (§Q10) witnesses to both the Brawl and the patentely crucial matter of Marlowe’s body’s identification; the Marlowe Shakespeare 13-day-segue (§S1). 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 Stratfordian experts. (Wiser than doctors about medicine [§E12], even knowing better than Shakespeare himself [§S] 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 animite 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) geocentrists, e.g., the Serapic religion’s top astrologer-mathematician Claudius Ptolemy, 2nd century AD, henceforth albified that Venus merely looked like it circuited the Sun: actually, it (like Mercury) circled a point between us & the Sun. The crackpot sleight (see DR’s “Figleaf Salad”) held sway for over 1000 years of uninterrupted geocentrist dominance. Meanwhile, only a few “fringe” (fn 35), impious outcasts (www.dioi.org/cot.htm#hckf) promoted the obviously “fantastic” (§R1) idea that the Earth went around the Sun, contrary to convincing but superficial indicia (§X27).

D Outta-Ink Newspapers & Outta-Think Academies
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D Outta-Ink Newspapers & Outta-Think Academies

C.Hoffman (H10) just saw Stratfordianism as a religion of essentially a priori mentality. But what are the wellspring & motive behind the heresy-stomping passion of Stratfor-
mature debut, etc? And (§G9) US forums do so every time. (Does such invincibly-reliable filtering arise from inexcusable 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).


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

D14  [5] Provocative evidential foundation summarizable in a paragraph (above at §A1). Marlovians are distinctively unproven29 to fall for fantastic and totteringly ornate (§H6) speculation-piled-on-speculation compost-heaps, a resort which is naturally standard for competing cults (§T13) who 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 analias-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-Goldberghan theories of cults who have wasted decades vainly scouring 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-vindication [§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 basically complex theories, leaving us with the most likely answer to the former (§Z1) authorship mystery.

D16  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.

27 See §§J7&U1.

28 See fn 146. A particularly naïve, abusive, and suspiciously unoriginal (§T10) 2011/10/24 Newsfeed-thumbing T2:12 conjures-up pre-1593 WS plays (“Marlowe plays . . . [which] filled 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 journalistic 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 orthodoxy doesn’t wish the wider public to be C'mon 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.

29 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 specifications of varying strengths (some exhibiting remarkable, plausible detective-work by several dedicated Marlovians — herself prominently included), & [ii] the Marlovian case does not rise or fall on their detailed validity (§W1), since the prime strength of Marlovianism lies elsewhere: §A1.

E Practical Epistemology: Unseen 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 (E87), 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) confirmed40 said blank, & a possible (E1 vs §E2) prior proposal that WS wasn’t an author. (See Ziegler’s dissertation in DIO 18 2009.)

E5 In 1895, Wilbur G. Ziegler (in a novel summarized at Hxiii) 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 the fear of arrest and capital punishment for some crime could have kept him silent?”

E7 To appreciate Ziegler’s prescience, 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/A4/16) 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) 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; N75), 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. The Brawl-participants’ misreport here takes us down one or both of two fruitful logical staircases:

40 Manuscript-bare Stratfordians have been on the coulda-happened alibi-defense ever since: fn 167. (Akin to other cults in their waning days: www.dioi.org/vols/w73.pdf [DIO 7.3 1997] fn 35 & www.dioi.org/vols/w50.pdf [DIO 5 2009]) fn 22.) Their pathetic evidential offense is now reduced to — but her speculations have two key differences vis-`a-vis the Oxfordians:

§I all alone beweep my outcast state

...
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 guesthouse, 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 longtime Marlovian substitute-body theory could be true, after all.43

E13 The 28th 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 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 gullie knows both persons, so it can’t possibly work. Reply: “O, death’s a great Disease, and you may add to it.” (Q210&391; Peter Farey [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 in use 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 1593/6/12 diary passage (originally discovered in 1794 but later long-forgotten) that the 1st known 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. So early nascent suspicion (§E5) of connexion between Brawl & V&A (suspicion based merely on the 4 month gap between the former

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.

43 Hoffman adds (H79f) 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 Friar’s knife would likely (contra N85’s odd scenario) be thrashing-about with him off-balance (legs squarely trapped twist table&chair and [N111] PoleysKeres, obviating the possibility of strike-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 perpendicularity.)

45 She also cites (Q425) Peter Farey’s further provocative suggestion that Marlowe’s escape “would be unlikely to succeed without official sanction”, leading to Farey’s speculative proposal that Marlowe’s fate was decided in camera by a compromise deal between those (e.g., the Archbishop of Canterbury) who insisted on the educational value (§M6) of prominent punishment for atheism. (Hints in favor of Farey’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”- Robert Blecker’s recent learned (and moralistic) book The Death of Punishment (2013 p.28) notes a parallel trend in both traditional & modern relativism: “Classical utilitarianism such as Bentham and Cesare Beccaria have long since claimed that a rational society should design punishment to appear harsher to the public than it feels to the criminal.”

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 sense there is a credible case for Marlowe’s authorship.

Several of the above-condensed items were summarized in the opening pages of H3f: 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, Diane Price (non-committal on who is the best candidate) should be recognized for her unequalled analytic & meticulous 2001 quietus ([5]K114) 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 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 quell&break Strats’ inertial grip on public discussion.

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

- [E26] Illustrating Stratfordian orthodoxy’s ample menu of resemblances to the very creationist (§W) and geocentrist (§K10) kookery which irony-immune orthodoxologists unceasingly charge Shakespeare-skeptics with. (Note also parallel to UFOlogy: §I12.)
- [E27] Discovering (§O5) that Marlowe included the strikingly odd & improbable mechanics of his upcoming “murder”, right at the end of his last acknowledged play (§E11) — 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] Logical demonstration from medical considerations (§E12) that body-substitution is not “far-fetched” ([G6&K7]) but evidentially implied. (And, for desperate deft spies, an obvious & compelling option.)
- [E29] Explaining (§§N12-N13) why Marlowe had to stab with another’s dagger.
- [E30] The hitherto-overlooked possible significance (§K4) of Shakespeare being an actor — what better choice could there be for a devious front?
- [E31] Computing for the 1st time the shockingly high 100,000-to-1 odds (§C2) against chance occurrence of 1593’s rapid-succession of Marlowe’s arrest, his Death, & WS’ debut.
- [E32] 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] 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] Proof ([§S34&K31]) Greene’s “Shake-scene” can’t have written the WS plays.
- [E35] 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. [50]

48 All 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.

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

50 This (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 unearthened 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
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[51] DIO challenges establishments’ fakes since: [a] they matter more than outsiders; [b] few dare to
F Elusive WMDs, Woody Allen, & Stratford’s Loch Ness Monster

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 saturated the industry’s fallback position:

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

Unless we find them.

F2 Fast-backward 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 non-existent mss of the most famous supposed writer in all history are the WMDs of literature: Will’s-MS-Data. Yet despite its bare cupboards, the Shakespeare Industry — aka the “Stratfordian” contingent of the Shakespeare Controversy — continues to try to (S5&8) banishing doubt of Shakespeare’s authorship of “his” plays and (transparently projectively) slandering such skepticists 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 (in 60) internet-metastasization — 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 “21593”, accepting via 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 ofcornered establishments, who (www.dioi.org/ff.htm#qkhv) 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 (§U22) deluded, the artistic director58 of the Globe a fool, and (§A1) several Supreme Court Justices nuts?! In 2009, it was said (http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123998633934729551.html & §S121) 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 now no-comment the issue.56]

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.


F5 So the Stratfordian cult is subject to a question paralleling TomT’s barb (§F1): what was the point of centuries of intense 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#bbbg; & see below under double-standards: §F13.)

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 orthodoxologists 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 §195.

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

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 of the most famous supposed writer in all history §§W&T&W). (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 single 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 Elizabthian documents (warrant & coroner’s report) which Hoffman has successfully adduced.

But, then, when cultish establishments circle wagons around a Shakey sacred moneycow, double standards are the single 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 (§V) — a cohesive intellectual crime which FOREVER ROBBED Hoffman of the in-his-lifetime public acclaim he had validly earned for the most important detective-achievement in the history of literary studies. Since Strats freely shrinko-analyse skeptics (e.g., E225&227), we have the right of guesswork-reversal: the theft of Hoffman’s credit may be due largely to careerist priorities (fn 190) non-presented to the same newspapers’ readerships.

F15 Bluster’s Last Stand? Columbia English&CompLit Prof. James Shapiro’s book, Contested Will (NYC 2010) and Edmondson-Wells’ 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-minimalist-art promoment (§W18), as agent Sidney Falco girds-up to conjure maximal sales pitch out 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.

---

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 [F1-48] 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).

57-Thought Hoffman was of predominantly Jewish background, AP’s 1956/5/2 squib, on his failed-gambling Walsingham-tomb 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 Oxoniansean clue-imaginings, Dora Hamlin (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 claim it is more improbable (§§A1&K2) than the appearance of “Shakespeare” only a few days after Marlowe’s vanishing?! Or (§E12) of Marlowe insta-dying from a lobotomy? Clue to the clueless: fronts are not a “far-fetched” fantasy — they’re positively to be expected in times of persecution of heresy, such as Armada-scared 1590s England and Cold-War-scarred 1950s US; see, e.g., the historically-based 1976 Woody Allen film, The Front, bringing to hideous life the Red-menace terror — an episode parallel to the Marlovian case, which had occurred during the post-Armada persecution of religious dissent in England.

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


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 Orthodoxology are treating (§[28] 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.58 And there’s almost no reason about him.” (Our comment 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 Orthodoxies 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’ 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 interludes-entertainment, let’s take orthodontologists’ 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 (§Z4) similar style and, most felicitously surprising for a SELF-STATEd neophyte (§S2), 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 devilishly-to-be-wished overlap-period — during which London might be simultaneously blessed with two ultra-genius writers — narrowly never quiteiiiiiiiii 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&K29) 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 oldboyperson-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. A folly 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 Aquitan (§G5) book and Westminster Abbey’s integrity (§F2), but) by New York Times critic Ben Brantley’s frontpage International Herald Tribune (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 [§E5] anybody?) Marlowan hypothetical aside: think Brantley’d yawn (§F1) if Shakespeare mss 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 ALL58 Free Press reaction in the US to the film Anonymous: it informs the public of no facts of dissenters’ cases.

G10 Instead, the IHT’s article wastes column after column detailing BB’s personal feelings (§F1) about the plays — (Another profligate investment.) The point is that the public can follow 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 debating63 Marlovians. Strats’ debate-aversion carries the obvious implication that the cult itself knows that its present opinion-dominance

58 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 — his followers were represented . . . as charlatans and dupes, there began to be in the most influential quarters careful avoidance of the [original 1859 reactive] 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/re/re.htm#nmpnl) more progressive than the biblical idea of instant creation by god.

(Did Strats learn their flexibility (§D7) from such stalwart contra-evidence-survivors?)

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

62 As longtime orthodoxy (among a cameknew cult of math-challenged historians), that 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#fscs). cult goo-roo N.Swerdlow prominently urged (Journal for 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#ecps.

56 Diana Price (P31-42) has raised reasonable objections to the common belief that WS did very much acting. (Outside fronting.) See also §§33. 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 (P37. Q417). But none of this affects the amusing contradiction in orthodoxy we are teasing here in §G.

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 “heresy”. No: it’s just an unimaginatively-all-too-common (§G7) last-ditch burp of a frozen orthodoxy gradually melting under sunlight. But (as later at §S14) there’s an unanticipated problem here: Brantley’s very next (268) sentence mentions Christopher Marlowe as among the three top serious longterm contenders for authorship. Hmm: Does BB’s claimed (§G12) narrowness extend to ignoring logic, too?

G11 Because—unlike any other Shakespeare-authorship contender — Marlowe left an attributed collection of mostly topical dramas, still read & performed today. So (§L5): Does Brantley seriously mean64 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 Dept give the New York Times’ chief theatre critic?!

G12 On the plus side for Brantley: he is wise to the phoniness of alleged Shakespeare bios, evidently aware that rearranging (§2) chunks of the plays into such merely apes the Oxfoadians’ 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 posing (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. E.g., he is fascinated by some65 mysteries but finds it prudent66 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 caution67 — 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 nuteness 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 mss 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 alibied as perhaps from illness), and his 3 signatures on his will show he signed his name with 2 different spellings (even through (Stratfordian-level) inertia, repetition, & cultist insulation. It would take to sign the 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 listher — since no one person could be responsible for suppressing all of WS’ hypothetical letters — but still short of rigorous proof of non-authorship (although all the preceding items 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. Which, incidentally, puts them in no position to scoff at equally sand-headed Oxfordians 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. 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.doi.org/vols/wa/b0.pdf (DIO 10 [2000]) 2/2.

H9 Predictable result (§H11): devolution into schizo-schismatic fantasy-contestland.

H10 S196: “The argument that Oxford sought anonymity because of the usual aristicocratic 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...
loyalty, loathed his Prince Tudor theory and feared that it would ‘bring the whole cause into ridicule.’ Freeman [a fervent Oxfordian (note [§6]) hated it too, and even sent a chastising letter to Allen. To this day it has deeply divided Oxfordians.” (Allen resorted to ESP: E39.)

11 Said divisive ([§9] 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.

12 Comparing Oxfordians’ shaky ([§24] presumption-alibis to the Marlovians’ lethal explanation ([§M] for anonymity is just another ([§§C4&K15]) no-contest.

13 The initially-exploratory and formerly-useful Oxford cause has increasingly become a sad impediment to resolution, draining-away skeptical idealism & energy into a patently incredible cul-de-sacrosanct of rigidly-held but logically-weak alibis for anonymity, which clearly frustrates Oxfordians’ diversion-tactics. (The public’s gullible fascination with an endless succession of baseless proposed authors leads E3&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?)

14 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 Marlovianism. Stratfordians have big-event debates with Oxfordians ([§205; E229]). Seldom with Marlovians. From this contrast, it’s easy to discern which skeptical 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 Napoleonic dictum that shee numbers ([§W29]) 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]).

15 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.

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

17 By contrast, his occasional ([In 28] scattered remarks ([§7, 201, 212, 217, 230, 316, etc] on the rational Marlovians add up to maybe a page or two.

18 And ([§20] he transmits not one word from the convincing documentary basis of their case. (Though, he does creditably cite Marlovian websites in an appendix: S316.)

19 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 weakness (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.

20 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.)

21 The title-page issue ([§H2]) 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&I11; 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] WS’ 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

1 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 another64 amazing coincidence65 — like §C2.

2 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 [§I3].) Strat scholar C.Rutter stresses that at this era’s grammar schools, Latin (E135 emph added)” was the core curriculum: the key qualification. THE LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION, the default setting for the transmission of human knowledge”. But the glaring problem here (Strat-alibied by challenging bias: fn 181) is that Jonson reported (P187&211) that WS had “small Latin and less Greek” which of course tells us that WS could NOT learn much at the Stratford Grammar School, if indeed he went there at all. (Marlowe, even as a Cambridge undergrad, was already a gifted translator of Latin authors Ovid & Lucan.)

3 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).

4 Standard Stratfordian retorts on the theological Problem-of-the-Will (§50) follow: the existence of a (now-lost) inventory of WS’ possessions, which is — on no evidence — [a] presumed (though unincited66 in the will) to be a supplement to the will. (Though it’s more likely just another’s last-bare list of its items, or even just a copy of the whole will.) [b] Thus the (lost) Shakespeare inventory coulda-shoulda ([§111]) contained a list of WS’ (also now-lost) putative books&mss. A classic apology-dance: drool ([§§29&12] over the


61 Ben Jonson, awed by Marlowe’s gift for the “mighty line” ([T2;173]), wrote a preface to the 1623 First Folio, lauding Shakespeare, perhaps primarily sales-hype ([P170, 184]) — given that Jonson&co were totally silent ([P148, 154]) at the real Shakespeare’s death. On Jonson visa-vis WS, see fn 181; P140, 195f, Q417.

62Likewise, 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”. (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.) [2] The forehead-placement of the stab-wound on the body being such as to maximize ([§][§][§][§][§][§](also now-lost) putative books&mss. A classic apology-dance: drool ([§§[§][§][§][§][§](also now-lost) putative books&mss. A classic apology-dance: drool ([§][§][§][§][§][§][§][§]) over the

63Like I.Newton accounting for both planets’ & comets’ motion, while Cartesian vortices explained Like I.Newton accounting for both planets’ & comets’ motion, while Cartesian vortices explained

64See 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 §6] speaks of no other data-records) put him 150 statute miles south of where the Missing-data mss are hopothesized to place him, to rescue his
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.

I7 Schoenbaum inventively tries (C305) to confuse WS’ unmentioned alleged books with his son-in-law’s library of medical books.

I8 Master Stratfordian-defense strategist Jonathan Bate arouses his conversing-large-ly with-each-other cult’s self-gratifying passion to be vindicated, by citing (§H9) (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.

I9 Schoenbaum’s summarization below (§H11), adding out facts omitted from Bate’s will-argument, thus quite demolishing it (which may be why Shapiro [S50] doesn’t cite Price’s response to Bate) namely that Daniel specified his publisher as his executor (leaving no doubt that he was a writer), and Hooker’s will attached an inventory referring to his books.

I10 Such Stratfordian argument from others’ bookless last testaments might have some slight force if the party had the same will-detail (§I4) as wealthy WS; and the same need, as the author of the plays (as against poems), for access to plenty of books (§P22; P242f).

I11 But the easily-missed, typically (Stratfordianly) 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 remarks Freud’s parallel “rashness in always preferring the arcane explanation to the obvious one”, noting also [idem] his revealing “habit of napping while his [victims] were on the couch”) E.g., (§E12, II, §F5, L3, S24, L5, S28, U9-U17, W16, fn 42&189. All in order to aibi one oddity or bio-blank after another: Marlowe “death” method, WS’ books, ms, vita (§J6), 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 Will Shakespeare shoulda—coulda—musta gone through the Stratford school. (Though Ben Jonson’s testimony [§I3] shows he did not.) For similar cult-think in another arena (likewise inventing non-existent documents to fend off skeptics, while discounting real ones): see fn 73.

I12 Shapiro’s frustration (§J6) is palpable (S50): if oooonly we had Shakespeare’s supposed list of books, we’d win! But: it’s just as gone-missing as his educational record, letters, etc. Hey, doesn’t this serial-letdown remind one of the flying-saucer freaks, who keep explaining&explaining&explaining&explaining why no advanced civilizational items are ever left by aliens at the sites of supposed UFO encounters and-or kidnappings?

I13 Stratfordians are immune to noticing the simple (§H21) firmness (of the obvious conclusion from the will’s non-literary cast) — the mutually-confirmatory consistency with WS’ entire lack of educational record.

I14 Price notes (P146) that even actors left books in their wills; that Shakespeare remembered with sundry gifts several among his actor friends, yet not a single writer; that nothing in the will relates to scholarship, but rather to colleagues (and their relatives) in his actual professions: acting, business, & usury. His will is so detailed that it even includes (§K14) Twain’s favorite bit: WS specified that his 2nd-best bed went to his wife.

I15 It takes but a few minutes to read and ponder Price’s summation of the will’s evidential impact. Its weight is textbook Frankfurter: it overwhelms all evidences on both 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 achieve in identifying the true author; though, by elementary induction, we will arrive at an answer with surprisingly high surety.

I16 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 as shaky grant-cow icon went on for a few decades among historians of astronomy regarding plagiarist and data-faker astrologer-goeocentrist Claudius Ptolemy. But even Ptolemy’s least-numerate defendants eventually caught on, and it’s now a dead controversy outside pop-sci pseudo-scholars.

I17 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 (§I5) to exhibit literary or scholarly interests? or [b] That the real playwright would wish to be anonymous? (Even Baconians & Oxfordians have solved this question.)

I18 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 (§5) of academic’s cult snipers, the failure of option [b] to catch on in academe is partly from failure to [i] explicitly ponder the comparative likelyhoods of [a]&[b], and [ii] explain the true author’s excellent reason for anonymity — a failure which has led (§I127) to what Shapiro understandably calls (S7) “endless trench warfare.”

I19 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.)

I20 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 shall briefly (§M) provide the evidence establishing the writer’s cause for disappearance; but we pause first for some sociology & background.

I21 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 Complieke’s complex, speculative readings of influence&symbolisms in(to) the works which lit-Experts claim to interpret for us?

I22 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, light-threatening klan; thus the necessary resort to non-rational means (mainly censorship, shunning, & snobbish insult) for fighting enemy ideas.

I23 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-Deniox, 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.

I24 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
a historian or scientist. Likewise, both of the earliest assertive Marlovians — Ziegler & Webster — were men of English. Similarly for most current Marlovians.

I25 Part of the reason DIO has few misgivings about issuing the foregoing blunder — but generally accurate — remarks (on English Dep’s ‘common sense’) is: [a] it is a matter of international academic import; and [b] the targets have themselves long since settled into an un-reexamined pattern of using too-broadbrush ([§28] smears to repel doubt of Stratfordian orthodoxy by stigmatizing it as zany, an approach which is not only revealingly overdone-nasty (“paranoid” [E13], “parasitic” [E227]), but turns out to be irreconcilably even amusingly, inverted ([§W]). As ever: The universe’s richest mudmine is a controversy’s last ditch.

I26 Typical Strat and Folger Shakespeare Library comments on skeptics (S202): “the sheer volume of heretical publication appalls . . . . voluminosity . . . matched only by its intrinsic worthlessless . . . lunatic rubbish” and requiring “the capacity to climb into a soap-bubble and soar away into Cuckoo-land”. StratCult’s 2010 antiThoughtCrime-broadside volume, the (already cited) James Shapiro book, Contested Will, is refreshingly more temperate, and produces a detailed survey of dissent’s excesses which is of considerable historical value — a credit to Shapiro’s dedicated & meticulous scholarship.

I27 But, as an argument for Stratfordianism, it is a logically failed mega-diversion, an orthodoxy of too-broad portrayal of skepticct as crazy, accomplished by the ploy of leaving out ([L29] explication of reasonable skeptical arguments, while super-detailing a succession of over-speculative searches in defense of hopeless candidates. The hitherto- unrealized natural origin of these unfortunate forays will be revealed below ([§§1&K26].)

I28 On 2010 April 17, the Wall Street Journal’s Terry Teachout reviewed the book, titularly implying (following Shapiro’s halting hint: S8) that doubters are not only kooks but are mentally akin to Nazi-apologist concentration-camp Deniers: “DENYING Shake pepa” (caps added). We will examine below who’s really a crackpot ([§W]) and who’s a nutty denier ([UI19] in the Shakespeare controversy.

I29 Just as censorially, Teachout deems Shapiro’s book to be all-you-need-ever-read on the matter. But the unambiguous ([§S25) pro-Shakespeare data Shapiro provides are merely (S35) contemporaries’ acceptances of his claim that the plays were his (a ploy long drearily familiar to skeptics: §§H20; P112), circularly assuming the very claim at issue: that ACTOR Shakespeare was not conning these witnesses.

J Thought-Experiment #1: Healing the Incomplete Crippled Ballot

J1 In the 19th century, the persistent, peculiar and unique ([§H21; P301f) lack, of direct evidence that Shakespeare was highly literate, drove major writers ([§A1&V1; Hxii) such as Mark Twain, Walt Whitman, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Henry James (P9) to doubt that Shakespeare ever composed anything of literary note. So far, so sane. And (except to The Inquiring) so科普yable.

But nothing else about the general public debate since has ever been that simple. Once Shakespeare was debunked, the natural next question was: then who did write the plays? Skeptics looked about for especially literate contemporaries other than the presumably-dead Marlowe and settled on a few favorites primarily because ([L31, S6&142) they were highly educated.

J2 In the absence of extant plays by Oxford — a weakness in anti-Stratfordianism that applies to all alternate candidates but Marlowe — advocates tried corrolations of events in Oxford’s life with the event-packed texts of the dozens of plays in the WS-corpus: travel, style, level of education, even (Mxvii, 190f) specific events and, e.g., Oxford’s Bible (M381f vs S214-215). (See A.Nelson’s amused E45 quote from Henry V 4.7.) The arguments were often adorned with supposed veiled allusions (fn 98; D.Roper Shakespeare: To Be Or Not To Be 2010 p.152) and cryptograms allegedly embedded (placed even years after Oxford’s death) into a motley array of publications (e.g., M365-367; Roper passim) —

77Leading Oxfordian journalist M.Alexander had (M411) 7 years university education in physics & atmospheric science. But (as DIO readers know all too well) such a background carries no guarantee of statistical expertise or instinct. Oxfordians who have cultishly-isolated themselves from non-Oxfordian sources may be surprised to learn that the Marlovian movement has produced its own biographical-correlations (B passim & A) & cryptography (B261&337). Some of these seem (to us) less convincing than the Oxfordian parallels. Indeed, the biographical hints in the Sonnets are shown by Webster to fit Marlowe’s fate & exile ([E10) better than any other candidate’s. But the basis for firmly identifying the plays’ author lies in the direction of less alibiable (fn 80) sorts of evidence. A measure of the shakiness of stylistic analysis for firm induction is provided by the case of Marlowe’s Hero & Leander, placed (T2:99) by some scholars at the start of his career; by others, at the end.


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 Sisyphean madness of Oxfordianism, starting bigtime in the early 1920s. A further cripping was evidential: non-access (until 1925) to knowledge of Marlowe’s terrifying arrest and the body-identifiers’ professional slyness. 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).

The very existence (M236, S177) of such praise suggests that Oxford’s hype-thesized 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”: §§ J11-J13).

E. 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 developer in English drama.

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 . . .

Swinburne continues: Marlowe “is the greatest discoverer, the most daring and value of Christopher Marlowe as a leader among English poets it would be almost impossible. . . . He . . . guided Shakespeare into the right way of work; [in] his music . . . there is no echo of any man’s before him . . .
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61 See also Blumenfeld’s amusing comments on the matter: B158. C.Wilson (W147) on the early First Folio: “Henry VI, Richard III and Titus Andronicus are so like Marlowe [§S2] 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 Balekeess’ 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 ([§S24] Marlovianism’s ultimate victory triggers overbroad post-smoking speculation ([§S21&S25] at CompLitwits. 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.

62 See §§3. 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), insufficently recognized: during the period 1575 to 1609, Bohemia’s King Rudolph II (in whose employ astronomer Tycho Brahe died in 1601) ruled a tiny chunk of seacoast on the Adriatic.

63 See §§. CT1 claims that university education was primarily for professions, not literature (though Marlowe went through this routine, common passage, coursing & theology: B33), while admitting that some of the best writers did indeed go to Cambridge or Oxford. (E.g. Raleigh, Greene, Marlowe, Marston.)

64 See §3. 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), insufficently recognized: during the period 1575 to 1609, Bohemia’s King Rudolph II (in whose employ astronomer Tycho Brahe died in 1601) ruled a tiny chunk of seacoast on the Adriatic.
passing acknowledgement (S9) of the will’s non-mention of books.84 (Like dodge: §§34.)

K8 Shapiro’s Teachtout-chapter, using Shakespeare’s fame as an argument for his authorship, only raises (§§H3&X5; 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 his birth, 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 skimmy 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 unequivable 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.85 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&J5: motive for anonymity. 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 portrayals of lords (Mxxxiii); [b] shyness of mundane publicity (P133, 218, 828).

---

84 The huge separation in Shapiro’s book between Problem-of-Booklessness (S9) 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 skeptics 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 P242] that echo 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 (§18). . . . (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.)

85 L15. Note some Strats’ resort even to graphology (E92f), despite the Shakey basis.
reprinted: 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.

L.6Also 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 — though not a one had been attached to his name before 1598. So WS’ play-authorship totals: zero-to-12 overnight!

L.7It 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 §§101 delayed 10!) as a title-page playwright, and
[c] Mers’ sudden first public recognition of WS as not just playwright but prolific playwright for years past.

L.8Did a passing 1598 rumor-suspicion (that Marlowe had survived) abruptly require multiple-allying? (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) might have seemed more necessary than previously.

L.9Or 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 & Walsingham] was unstably crossing, accompanied by a spat 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.

L.10In 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)98 claims — contra the successful 3-century secret (of a front) could succeed in “glossy” London. (I.e., a plot’s existence can only be accepted [fn 198] if it leaks & fails!)

Wilkie Collins’ Count Fosco is told: “Yes — all the crime you know of. And what of the rest.”

L.11Note the parallel Brit deepsixing — for over 1 1/2 centuries — of the file that proved 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.

L.12Returning 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 gossip 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 [T23] 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 claiming that wanting-for-torture would crave glory more than his life. And his fingernails. (Similarly, Strats quote [E3&278] as evidence)

As You Like It’s reference to Marlowe as “Dead shepherd”, evidently expecting a wanted man to write “Alive-shepherd, after all: come get me”?)

L.13Those who profess to (unreasonably: fn 91) rank gossip-leakage — which they’ve delayed 10 years past...

L.14Given that Deptford is a Thames port on the Continental side of London, and that Marlowe had already ([E3]) 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 that was on that day, according to local Deptford legend, Marlowe accompanied some companions on a visit to a ship. (Nathan Dews History of Deptford . . . Deptford 1883 p.124.) Now, the legend does not recall it as an escape ship, but rather the famous Golden Hind (which he evidently had occasioned earlier, or for banqueting) — Drake’s Earth-circumnavigation-vessel, by then retired as memorial & tourist-magnet, in dry-dock at Deptford. But one may try factoring-in oral centuries-old traditions’ notorious capacity for distortion.93 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.

L.15Another 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 happily less expensive), which fairly notes Stratfordians understandable preference for changing the actual punctuation in the record (wishing to interpret the recollection as WS’ written plea of illness whenever he was invited to debahuc — this, though not a single written personal communication of his exists). Price adds that the unaltered text’s implication is consistent with WS’ crude surviving signatures ([H2]). The account can be read as describing WS’ virtue & shy modesty, including our play-writing champ’s cramps-of-agy — which came on whenever he was asked to wield a pen (P127): he “was more to be admired [because he was not a company keeper lived in Shoreditch, Summer circular-orbit ephemera, see www.dioi.org/vols/w91.pdf (DIO 9.11 [1999]) Table 1 & its citation at Scientific American 2004 Dec (“Stealing a Planet”) p98. Thanks to these researches, Leverrier’s primacy in Neptune’s discovery has by now generally accepted at last.

94 E.g., such Biblical transformations as: [a] Rhino into unicorn (e.g., Num.23.22, Deut.33.17).
95 [b] Jesus nailed to a ‘T’, later becoming a cross. [c] Confused hybrid-occultist myth — mish mash of prophecy-fulfillment & more dreams than the rest of the New Testament — evolving into Matthew 2’s geographically-ooohly Christmas Star tale (fn 0), a legend which weirdly has magi-from-east aiming at star east. Most likely solution (since Chaldean was east of Jerusalem): magi-from-east were “Chaldeans” — common ancient synonym for astrologers (“magoi” in Greek) — presumably already in or near Herod’s court, thus no international travel involved. As for star-in-east: Greek for east is “anatole”, also Greek for the Ascendant, the horizon’s holiest point — invisible, thus indoor-calculated, requiring professional astrologers. The other Greek word for Ascendant was “oroscopos”. Christmas Star ends up overhead: “mesouran” in Greek, which also means Midheaven, the other key invisible (calculated) horizon point. (Marlowe knew both: fn 170.)
96 Details: www.dioi.org/cot.htm#xssm; DR “Astronomy vs Astrology” (Queen’s Quarterly 91.4:969-989 [1984] pp.976-977).
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 (§510) post-Deptford play. (This early in Marlowe’s anonymity, perhaps the eventual routine [see reconstruction-speculation at Q430] 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 Shake- recantated in 1687.

L18 Ravenscroft said (T2:259, emph added): “I have been told by some anciently conversant with the Stage that it was not originally his [WS’], but brought by a private hand to be Acted, and he [WS] only95 gave some Master-touches (§26) to one or two of the Principal Parts or Characters.”

L19 This interpretation might accord with Greene’s sneer at pushy “Shake-scene” (§272) and perhaps at occasional ad-lib or pseudo-ad-lib “bombast” (ibid) 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 §§227; H35 also capitalizes “Crow” & “Tyger” & “Player”.)

L20 Such interpretations are anyway less incredible than the now-orthodox Stratfordian position (§24) 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 as private 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 (§13) — 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. (§W25; M255, 275, 317; B86; R90; E44-48.) Some plays were even performed at court (§W25; 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 Walsinghams, 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-Marlowan 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-moneylender96 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 credibly perceived Shakespeare’s fraudulence.

95This 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.)

96Speculation: money-lenders (fn 87) need enforcers. Skeres&Frizer appear to fit the way. 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 skeptics — facetiously (§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 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, considering the same members of the same ring had already (§N2) pulled off the most important, delicate, & successful conspiracy in the pre-Enigma history of England? Shapiro personally denigrates Hoffman (S201), all the while not even telling readers what Hoffman’s evidence is (§D7; S212), though aware of it (§§F13, 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.

L29 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 (§7) 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 neatness of the 1593 Marlowe—Shakespeare two-week segue. 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 Stratfordianism: §R4.)

L30 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 (§67): “perfect background, really. He was clever, well educated, well traveled.”

L32 This and Looney’s ever-more imperialistic (§H7; 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 (against which the Oxfordians have nothing at all to put in competition), to the provocative neatness of the 1593 Marlowe—Shakespeare two-week segue. 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 Stratfordianism: §R4.)

L31 Whether Oxford had always been at bottom an obsolete-since-Hoffmann well-who-else-coulda (§J1) process-of-elimination, claiming Oxford had, more than other candidates (§67): “perfect background, really. He was clever, well educated, well traveled.”

L32 This and Looney’s ever-more imperialistic (§H7; 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 more98 tenuous.

97An 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 the phenomenon, no one else saw Umbriel until Wm. Humboldt 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.

98From 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 (S194): “circuitous 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-
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 fails100 to see it (empgh 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 playscript, 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.]

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, unfounded chronology, and devastatingly solid documents (§§E13-E15 & T13).

The openminded scholar lets the evidence teach him. E.g., www.dioi.org/vols/wk0 (DIO 20 [2012]) 1 fn 4. The foregoing quote is thus a textbook case of the very reverse.

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 Marlovian evidence — the fact that the sole known identifiers of the body were fellow spies and professional deceivers (§E13) — is met by mere speculations that the judge or the jury could not be fooled, though even no evidence is produced showing that any of them knew Marlowe. See Nicholl’s sensible observation at fn 171. One Strat could ridiculously 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 Strats’ preference for speculation, shaky (§§S28&K16), 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).

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 more ever 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. 99Hardly unique. Some parallel examples DIO has encountered over the years in other controversies: www.dioi.org/vols/w11.pdf (DIO 1.1 [1991]) 16 §§H4-H5 [pp.63-64] and self-critical fn 34; www.dioi.org/vols/w21.pdf (DIO 2.2 [1992]) 4 §H7; www.dioi.org/vols/wg0.pdf (DIO 16 [2009]) 4 fn 7.

See §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

101E.g., after (§X39) Marlowe’s “death,” pastors issued vindictive, even gruesome sermons (T1:143f) on atheist Marlowe’s much-deserved fate.

Marginal notes:

101 Bakeless (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 Tamburlaine, it’s unlikely Kyd was the prime suspect; rather, he was to be squeezed to spill on Marlowe.

102 Shapiro (S7, 212, 230) scoffs at the theory that Marlowe fled to the Continent (at least temporarily). But Blumenfeld rightly asks (B219 emph added): What were Marlowe “and two of Walsingham’s servants doing in Deptford, spending a full day in idleness and hours walking in a garden . . . at a seaport [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 Privy Council on May 20? Marlowe was “killed” in Deptford, at the guest-house (apparently transit-house) the same day.

103 See L13.
of Eleanor Bull (who, notably, had court connexions: F).

M11 Marlowe was a longtime operative\(^{106}\) for the Walsingham family’s spy ring. (Geoffrey Rush played all-powerful, resourceful Protestantism-guardian [§27] Francis Walsingham in the 1998 film *Elizabeth.*) Marlowe thus had friends (B200) who were wealthy & potent;\(^{107}\) also routinely superduperious (§220; T1:91). So: did they arrange a fake death, to protect Marlowe from torture that might (§Q10) reveal secrets that would endanger\(^{108}\) 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 1\(^{st}\) searched for at Thomas Walsingham’s estate. The temporal coincidence of his “death”, so soon after his arrest, is at least provocative. (But to Shapiro, 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 (§17: Thought-Experiment #1) was set too far from 100%. I.e., the probability that he is the best candidate as WS-author is effectively equal\(^{109}\) 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 (§S18) 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*\(^{110}\) almost succeeded with a fellow-spy-witnessed fake death--& body-substitution plot, 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.)

\(^{106}\)T1:159, 177-185; M274; B200, 202, 218.

\(^{107}\) Late spymaster F.Walsingham had been on the Privy Council: H65. His cousin, Marlowe-patron Thomas Walsingham, was often at the court of Queen Liz1, who (T1:91; B240) in 1597 even visited him at his estate.

\(^{108}\)Thus, Marlowe’s hypothetical rescue might have been for more than preserving 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-clique 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” severed the prospective chain.

\(^{109}\) We later (§R) show more directly that it is not even necessary to adduce the WS will (or compare Marlowe to other candidates) to show that, if Marlowe survived, he wrote the plays.

\(^{110}\)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 memoriabilia, including: 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.

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#Fppv) of the “corpse”. Less remotely ago: the centerpiece-ploy in Puccini’s 1900 *Tosca*\(^{111}\) 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 *Colombo* pilot “Prescription Murder” employs a substitute bod (which isn’t even dead) for a fake suicide. In the 1973 film *The Sting*, Rob’t Redford will never know peace (§P11) from the cops or the robbers; so: he fakes his death. Paul Newman does too, leaving us with 2 simultaneous fake deaths. (Both as convincingly humiliating as Marlowe’s: §X3.) The marvelous 1986 cinecomedy *Ruthless People* also ends with a neat version of a substitute-body fake death. Pre-Third Man era: 1933’s *Secret of the Blue Room*; Agatha Christie’s 1945 *And Then There Were None*\(^{112}\) exceeded all those other tales in that, while a fake death is key to the plot, the story culminates in yet an additional fake death. And the plot-crus of 1944’s *Laura* hinges on a body’s misidentification from facial damage (unplanned in this case).

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 2014/1/2, CNN carried news of the capture of banker-commun Aubrey Lee Price, who’d swindled victims of tens of millions, before pretending he’d suicided 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, N9) reveal secrets that would endanger his enemies that he was dead so (§X38) they’d stop even looking for him:

N7 Returning to 1593: which is more\(^{113}\) 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-employee Ingram Frizer (B218). (This permits Frizer to get off on self-defense, which he did with remarkable swiftness — going right back to his employment by Walsingham. See EncycBrit; T1:157f, B240.)

\(^{111}\)Is it possible that Puccini knew of Ziegler’s novel, then-recent (1895) Marlovian speculation (§E5)? (Puccini knew his “Shakespeare”: Tosca’s Scapcia [with credit] from Othello.)

\(^{112}\)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-unnamed Slight Problem with the Happy Ending when her boyfriend returns from the “dead”: how does this answer the problem, since any couple found among 8 corpses might stimulate a mite of police skepticism, too.

\(^{113}\) Note that this situation provides an inverse version of the disproportionality (§22) encountered when comparing the difficulties of CompLit’s challenges on WS’ unsubtle will vs subtle symbolisms, etc, which the field’s celebs profess to discern in the world’s literature.
N11 A seemingly minor detail of the coroner’s report (§Q7; N17): Poley & 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 (H48, Q353), so: why (§Q7) did he need to grab Frizer’s? Obvious answers: [a] Frizer must be daggerless 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-farfetched? 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, 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.

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. (Robt’ Greene had 154 made this accusation cryptically 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 D100f.)

O3 It is possible (§116) 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 unsmiling Privy Council.

O4 Marlovians (myself included) have hitherto at least implicitly assumed that sneaky PoleyÆcco (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, betrayed. In a word: spyneat.

O5 Is it mere speculation (§E22) that Marlowe, on learning of his mortal danger, instantly began dreaming-up the details of his eventual fake-death’s “brawl”? No, it’s demonstrably not. The conclusion of the hastily (T2:70) semi-completed final play Marlowe produced under his own name, The Massacre at Paris, 1593 concludes with a device startlingly redolent 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) snuffed 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.118 Sound familiar? Of course! — it’s the Paris edition of the fantastic blade-switch ploy of the Deptford “brawl” (§N14) — finally perfected &effectted 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 its last act.

O6 In Hamlet’s final scene, Laertes plans to murder Hamlet by perverting what was supposed to be a mere game of fencing: he uses a rapier that is secretly “Unbated and envenom’d” (unblunted and doused with slow poison, just like that which actually killed Henry III).122 But, after he stabs Hamlet with it, Hamlet seizes it during a scuffle and fatally wounds Laertes with the same poisoned blade. I.e., Marlowe’s 3rd use of his blade-switch device! — Massacre at Paris, Deptford, Hamlet. (The same ploy is also used in the 1998 film Shakespeare in Love.)

P Arch-antiMarlovian 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-convention (§P4) than B131 or (§P3) Nicholl, but worse arithmetic.

P2 The play was left unsolved (fn 121) by a suddenly-scrumming 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-playwright of them all. The fact that act-bounds were not set as he wrote shows that he was 117 Massacre brings to life the 1572 Catholic slaughter of Protestant Huguenots (by Mary Queen of Scots’ relatives), a horror which F.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 (§Z7) to keep England permanently Protestant.

118 Entirely Marlowe’s invention. In actuality, of course, Henry’s bodyguard cut down Clément instantly. (Note that the assassination occurred only 9 before Marlowe’s play brought it to stage-life.)

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

120 Both Henry III & Hamlet died from slow poison on the blade used. (In Marlowe’s Tamburlaine 5.1, degraded Turkish ruler Bajazeth lamb-pentametrically 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 shakiness 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 (§). 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 amiably 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 govt (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., §§33] 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?! And why the big show (§N8), with witnesses, elaborate alibi-for-kill, coroner, etc. — when murderers could just disappear Marlowe (à la Pinochet’s Argentina), or (even simpler) have an anonymous goon mug&kill him on a lonely pathway and leave him there — just as Dan Quayle was done-in by Macbeth (3.3).

**P8** As N328 realizes, forcing him to a quite speculative hit-conspiracy (§L33), which requires (see similarly at fn 45) merging enemies Essex & Cecil, etc.

**P9** By contrast, the simplicity of an anonymous murder is parallel to one of Shapiro’s best points (§K16).

**P10** The very fanciness of Marlowe’s “death” has an obvious implication:123

**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.

---

121 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.”

122 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 h 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 16° 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 §3, we find another parallel mixup (www.dioi.org/jha.htm#qthd) by the Royal Astronomical Society’s Vice-President, revealed at www.dioi.org/vols/w11.pdf (DIO 1.1 [1991]) 18 G. Similarly: able Spitzbergen explorer Sir Martin Conway’s confusion, about Henry Hudson’s calendar, at Rawlins Peary... Fiction [1973] p.16.

123 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?

---

**Q1** The coroner’s report said Marlowe died instantly of a 1 inch-wide stab-wound over221 his right eye, entering 2 inches into the brain (T1:156, H78, B220). Skeptics and even some among the orthodox have long rightly emphasized that such a wound would not kill quickly if at all (T1:182-183, W146, B220) which hints that the body was already dead when the stab occurred. (Marklessly killing a man after enraging him by a stabbing, would be... difficult.) Indeed, such a wound is usually survivable, though it would handicap thought.

**Q2** But a perhaps-hitherto-unasked question is: if one wished to substitute a freshly hanged body for Marlowe, wouldn’t it help to stab it in the forehead?222 thereby cloaking the face with blood? Obscuration, damage, and-or (§E16) death’s rigmo could help fool an innocent coroner — or provide a fail-safe excuse for a nervous bribed one. (Recall: H.Poirot’s noting the needlessly covered face of a supposed corpse was the solution-key in Agatha Christie’s His Body Under the Sun.)

**Q3** It is more than possible that the face was somewhat disfigured, given the violence of the wound: gossip in 1600 had it that some brains had spilled out of the skull (T1:147). Was the skull split, distorting the face, parallel to JFK’s ugly death? (Which launched a nut-competition as vigorous as anything discussed hereabouts.)

**Q4** Let us now go further by asking: how likely is it that a dagger-stab would pierce the hard bone of a human skull? Especially 2 inches into it. It seems doubtful (though not impossible) that a dagger would break the bone at all — unless it was hammered (§§E12&N13) into the corpse of a man already dead — deliberately splitting the skull, thus further enhancing facial unrecognizability.

**Q5** This is just part of a larger question: whereas stabbing someone in the face (and only in the face) is an unlikely tactic for a genuine fight, it is perfectly consistent with the traditional Marlovian hypothesis (long since already independently arrived-at on other grounds) that the Deptford planners were pulling a body-switch. Obviously, blood-covering & mess-uping-a substitute body’s face would be safeguard-desiderata against the chance of exposure. Strats deem Marlowe’s death “one of the best recorded events in English literary history” (e.g., E2; echoed at Wikipedia), forgetting the maxim that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link (fn 171): the Deptford corpse was identified by England’s most skilled liars.
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 daggers?) 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 snuggly-adjacent ([N11] Poley & Skeres have been able to intervene and calm down the alleged fighters? 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 kooky, despite Stratfordians’ insufferably snobbish ([T11]) shun-attempts to paint it so.

Q8 Marlowe and his also-vulnerable ([L33]) but also-agile fellow spies were presumably in a state of trying anything, with him under the shadow of the Tudor rack. 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 Nonwitness ([S1]) Protection Program, most ([S23]) of us would deem the probability far from low. As already noted ([J3]), 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 “absolutely preposterous” ([L28]) “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 ([S5]) conditions? Have they not read of the daring schemes that litter the history of politics,([L28]) 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 Stratfordian adamanently (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 pride ([S]) can explain Stratfordians’ eternally immutable ([J3]) insistence that what was obviously non-zero, non-trivial

probability must be declared EXACTLY zero?

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 indica ([H19]) 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 had never before, during his years of previous aliases for international espionage ([M9]).

R6 As Barber empathetically emphasizes (Q211, 290, 374), Marlowe LIVED ([S32]) 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)! No, there is — immediately (and as maturely as ever: [S]) — still but one. (How things do stay the same. . .). It is the obviousness of this point that elucidates the otherwise inexplicable passion various cultists display in decreeing ([S]) 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 ([S2]) 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. Slyly contradicted at 234-235, over sixty pages distant — without mentioning the reader to the conflict.)

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

S3 Further: this WS 1593 poem’s creation (like plays following) is so obviously beyond a neophyte’s ability that Shapiro — creditably 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”.)

S4 Advocates for other authorship candidates consistently betray their fears that Marlowe — & Frizer! — would be stabbed in the top of the head. Such questions are part of a classic case of inductive reconstruction.126 The head-stab seems very odd for [S] Marlowe’s “death” was a classic espionage ploy for entering him into what we may dub a Nonwitness ([S]) Protection Program, most ([S23]) of us would deem the probability far from low. As already noted ([S3]), 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]).

S5 Emphasized at [S23].

S6 The worst of Shapiro’s several ([H17]) key misjudgements on Marlovianism is the astonishing claim ([S21-212]) 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 his seemingly-wildcattish 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.

126 See www.dioi.org/vols/w93.pdf (DIO 9.3 [1999]) §A2 [p.120].
Double-standards again (§F13): Stratfordians cannot accept Marlowe’s escape partly because he was invisible after 1593 — even while his 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.

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 [troupe] had Shakespeare ... we do not know definitely of any plays he wrote for them.”

Note that the §§3 speculation of 1588 writings by WS is Stratfordianly presented as fact: this, while on the previous page (§225) Shapiro accuses his critics of speculative zealousy. He says simply that WS was trying to publish, but only by 1594 was his dramatizing 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 (§§14&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?

As usual (§L20), it is conveniently forgotten that Shakespeare himself said (§22) that his 1st work was 1593.

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

For any of twelve successive plays — until the retro-announcements of 1598 (§L2).

Specifically: Shapiro is claiming (§§3) 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 extent (§L7) of Marlowe’s acknowledged solo writing career! — i.e., “Shakespeare” (born same year as Marlowe: 1564) appears out of the blue with a style just as mature as Marlowe’s — and at the same time.

A further welcome testimonial to Shapiro’s literary expertise is that he senses the right quantity of time (5’-6’’) — even if oblivious to the obvious conclusion from it. (In 1593, Marlowe had been writing plays on his own for 6’, having effectively completed Tamburlaine by 1587: B46. We note that Oxfordians [e.g., R67] 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-explanation: www.dioi.org/mus.htm#wmv.)

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.

However (§L3): Straits believe that WS sought glory in acting. So (paralleling §G10) there is an obviously-anticipated consequent in Shapiro’s (shall we say Far-Fetched?) explanation (§62) 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: §111, all the way to 1598 (§59) by refusing to admit that he was writing some of the plays he acted in? A further welcome testimonial (§225) that Greene called WS a pushy “upstart . . . Tyger” whose “conceit” & “bombast” supported an inflated sense of his own uniqueness (§227)!

Anonymous 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

137 It’s possible that Shakespeare’s close similarity in age was a point in his favor when Marlowe was (if you will) casting about 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.)
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Note that the §§3 speculation of 1588 writings by WS is Stratfordianly presented as fact: this, while on the previous page (§225) Shapiro accuses his critics of speculative zealousy. He says simply that WS was trying to publish, but only by 1594 was his dramatizing 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 (§§14&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?

As usual (§L20), it is conveniently forgotten that Shakespeare himself said (§22) that his 1st work was 1593.

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

For any of twelve successive plays — until the retro-announcements of 1598 (§L2).

Specifically: Shapiro is claiming (§§3) 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 extent (§L7) of Marlowe’s acknowledged solo writing career! — i.e., “Shakespeare” (born same year as Marlowe: 1564) appears out of the blue with a style just as mature as Marlowe’s — and at the same time.

A further welcome testimonial to Shapiro’s literary expertise is that he senses the right quantity of time (5’-6’’) — even if oblivious to the obvious conclusion from it. (In 1593, Marlowe had been writing plays on his own for 6’, having effectively completed Tamburlaine by 1587: B46. We note that Oxfordians [e.g., R67] 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-explanation: www.dioi.org/mus.htm#wmv.)

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.

However (§L3): Straits believe that WS sought glory in acting. So (paralleling §G10) there is an obviously-anticipated consequent in Shapiro’s (shall we say Far-Fetched?) explanation (§62) 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: §111, all the way to 1598 (§59) by refusing to admit that he was writing some of the plays he acted in? A further welcome testimonial (§225) that Greene called WS a pushy “upstart . . . Tyger” whose “conceit” & “bombast” supported an inflated sense of his own uniqueness (§227)!

Anonymous 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

137 It’s possible that Shakespeare’s close similarity in age was a point in his favor when Marlowe was (if you will) casting about 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.
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[b] Or (a highly shaky speculation) did Bakeless’ mind at some level suspect the truth but feared that Harvard could reject his Marlowe bio (Bakeless’ 22nd dedicated labor) if he promoted — or (even slightly) entertained in public — a taboo position (§W20)? He renounces said heresy as impressively as Galileo, stridently echoing [T2:216] orthodoxy in calling the Marlovian case “fantastic” and “preposterous”. But he has no evidence to back such too-much-protestation [of play-within-the-play overkill-proportions] other than the very death-report that’s in question.) If some part of Bakeless was after all-skeptical, did he clear his conscience by leaving his impressive rift (§S22) of clues and insights for later scholars to mine? He remarks that the “death” occurring right as Marlowe was called before the Star Chamber is “suspicious”. (Yeah, sorta!!) But why does Bakeless then merely say (T1:183) at this crucial juncture that Marlowe was in the toils of the Privy Council “very probably as a witness against someone”. This mutes the awful terror that necessitated Marlowe’s faked death. Bakeless knew better — and says so elsewhere (e.g., T1:185). He later acknowledges that Baines’ and others’ charges (§M8) to the Star Chamber were such as to (T2:110 emph added) “bring any subject in peril of his life”.

S24 The cult of Stratfordian orthodoxy traditionally, invariably, irrepressibly, and impossibly has kept trying (§S1&S7) to contradict their own hero’s direct chronological statement (§S2).

S25 Stratford’s play for dodging the author’s clear statement that his 1593 poem was the start of his literary career: adudging (S234 a lone, ambiguous-at-best (§I29; P45f) 1592 Robert Greene pamphlet, A Goodworth of Wit Bought with a Million of Repentance. §S26 Goodworth obscurely appears — maybe 141 — to be accusing someone dubbed “Shakespeare” of showboating and-or literary plagiarism and-or (§L18) tampering.

S27 Greene (emph in orig): “an upstart Crow beautified with our feathers, that with his Tyger’s heart wrapt in a Player’s hyde,” 142 suggests he is as well able to bombast out a blanke verse as the best of you . . . in his own conceit the only Shake-scene in a country.”

S28 Pathetic? Yes, but that’s the ENTIRE extent of the Stratfordian cult’s feeble “proof” that Shakespeare composed any work before Marlowe’s 1593 disappearance. (Again [K7]: 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 — conspicuous for its naked isolation 143 — contradicts (§S2) Shakespeare’s own clear chronology. Yet it is holy writ among all Stratfordian orthodoxologists, including Folger-edition prefaces. Strat-preference yet again (§S4) for opaque & shaky evidence over clear & solid evidence.

S29 Only a cult that’s evidentially up-against-the-wall would be reduced to defending its hero by leaning-on an item that (if it is held to relate to WS’ writing rather than acting or script-tampering) accuses him of poor writing and plagiarism! (T2:223 wamts accepts refutation.) But, then, Stratfordians’ crusade to contradict Shakespeare and thus argue that he was a playwright before 1593, have no other “evidence” for said contention (§S2). Greene’s highly ambiguous (§W15) work is all there is.

S30 Words such as “Player,” “bombast” (§L19) and “Shake-scene” seem far more indicative of an actor than a writer 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-warning to London’s playwrights’ “union” that an outlaw-interloper (a mere player!?) is pretending to be as able 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 (§S10).

141 See T2:223; P45f; Mxxx, 235, 257-259, 317; B85&184.
142 Emph in 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 York.)

S33 Also (caps added) “the ONLY Shake-scene in a country” sounds like someone at the top of his chosen profession of ACTING as leading Marlovians argue (with a balanced perceptiveness [B103; D107-108 n.18; Q421-422] which should shame straw-grasping [§W15] Stratfordian orthodoxologists). Marlovians convincingly conclude (e.g., H35) that Greewt’s target was the leading British actor of the day as well as a usurer (Q422) and businessman (even sponsoring dog-fights: B106), Ned Alleyn, who in his “conceit” was also (D108 n.18) a writer-dabbler. But why would Greene attack then-obscure WS, who did little acting on the stage (fn 58), and in 1592 had no visible reputation as a writer. S34 Regardless of who “Shake-scene” is, we can prove he was not the WS plays’ author: what could a playwright of Greene’s experience regard said author as a rotten writer? (Greene hated & slandered Marlowe, too [§O1], but doesn’t attack his competence.) Note all Strat steps here: WS wrote plays from 1588 (§S6) that — even after 40 — were still drive. But 17 later, he’s the world’s greatest poet. This sequence is what Strat-think is proposing. But (like §§K7&W31) not together in one place.

S35 Notice that Marlowe is the sole candidate whose case is affected if Shakespeare were a major writer in 1592 instead of 1593.

S36 So cultish Stratfordian-cling to the theory that Greene’s pamphlet establishes WS as a writer in 1592 not 1593 (a trivial time-difference with respect to all other authorship candidates) specifically (§W14) suggests that, as a way of Quotients are quietly, cringily aware (§H19) that Marlowe’s case is the sole dangerously powerful challenger.

S37 We again emphasize that, of the 3 main contenders for authorship, WS, Oxford, Marlowe, the last’s case alone does not lead to chronological difficulties (§W10) and or contra-Occam manipulation. 146 It is odd that Stratfordians regard as authoritative the First Folio versions of previously quarto-published plays, though they contain numerous edits that could not be valid unless effected by the creator 147 — yet WS (like Oxford) was certainly dead by 1623. This point is driven home by Blumenfeld (B308) particularly for the case of Othello, where we have a 1622 edition that is not the usual mess of most quartos, yet comparison to the 1623 First Folio version reveals careful alterations & interpolations. So there is clear evidence of authoritative final editing being carried out in 1622-1623.

S38 Question regarding Stratfordians’ paralytic inability (e.g., §§D7&T17; S217) to quote to their readers the documents regarding Marlowe’s desperate plight: do Stratfordians find these documents totally uninteresting?

S39 If so, one can reliably and profitably gauge their cementalities. But even more revealing is the implicit arrogance (of those who rule most public forums on the authorship issue) in unilaterally, systematically (§F12) keeping from public awareness (decade after decade) the full range of startling evidence relating to whether Marlowe survived.

S40 Obvious question (our cover & §T16): why should anyone make such a judgement for everybody else? This, even (fn 175) WHILE accruing skeptics of playing-goed? It’s hard 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.

144 Open to accepting “Shake-scene” as WS, Price succinctly sums up Goodworth on “Shake-scene” (P47): “an attack against an untrustworthy actor who is also a money-lender and . . . a paymaster of playwrights.” 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; Q255, 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 Collision” in his 1951 Mopaling 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). The trigger for the First Folio’s issuance may have been Marlowe’s final health-decline, since he was a heavy smoker (T1:128) now nearing 60’.
T Spat’s True Naifs: Reliable Expertise as Thespianism-Pinnacle

T1 We begin the process of identifying which side actually shows symptoms of crankitude, by analysing the rationality of leading Stratfordians, ultimately revealing some unexpectedly establishment-embarrassing parallels to the Evolution-vs-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 adored with shrinko-detective-work to spot megolamania 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-contrast.

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-scarecrow (though hopefully not resorting to normative insults like “fringe-science”), a view unwittingly bolstered by the following unfounded Stratfordian truants. From the already-cited (§I27) 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. . . .

zani(es) (§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 coolheaded 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” (§I28). (The ubiquitous 1959 Folger Library editions of the plays prefatory dissemble 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 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 (§I19) irrelevant: WS’ low origin.151

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

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 compiled 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.152 (Nicolich [E29] and B.Branly 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 Branly), it’s a farf to watch shunning (§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 the plays’ author was upper-class (thus his high writing style & familiarity with court), into a symptom of Oxfordians’ noblitis and conceit, is pure shrinko-analytic gas — this from cultists who can’t stop branding other people as cranks. Review after review of Anonymous squandered space on such insult or on personal irrelevance (Branly), when what is supposed to be at issue (see the reviews’ own headlines) is: whether Shakespeare wrote his plays.

T12 The 2011 reviews reveal embarrassing innocence (fn 38) of the Marlowe theory — and it looks false with cases it plainly is multiply distinct from (§D10, S37, T4). Stratfordianism is 2010 knight-in-shining-orthodoxy, I Shapiro, already slyly did likewise — outrageously deeming the Bacon & Oxford candidacies (S4) “the best documented and most consequential . . . [and] most representative”. Thus, he may steal away (§I27) 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 visibility 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 mss (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 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.[5] Shakespeare’s 1616/3/25 will.

T14 While Time’s interview with skeptical Justice Stevens (fn 56: not published in a drama or review dept’) is a welcome if limited exception to the 2011 anti-Thought-Crime origy 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 his right-afterwards materialization.

any baron of the Free Press ever considered requesting such evidence before engaging in mass-slander-slinging?) With the internet’s oncoming new danger to Stratfordian orthodoxy, it seems that centrist have abandoned all standards of logic & decency in their frantic Charles-Martelian desperation to hammer & hurl back the pagan barbarians (§U27).

152 The bane of the plagiarist is copying another’s errors. Thus, our film-critics’ virtually universal repetition of the uninformed (§T9) and patently (§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.doi.org/che.htm#cbib) pack-animal pretenders.
T15 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.)

T16 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 & exclusion FOR the reader (see cover & §S40), while never letting said reader even know of his data-deprivation?

T17 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. To the film Anonymous, our Free Press’ excuse for suppressing Marlovian data was but-is-news? (This, from newspapers that print recipes, horoscopes, comics, etc.) So now that the controversy is news, these same establishment-catering newspapers print fictions’ opinions, slanders, and (§G10) personal ruminations instead of central evidentiary fact. The Marlovian case: persecution for heresy, spies, stabbings. Was it Munder? Or Escape? Boooorriiiing. Who’d be interested?

T18 Teachout in-sum: his argument typifies Stratfordians’ ignorance of the Marlovian evidence.

T19 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 most even of their 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?

T20 Teachout TeachIn. Most Stratfordians seem naïve about how much ghostwriting and fraud go on in various of the arts.

T21 This is an inevitability on a planet where celebs are much rarer,153 richer, & pushier (§S27) than creators. Are Teachout&clo beyond our help in this area? We can only try.

T22 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?).

T23 Vermeers may now be as costly as “Rembrandt” paintings that have been reclassified (into “from-the-school-of—ambiguity”) comparable to those which have not (yet?).

T24 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 devoting the proceeds. (Half of something is better than all of nothing.) The truth (that O’Reilly invented 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-sure undoing of slavery was his issuance of the (1863/1/1) Emancipation Proclamation after the Civil War, i.e., 1865 April. (FOX News is fitfully False-Or-Xaggerated; but and it O’Reilly also more than occasionally provide a refreshing alternative to the uniform Lib-Centric menu served up by the other nets.)

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 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 devoting the proceeds. (Half of something is better than all of nothing.) The truth (that O’Reilly invented 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-sure undoing of slavery was his issuance of the (1863/1/1) Emancipation Proclamation after the Civil War, i.e., 1865 April. (FOX News is fitfully False-Or-Xaggerated; but and it O’Reilly also more than occasionally provide a refreshing alternative to the uniform Lib-Centric 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
pseudo-ancient “Songs of Bilitis” turned out to be a prank upon over-arrogant German classicists, the texts actually written by France’s Pierre Louys, assisted by friend Claude Debussy’s musical setting — a work still deservedly admired on its considerable merits. T26 Are we to suppose that Elvis wrote his songs? That Dear-Abby wrote all her advice-columns? (When her sister Landers’ competing column was detected in plagiarism, it was blamed on her stability.) 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 nearly at 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(160)(Nat.Hist.Pref.21&23) of the commonness of plagiarism even by the best-known writers. Synesios, 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 name at its base, covered with plaster fragile enough to be sure to flake away after Ptolemy’s death.

U Prefering Debatable Evidence to Undebatable U1 All of the foregoing cases should be kept in mind whenever a Stratfordian decrees to insensitive-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 scarcely-prominent 1923 article, & culminating in Hoffman’s 1955 book) sent the Stratfordian cult reeling (§U8) into ever-more-insistent denial. U4 An eradicable exception is (nonetheless-adamant-Stratfordian) Jonathan Bate who says(160) “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


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 case’s anemia becomes ever more publicically obvious, some Strats seek snatched-from-jaws-of-Heresy 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 Strats’ supposed statistical genius in claiming matching with WS case was 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-lifted any via (since sunk)(161) classic Fatal-Flaw-Dreamup. These 3 parallels to the Marlowe—WS case emphasize a key lesson (§W16): never reject a theory with numerous obvious, potent, & Undebatable(162) evidences recommending it, just to cling to old orthodoxyology 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, manic Strats’ most-insisted-upon Fatal Flaw is: Marlowe dead-sure in 1593. U7 [2] StratStylometry(163) like OxCryptograms, is the refuge of a case in such trouble, it claws misrauralization by steroid-injection-ex-machina. (See: In 40’s citations; DIO 1.1 §4 pp.28-29 ["more fiddle factors than the New York Philharmonic"); DIO 2.2 §5 (A.) 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 include a chapter on stylometry, yet their own chapters don’t endorse such.) However, this could change (like §U3), as the Strat case’s weakness becomes better known.

161This 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 under 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#cfjb. 162Preference for debatable over undebatable lives-on near-unanimously in the facral 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°1/2 (which is accurate). Far funnier details at www.dioi.org/vols/web/pdf (DIO 14 [2008]) §2 C. 163An obvious problem for stylometric tests: since public perception (§L9) that Marlowe survived scarily-prominent 1923 article, & culminating in Hoffman’s 1955 book) sent the Stratfordian cult reeling (§U8) into ever-more-insistent denial of this factor’s chaotic pollution of stylometric tests?
U9 Why resort to shaky, diffuse (§U5), & complex statistics, when simple stats (§S1-C2) provide a clear result? (See also on this subject T2:216-217 & 228. And note the obvious:164 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 !)

U10 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 least-ambiguous (§Z4) similar justified inferences, that really matter (writing styles, obviously to all, and [ii] other inevitably-unanswerable points, which we next enumerate.

U11 [1] The Marlowe & WS styles are nearer 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, agree-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” (§L33). [5] Stratfordian Bakeless (T2:214) admits that it is non-speculatively established that “Certain plays ordinarily included in the Shakespearean canon reveal definite traces of Marlowe which can hardly be due to mere imitation. Notable among these are the first two parts of Henry VI, Richard II, Richard III, Titus Andronicus, and Julius Caesar.”165 Though Bakeless is a believer in Marlowe’s death and Shakespeare’s genius, he admits (T2:214-215), “The traces of Marlowe consist first of whole lines or short passages from plays known to be Marlowe’s; second, of words typical of Marlowe’s vocabulary, not typical of Shakespeare’s, and not known to be typical of any other playwright; and third, of obvious examples of Marlowe’s structure, mood, and style.” (Bakeless then spends pages trying to explain all this with Marlowe supposedly dead at the supposed creation-times of the cited plays. Exploratory speculation: were most of these plays at least partly written before Marlowe’s arrest [Henry VI surely was: fn 142], after which he disguised his style?) [6] The very 1895 (§E5) & 1923 (§E9) origins of the Marlovian theory were due almost entirely to textual analysis (true even of Hoffman: Hxiv) — notably predating 1925 recovery of hard evidences (§T13), e.g., [a] arrest warrant, [b] coroner’s report, & [c] diary record of Shakespeare’s soon-after debut as a writer — which have by now become stronger evidence (than textual comparisons) for the hoax-interpretation of Marlowe’s “death”.

The foregoing 6 literary evidences place even the Marlovians’ text (quite aside from the even-stronger documentary one) far above that for any other alternate candidate.

U12 Resort to stylistics is a classic cult tactic: divert the observer from simple, hard, reliable evidence (segue, WS’ maturity, etc) to fixate on dubious, shabby arguments. The only disputants that lean heavily on computer word-tests are the Strat-soldiers who 164Stratfordians’ laxity on this point reminds one of the dying embers of the Peary North Pole controversy, when dog-sledgers W.Steger & T.Avery failed to replicate Peary’s miracle, but — being as leashed as their dogs — claimed success anyway in matching the former-establishment hero’s average speed, while de-emphasizing their failure to come anywhere near the round-the-Earth ice-seaspeed Peary claimed on the unverified (most northern) fraction of the 1909 trip, which is all that matters.

165Last unpublished ‘till 1623, 7th after WS’ death. Only supposed record of existence earlier: a tourist’s recollection (C209, B219, M322) of seeing a “Julius Caesar” performed at the Globe 1599/9/21 — author uncredited. Caesar being a popular subject then for plays (M240), certainty is elusive here. 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#mdnbv): 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-plays). U13 Among reasons newspapers won’t print the simple Marlovian evidences cited here at the outset (§A1): whenever newsmen think of writing on the authorship question, they (quietly) go to the most conveniently accessible but laughably least reliable guide for any passionate controversy, Wikipedia (though WP is sometimes marvelous for source-mining), and from its corrupt articles naïvely misconclude that word-counts & expert-counts are so conclusively invalid that the matter is over, as a common sense (instead listening to their own careerism and—or sloth)166 by discounting — and thus never informing the public about — the 13th segue. (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-removal removed.)

U14 So, instead of a neutral story just giving both or all sides, newsvokul TOTALLY (§F11) suppress such obviously spectacular and massively odds-defiant data as Marlowe’s 5/18 arrest, 5/20 bail, 5/30 “death”, & fully-mature WS’ appearance already by 6/12 — all 4 events implicitly (for StratThink) occurring BY CHANCE in a span of c.4 weeks (1593/5/18 to 6/12 or before). In the US’ Free Press, ALL media ape each other — ALL the time — in hypnotically rigid, unbroken adherence to the ultimately censorial task of preventing the public from knowing of the information we have just expressed in the previous SINGLE sentence. As we summed it up earlier (§D) on contraStrat evidence, the US press and its goo-roos are permanently, reliably, leaklessly outta ink & outta think.

U15 Contra Strats’ “Denier” sneer (§I28): it’s obvious that §U11’s six utterly UNdeniable points, agreed to by all sides, through their very simplicity overthrow in power:

U16 Any (pro or con) of the various oft-naively-cited statistical tests on style.

U17 The Stratfordian orthodoxological chorus (§U26) that Stratfordians’ sense of style and mood is the ultimate arbiter and thus definitively counts more than all the hard documentary evidences that suggest Marlowe authored the play that their fanatically-promoted Memory Hole will forever gobble up all the dozens of contrary testimonies by leading pre-Webster (§U3, Q413) Shakespeare experts. See. e.g., the mass of examples of such evaluations which Hoffman is able (§J12) to list for pages; also Bakeless’ attempt (§U11 & fn 40; T2:216f) to speculatively (fn 40) alibi-refute or buffer the eminent J.M.Robertson’s belief that “Marlowe’s contributions to the text are important” in no less than eight Shakespeare plays.

U18 So what we have is a remarkably close and exclusive Marlowe-WS fit on multiple counts — but (§U19) not quiiiiiiiiiite close enough for the superior Stratfordian nose.168 To return to the real world of legitimate debate: given that the Stratfordian religion has so lost instead of suppressing Marlowe-case facts — due to conviction by Stratwrenched lawyering — might not news media consider printing-juxtaposing both facts and Strat-advocacy? Pressfolk mentalities have for decades exhibited reliable immunity from infection by such egregious temptation. 167 — why don’t they even look at their Orwellian dream to obtain? 168 A current parallel to depending upon foggy stylistic analyses as against unfoggy facts (Marlowe’s hideous predicament & sneaky friends, as well as full-blown Shakespeare’s just-after debut): those Dembos who voted for Obama demonstrate their dear imperviousness to the obvious reality that they were taken in, by adoring his image and concentrating not on starkly clear, unalibiable evidence but on hazy ambiguities such as his superficially-ambiguous ongoing complicated interactions with the Dembos (encased in Lib-speeches & promises, but unerringly GOP-accordant in plutocrat-enriching outcome), meanwhile zombiesquely (§S24) ignoring Obama’s unambiguously oldbopersons-compliant Day-One unilateral appointments of Shubuya’s “Defense” Sec’y, & bankster-stooges L.Summers & TimiGofer.
its cool that it unhinged (§V2) rages at any departure from its creed and is even prepared to exile heretics (§V1), can one seriously trust such an excitable 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 are the ultimate in-deniable snobs here? If it’s crazy to deny the plays’ authorship to a user-actor with no education-vita, then how much megalomaniacally crazier is it to deny it to a low-born (§IV4) scholar whose hard-wrought pre-1593 literary achievements took him to Cambridge, and on to London where his plays were within at most a wisp (§§IV4, 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 anathema 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 (fn 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 290). Even jail can stimulate, e.g., John Bunyan & Hitler. Or political threat: Stalin—Shostakovich’s 5th §F4. 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,§F4 why would his worldview change? What a mystery! As Webster realized, exile is a recurring theme in the Sonnets — who could possibly know why . . . ?

169Marlowe surely reacted better (§U22) than neighborhood-protector George Zimmerman (possible brain-damage vicim of Knockout-Gamer—black-icon Trayvon Martin) to a permanent life-of-exile — due in GZ’s case to kilometers 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 connections and historically unique literary talent — and did not suffer Zimmerman’s psychologically crushing sense of utter abandonment by all, due to media-persons’ Dembo-sludhre or fear of becoming death-threat hate-targets themselves. Both men were aggressively pursued by their respective gov’ts. Even 2ª after Martin’s vicious attack and months after GZ’s vindication by meticulous jury-trial, GZ believes (perhaps wrongly) that the US Justice Dep’t is still trying to dig up some bases for (effectively) double-jeopardy. Racists keep emailing him death-threats by the thousand, even helpfully outing his family’s address (miniciting foetuses-huggers’ tactic against abortion doctors), as a prominent Hollywood did anonymously in 2013 Nov. Having in 2012 dishonestly tried & lynched GZ, before a jury overturned its premature verdict, the Free Press might have considered post-trial atonement by protecting GZ from mob-just. Instead, his former media-volk lyncher 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 tongs” rant (§T5), delivered in felicitously incalculable rage at the ThoughtCrime of mere disagreement— overly recommending the shunning of heretics— blunts the precise dirty secret of soft academe’s purported “free discourse”: the contemporary academic world is rife with elicits which shun (§W20) those who dissent from the archons who control funds, appointments, conferences. Fearing loss of such patronage (§C4), the lumpen-rabbitaritate— 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 [§E6]), and mental limitations (see at fn 51 pointed NTimes analyses by J.Tierney of other DIO opposites’ parallel cultist stubbornness) have reduced Strat intellectual mobility on the Shakespeare’s sh-game & Occam’s Razor, such as to gut all proposed signification to the off-adduced (§D7) apparent Unanimity-of-Experts.  

V2 Contemptuous Stratfordian psychoanalytic²⁻² lavings 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 Aaronovich¹⁷⁷ 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.”¹⁷⁸ (Edmondson similarly at E225.) Aaronovich then quotes Mamet (emph-caps added here on creationism— for amusingly ironic reasons soon [§W] to be in evidence):  

The 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-earther²⁵ and the CREATIONIST.²⁶ élects himself. . . . God²⁷  

And Stratfordians attack (e.g., [§T3] doubters for evidence-supported 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: farther from denying-scoffing ([§V12] at the reality of standout-genius, Marlovians are the most genius-glorifying of all the vying parties to this controversy.  

V5 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)?  

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 DIO 18 2014 BardBeard: Marlowe Invented Shakespeare 59 DIO 18 2014 BardBeard: Marlowe Invented Shakespeare 59

172 Dembos’ 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 afflicts 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 existence of written records [P238] 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 §I2.  

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 unsurpassably 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 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 éde in killing the popularity of serious music by replacing dramatic, powerful Beethoven with graceful 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.)  

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


180 An odd-hominem’s smears are insufficient justification for going somewhat ad-hominem in return; but when it becomes indisputable that a cult is pronouncing dicta and banishments with a ceritude way-insufficiently supported by its evidence & arguments, one naturally turns to psychology and group dynamics for explanations. A quote from Bishop Berkeley was a favorite of our late friend Hugh Thurston (www.dioi.org/NotHim#Him): “I observed how unaccountable it was, that men so easy to confute should yet be so difficult to convince.”
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.\textsuperscript{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 (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 favorable evidence into a charge of bigotry (§T7): a fantasy that skeptics (secretly) hate 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 evidence\textsuperscript{182} 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 1\textsuperscript{st} analogy (of a flock yet to come: §W) from the Darwin-vs-creationism history, where only Darwin’s side has any coherent scholarly evidence at all. A rough equivalency to the Mamet-Aaronovitch-Teachout tantrums would be: a religious nut sneering at an evolutionist for defying (and thus supplanting) god by basing opinion upon geological data, rejecting Intelligent Design-out-of-nowhere & the nothing-but-faith-based (§V12; www.dioi.org/nm/t.htm#slsb) Biblical version of creation.

V15 This is a grievous sin because faith is morally (§V12) superior to reason. (Just as Straphard faith is 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 Stratford-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, Stratfordians (who meantime 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’ blustering 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 evident 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 2pp 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 poems & plays that are near-universally recognized (§U4; fn 81) as resembling\textsuperscript{183} 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 nowhere\textsuperscript{184} with zero known evidential vita upon his debut at the (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#dvxj) 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 Oziens their Wizard was real: Shakespeare was a writer since lots of people believed\textsuperscript{185} 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 absence\textsuperscript{186} of solid evidence on the point from Shakespeare’s lifetime.

W8 All Shapiro can do is quote (§235f; P112) several admirers of (what they believed were) Shakespeare’s writings.\textsuperscript{187}

183 This clear connexion (once-routinely-stipulated-to: §J12) may become increasingly denied by ever-flexible (§C10&U3) and frustratingly evidence-bare Stratfordians as Marlovianism comes on.

184 B341, P255; “miracle of genius” (C71).

185 Being-believed-for-being-believed is as philosophically deep as famous-for-being-famous celebs. As with other religious sects, most of academe’s Stratfordians believe in Shakespeare’s authorship because their mentors and funders do. Several Wikipedia comments on the controversy use (apparent: §V1) near-universal English Prof 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 “fringe” (§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 nauseum its numerical success at holding heresy in check, if it possessed convincing logical 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 purchaser of poetry & co-purchaser (S225) of plays, but not a creator of them. And Price emphasizes (P138) a point that guts the strength of Shapiro’s main argument from contemporary alleged witnesses to WS as a writer: “Most of the explicit [contemporary] literary allusions to Shakespeare . . . could have been written after reading or seeing one of Shakespeare’s works. Allusions such as those by Weever, Barksted, or Meres tell us only that these writers knew Shakespeare by his works and name. [Of the] principal ambiguous allusions . . . , none confirms a personal acquaintance with Shakespeare’s least . . .” (186c, www.dioi.org/vols/wc0.pdf (DIO 12 [2002]); Encycl.Astron.&Astrophysics 2002 Hipparchos entry.)
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 & the like credited non-authors: §§T23, T27-T28, fnn 153&187.)

W10 Yet, as with the Bible, there are improbabilities & contradictions. Henry VI is in the Shakespeare-titelpaged First Folio, but (B156, 184) all 3 parts were written in 1591, 2 years before WS’ 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 $234-235 or any WS play’s 1595 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 fash theory (e.g., $240; 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 quasidebate. Evolution is testified to by time-ordered geological layers. So creationists unashakingly cling to shaky caves, to try throwing doubt on that order. W14 Similar desperation (§S35), 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 100.0000% SOLID proof that Shakespeare was a playwright then. (Not even the editor of the modern critical edition of Groatworth agrees with them: P46. And Wells has here intelligently disentangled from StratHer overcertainty: E74.) We repeat (§S28) for emphasis: this ultra-Shakey 1592 item is Stratfordianism’s SOLID 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 preferred¹⁸⁹ over clear evidence (e.g., §L36), even for central tenets. Recall also a parallel StratCultist pseudo-

¹⁸⁸Further, there were some works published c.1600 with Shakespeare’s name on the title-page that no-one today accepts as his: H20-21&200, P129. Marlowe’s The Passionate Shepherd to His Love, containing his famous line, “Come live with me, and be my love”, first appeared in a book which the publisher put Shakespeare’s name on (T2:155). Yet there is now no doubt anywhere that the poem was Marlowe’s (from his university days: B73). And a 1612 work with Shakespeare’s name on the title page as author was (B237) later reissued with his name removed (sole alteration) due to complaints to the publisher (not to WS) from the real author of portions of the work. Such data can make one skeptical regarding whether Shakespeare’s name on the First Folio proves his authorship.

¹⁸⁹Various examples at §J11. The prefaces to the Folger editions of “Shakespeare” plays uniformly echo-promote as fact the feebile Strat reading of Greene (§W11), ignoring clear Shakespeare: §S2. Such motivation-driven distortions are typical of cults (thus our notion that “both” epoche can only be kept Frankfurter’s point in mind: §H1). For one of the funniest parallel examples ever, see how worshippers of the thoroughly exposed explorer-faker Frederick Cooper feed cock and cryptographic disproof of his claims by Brad Washburn & Rob’t Bryce: www.dioi.org/vols/w73.pdf (DIO 7.2-7 [1997]) esp. Figs.6&8, 18, 28&29. (Note that none of these evidential clinicians prevented promotion of the family-wealth-driven Cook cause in 2009 by the so-easily “influenced” American Philosophical Society! [1] and Smithsonian Magazine.) Take particular note of Cookie logic at DIO op cit p.85 and at www.dioi.org/vols/w93.pdf (DIO 9.1 [1999]) p.122 & esp. Fig.6 (p.116) & caption.
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 declassé 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 feeble 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#mlpn.)

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 near simultaneous solution of disparate mysteries.15 Likewise for Marlovianism, as our next section (§X) will show.

W31 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 (§S11-K13) with the devastatingly consistent fact of WS’ zero education-vita. [b] Or his Latin-smallness (§L3). [c] Contra our [C2 odds-multiplication, Strat (e.g., fn 30; E29&34) won’t cite the arrest — Death 12° coincidence in conjunction with the Death — WS-debut 13° 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 independent Greene 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 accused-bombastic ‘tyger’ (§S14) as WS.

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 (§I3) the shenanigans & names, e.g., Henry IV Part 2, the queen, etc. After the nobles’ deaths, too? — Essex (M316), & Cecil (S177). Hmmm. 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 feeble 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.

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 the theory, seamlessly sewing together a variety of mysteries; neatly and reverse-Hamletly (1.2) merging their separate — 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? Why did the plays end up published under the name of an actor — is the linchpin that has proven productive (E39):

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

X7 Is it pure coincidence that Marlowe “died” a few days after arrest for a capital crime?

X8 Why (§Q2) would a real killer stab someone in the head instead of the torso?

X9 Why stab him at all (§Q7), once he’s disarmed?

X10 Why does Shakespeare suddenly (§S3) appear out of nowhere in 1593?

X11 Right after Marlowe’s exit.

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

X13 And why would WS’ maturity (upon his 1593 debut) be — according to the leading Stratfordian (§S11) — almost exactly the same as Marlowe’s? Why is it this will of a non-literary person?97

X14 Why do we find a mutually-confirmatory double-negative blank (§S14) to multiple evidences and the broad resolution of what previously seemed independent, uncrackable mysteries.

E.g., the power of Darwin’s idea, “Natural Selection”, is its near simultaneous solution of disparate mysteries.15 Likewise for Marlovianism, as our next section (§X) will show.

X32 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 (§S11-K13) with the devastatingly consistent fact of WS’ zero education-vita. [b] Or his Latin-smallness (§L3). [c] Contra our [C2 odds-multiplication, Strats (e.g., fn 30; E29&34) won’t cite the arrest — Death 12° coincidence in conjunction with the Death — WS-debut 13° 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 independent Greene 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 accused-bombastic ‘tyger’ (§S14) as WS.

X15 Why is it this will of a non-literary person?97

X16 Conversely, why is there positive evidence (§S3) that Shakespeare was not educated?

X17 Why is there positive evidence (§S3) that Shakespeare was not educated?

X18 Why was the style of the plays so Marlovian (§S17, D16, & J8)?

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 sparseness — and is actually ironic in light of David Mamet’s unthought-out comparison (above: fn 175) of anti-Stratfordians to flat-earthers, of all people. Throughout the century 1882-1982, many scholars (Hultsch, E.Lehmann-Haupt, Diller, Fischer, Sagan, etc) argued extensively that the huge 40% disagreement between the two standard Earth-size estimates adopted in antiquity — 252000 stades vs 180000 stades — was an illusion merely due to various ancient scientists’ differing definitions of the Greek stade. But others (Bunbury, Dicks, Neugebauer, Engels, Berggren, A.Jones) were never sucked into such desperation. (See parallel Marlovian options at §§L62.) And we vindicated when a much simpler explanation appeared: see, e.g., www.dioi.org/vols/we0.pdf (DIO 14 [2008]) 1 eq.28. And the radically new theory surfaced just as unexpectedly as the 1955 Marlovian solution’s dramatic logical elimination of the many anomalies in the early-20th century Shakespeare situation. (Bookless will; no educational vita; instant maturity; no reasonable explanation for alternate creator’s anonymity; etc.) The new 1982 ancient-geodesy theory was found not through arbitrary, manipulative metrology but rather from long-universally-accepted physics (fn 191), and it simultaneously (and very closely: within 1% each) explains BOTH precise but highly disparate ancient Earth-radius estimates — and does so without the slightest inventive fitting with Greeks’ standard macro-measure, the long-established regular 185m stade. Again: the theory — like Hoffman’s — passes Occam’s test: simple, while evaporating multiple anomalies at a stroke.

197 This item & the previous pair together provide an ideal example of skeptics’ Occamite advantage here. Similarly to §11: while the theory that WS was a front simultaneously solves all three evidences.
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 (§S1) the careers of Marlowe and "Shakespeare", with the seam fixable at mid-1593.
X23 We conclude our Ovocan 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.
X25 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 its fundamental dualism, 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, 199 Relativity, round Earth (fn 72&201), geomaticity, stars not on-fire but nuclear. (Note that Marlowe's Hamlet 2.2 misled Ophelia on the last two!)
X28 The discoverer keeps searching mind-enedly until finding the key (§X1) that fits-unlocks the available data.
X29 Further, valid mystery-solving stories often fruitfully (§35) 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 academics), dealing with cases where contradictions in what appears on the surface require inducing coherent
X31 solutions from scattered evidence.
X32 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 cemetal Strats — had chosen to escape and thereby decline199 otherwise certain torture and execution. (A seemingly natural but novel speculation: was Bible-expert & atheist200 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. Hoffman specifically 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?)
X33 Stratford 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.
X34 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 forums200 that determine consensus. And some eminent Stratfordians know it (§H14).
X35 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.
X36 Any reader reluctant to accept that Marlowe went incognito after 1593, must consider that name-shiftness (§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 perhaps packed with them.
X37 Yet the only Marlowe false name that survives had nothing to do with political espionage. That immortal alias was, of course: "William Shakespeare".
X38 It is long past time for public forums to face the cohesive power of the Marlovian case — and to recognize and credit at last the unique genius (§V5) who really created and
X39 the Earth's shadow during lunar eclipses, the 24/day non-visibility of southern-horizon stars after one traveled far enough north, etc — long before space-craft ultra-verified the truth.
202 Several observers have added another consideration: Marlowe's anonymity was only partial; unlike Oxford or Bacon, he already (§J8) had to his public credit a considerable corpus of the most popular (§L33) plays of the pre-1593 period, so his dramatic mortality was assured, regardless. Possibly this relates to the interesting if secondary (§I17) question of why he never claimed authorship of his post-1593 productions, though the (likely very few) involved parties' silence may have more to do with standard spy-ring group-protective discretion in a world in which dissenters' heads ended up spiked on London Bridge. (Thos. Walsingham and Frizer lived past the First Folio.) Did Marlowe follow the example of Copernicus in deposing a Horatio (§A2) to bring out the long-suppressed truth after his own demise? If so, the appointed spymaster may have guided (even as the queen's brave disciples) felt that he was no more willing to risk his "felicity" (idem) or life for this particular truth than Marlowe had been.
203 More non-ironic than the creation of VaCity as a nation, by athist Mussolini (1929 Lateran Pacts). Or the music world's in-joke that nearly all the grand Christian masses/Arequiem is by composers not conventionally (at least!) Christian: Beethoven, Berlioz, Verdi, Brahms, Janácek, Vaughan Williams.
204 Another project that would help make known the Marlowe view would be the issuance of an edition of the plays of Marlowe and "WS" running — the other after The One — in a single huge, rice-paper volume, entitled simply: "The Complete Plays of Christopher Marlowe".
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 casting hounded for the rest of his life (§S5&S8), 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 Depford scenario was selected partly because it was so humiliating that it implausibly 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 ipsa 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 fellow writers): “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.
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A note in the text such as “P218” refers the reader to Price p.218.

Z Appendix: Two-Faced Planet, Religious Cults, & the Walsinghams
Z1 Most of DIO’s boardmembers are experienced (www.dioi.org/hoa.htm#jptm) in evaluating cases of suspected fraud. Its founder D.Rawlins (DR) has published detailed academic-journal scholarly investigations of more historical science hoaxes than anyone (www.dioi.org/hoa.htm#dch). Mention of this fact is merely informational, not in any way an argument-from-authority.211 But the cited superlative permits reference to another: of all the hoaxes DIO has searched into, Shakespeare is the most212 transparent (§G8).
Z2 Reborn Venus. The disappearance of Marlowe followed immediately by the appearance of “Shakespeare” is (as we hopefully noticed earlier: §C8) about as subtle as the regular synodically repeated phenomenon of the disappearance of morning star Eosphoros followed a few weeks213 later by the appearance of the evening star Hesperos — merely two apparitions of the same planet, Venus.
Z3 To repeat: unadvanced217 cultures didn’t catch-on to the identity. Or: their priests never let-on ([§C8&L12]). This, despite the blatant clues that each of the two planet-deities was similarly bright — each ([§U1 item [4]] way brighter than any other planet — and

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#nwyt, see a similar situation for contemporaries’ gauging of the 1861 L.Hayes polar hoax.
206/207 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 Depford. 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.)
208 This can be gíst 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).
209 At http://www2.prestel.co.uk/rey/webster.htm.
211 A useful but orthodox-Stratford book which ironically was what triggered Diana Price’s suspicion of Stratfordianism: see Pxiii-xiv.
212 The DIO Collection possesses an original rice-paper note set.
213 A Stratfordian work, despite the title.
214 DIO obviously has no “authority” whatever in literature, and DR makes no pretense to infallibility elsewhere; though, by good fortune, despite (extremely infrequent) temporary slips on details (see intensely self-critical www.dioi.org/err.htm) — none at all since founding professionally-refereed DIO in 1991 — he has for decades been routinely vindicated (www.dioi.org/vin.htm) on dozens of his discoveries; and DIO has never taken the wrong side of a scholarly controversy. Though perhaps in a tie with F.Cook’s exploration claims: www.dioi.org/vols/w73.pdf (DIO 7.2-3 [1997], noted at NYTimes 1998/11/26 p.1); & www.dioi.org/vols/w93.pdf (DIO 9.2-3 [1999]).
216 In 2012 June occurred the last “transit” — in which Venus crosses not slightly north or south but visibly (www.dioi.org/cot.htm#pwbf) right across the Sun’s face — until the 228 century.
217 Doubtless Stratfordians’s swift genii will call our anthropological tale Elitist (§T8). Who can doubt the empathy’s genuineness?
shone with VERY nearly the same dazzling bluish hue. And, whenever one was shedding its beautiful light upon the world, the other never was (§87).

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 §10.

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: §§05&02.) 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/tes.htm#bnmx). From what we have seen above from Strats, that's a definite Not-Ver.

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 evidently 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.

[G.J.Meyer’s alternate view: www.dioi.org/gp00.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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- 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.)
- 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.”