Hypothetical Earlier Dating for *The Passionate Pilgrim* and *First Folio*

W. Ron Hess

Did part or all of Shakespeare's *The Passionate Pilgrim* (*TPP*) actually predate 1593 *Venus & Adonis* (*V&A*) and 1594 *Rape of Lucrece* (*RofL*)? Oddly enough, that may be the case, because the sole extant copy of its first edition has no title page, thus no date. Copies of its second edition do have a title page and are clearly dated 1599, plus a 1612 augmented project was marked "third edition". Thus, it should be significant that some of *TPP*'s poetry have been found in manuscript or early publications back to the early 1590s, and in one case perhaps as early as 1585. But *TPP* may be a relic of a much larger anthology of poetry which possibly existed in manuscript circa 1589-94, was revised circa 1610-12 to accompany an intended publication of all of Shakespeare's works (poetry and drama), but was not fully published until nearly three decades later. It is also notable that the 1640 anthology attributed to Shakespeare contained *TPP* plus lengthy poetic paraphrases from Ovid in much the same mold as *V&A* and *RofL*. Moreover, the 1640 anthology may hold a key to radically earlier dating of the 1623 *First Folio* (*FI*). We will briefly delve into the murky world of the Elizabethan publishing world of the 1580s and beyond, wherein the 17th Earl of Oxford's former servant, Anthony Munday, may have had an important role in the disposition of each "Shake-speare" work.

Keywords: Shakespeare, *Passionate Pilgrim*, *First Folio*, 1640 Poems, Thomas Heywood, William Jaggard, Leonard Digges, Anthony Munday

Introduction

In 1612 Thomas Heywood appeared to complain about a transgression by the printer William Jaggard, and even apologize to William Shakespeare, for Jaggard's printing under Shakespeare's name two Heywood poems earlier printed by Jaggard. This of course causes problems for those who believe that Shakespeare was retired or otherwise not in the London literary scene by 1612. Is there a resolution? One may be found through careful re-examination of the dating of 1599 *The Passionate Pilgrim* (*TPP*), in recognition that the sole extant copy of the first edition is undated, or glibly declared to be "by-1599", when the present author argues it may have been published as early as 1589-94. Redating the Q1 of *TPP* also allows a redating of the project to prepare what became the 1623 *First Folio* (*FI*). This is based on association of the contents of *TPP* with the 1640 *Poems by Mr. Will Shake-speare*, which had within it what may be a continuation of Leonard Digges'

W. Ron Hess, CISSP, BA History, MS Computer Sciences; Retired Civil Servant and former Adjunct Professor in IT Security at Johns Hopkins University Graduate Extension Center, Gaithersburg, MD. URL: <http://home.earthlink.net/~beornshall/index.html/>. E-mail: BEORNsHall@earthlink.net.

dedicatory poem from *FI*, providing clues to when the poem, and hence the *FI* project itself, was likely originated. All this requires us to have our minds creatively attuned to the facts available, as opposed to “received opinion”.

Opening Game, up to 1599

Shakespeare’s *The Passionate Pilgrim* (*TPP*, generally dated at “by 1599”) has had a long and twisted road from “origination” of its parts to inclusion (or exclusion) in the Bard’s canon. Before we begin tracing its poems, each of which may have had earlier dates than did *TPP* as a whole, note that many orthodox scholars doubt Shakespeare wrote much of it at all (the Online Lit Site¹ has *TPP*’s text, saying other poets in *TPP* include “Richard Barnfield, Bartholemew Griffin, Christopher Marlowe, and Sir Walter Raleigh”). In fact, besides five poems found in other works attributed to Shakespeare, and despite the fact that all of *TPP* was attributed to him on its title page (which they feel was a “piracy”), some doubt any other *TPP* poems were by him, often putting them in “Various Poems” or “Sonnets to Sundry Notes of Music”. As Greenblatt’s *Norton Shakespeare* (1997) opined:

Modern editions of the complete works routinely exclude many of [his “Various Poems”]—in most instances wrongly, it seems... Ironically, the major exceptions are the poems from *The Passionate Pilgrim* (1599), some or all twenty of which are often included, presumably on the strength of the original publisher’s assertion of Shakespeare’s authorship. Nonetheless, Shakespeare is likely to have written only the five pieces in that collection that are lifted from his other works (the sonnets and *Love’s Labour’s Lost*). At least four poems in the collection are clearly [??] by other writers. Among the other eleven, which remain anonymous..., numbers 4, 6, and 9—all sonnets—are noteworthy for their focus on the theme of *Venus and Adonis*, to which they may be a response. (p. 1,991)

Frankly, this author joins Chiljan’s (2012) appraisal about *TPP*: “...that these poems were written by Shakespeare, just as [Wm. Jaggard’s 2nd] edition implies... The evidence that four poems were written by other writers is also dubious” (p. 74, 80). It makes little sense for orthodox scholars to attribute to “unknown” 10 or 11 of the 20 *TPP* poems just because they arbitrarily suspect three or four poems were not by Shakespeare due to instances of them in other anthologies, and then use that pretext to degrade most of the rest!

The numbering of *TPP* varies from one modern collection to another. So, we can construct our own Table 1 by using the chart from the Wikipedia’s *TPP* site², adding this author’s hypothetical “Hess’ Dates(?)” and “Dating Notes” for each, plus a bottom-line hypothetical to be discussed later. For purposes of this article, the “Hess’ dates (?)” in Table 1 are less concerned with the date that a given poem first appeared in publication than with when it was likely to have been circulating in manuscript (MS), and then when it was available for Jaggard to have “borrowed” the assembled MSS as his printing career began circa 1591-94 (not counting any printing he may have done even earlier, in his apprenticeship).

¹ Retrieved from www.online-literature.com/shakespeare/333/.

² Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Passionate_Pilgrim.

Table 1

The Passionate Pilgrim (TPP, “by 1599” O1, 1599 O2) “by W. Shakespeare”**Redated to c. 1589-94** (This Author’s Hypothesis of an Aborted Project of TPP + Other Poetry)

TPP #	Hess’ dates(?)	Dating notes	Orthodox now attribute it to	First line begins
1	1586-94	A]	Shakesp. (<i>SON</i> 138)	“When my love swears that...”
2	1586-94	A]	Shakesp. (<i>SON</i> 144)	“Two loves I have, of...”
3	1594<	B]	Shakesp. (<i>LLL</i> IViii)	“Did not the heavenly...”
4	1594*	C] D]	>> Unknown	“Sweet Cytherea, sitting...”
5	1594<	B]	Shakesp. (<i>LLL</i> IVii)	“If love make me forsworn...”
6	1594*	C] D]	>> Unknown	“Scarce had the sun dried...”
7	1594*	C]	>> Unknown	“Fair is my love, but not...”
8	1589-98	E]	Rich. Barnfield	“If music and sweet poetry...”
9	1594*	C] D]	>> Unknown	“Fair was the morn when...”
10	1594*	C] F]	>> Unknown	“Sweet rose, fair flower...”
11	1590-96	E]	Barthol. Griffin	“Venus with young Adonis...”
12	1593	E]	>> “Th. Deloney?”	“Crabbed age and youth...”
13	1594*	C]	>> Unknown	“Beauty is but a vain and...”
14	1594*	C] G]	>> Unknown	“Good-night, good rest...”
15	1594-95	G] H]	>> Unknown	“It was a lordling’s daughter...”
16	1594<	B] G]	Shakesp. (<i>LLL</i> IViii)	“On a day (alack the day)”
17	1590-97	G]	>> Unknown	“My flockes feed not, my...”
18	1585-90	G] I]	>> Unknown	“When as my eyes hath...”
19	1589-93	G] J]	Chris. Marlowe & Walter Raleigh	“Live with me and be my...”
20	1594-98	E] G]	Rich. Barnfield	“As it fell upon a day”

Notes. The bracketted bold letters are “Dating note” symbols corresponding to the “Dating notes” which immediately follow. For example, the “1594*” items are explained in note # C] below. Each poem is explained by one or more “Dating note(s)”.

Dating Notes:

A] Hess’ 2007 article shows that of Sh’s 1609 *Sonnets* the only reasonably “datable” were #107, #123, and #124, dated at 1586-89 from analysis of Prof. Leslie Hotson in his 1937 book (pp. 4-32), and #119 datable to the 1570s from analysis in the late Robert Brazil’s 2000 self-published book (p. 40). Thus, this author dates TPP #1 (=Sonnet #138) and #2 (= Sonnet #144) to at latest 1586-94, although leaving these high-numbered sonnets at “by-1599” still makes it clear that the great bulk of Shakespeare’s sonnets were written prior to 1600 (and even the supposition that the Sh. 1609 *Sonnets* were in an order intended by Sh. himself can be challenged, as this author has done in his Oct 2004 article, pp. 1-7).

B] The 3 poems from *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (*LLL*) are #3 (= “Longaville’s” sonnet in IV iii), #5 (= “Sir Nathaniel’s” sonnet in IVii), and #16 (or *Sundry* #2, = “Dumain’s” 18-liner in IViii). *LLL* is dated by orthodox scholars as already in performance 1594-95, first in print 1598, with “W. Shakespeare” on its title page (the first Sh. play not anonymous!), and among the 12 plays noted by Meres in Sept. 1598. This author’s Vol. II, pp. 214-15 dates *LLL*’s “origination” to 1574-76, with revisions 1578-83, 88, & 98. Thus, the 3 poems dated by this author to “1594<” at latest, are based on the performance datings for *LLL*; but this author’s published datings for “origination” of *LLL* could easily place those poems to c. 1583 or earlier. Note that this author’s concept of “origination” covers periods of writing, revising, private circulation, performance or recitation in private venues,

and other activities prior to first public performance or publication. The orthodox approach of only using the latter two as evidence ignores the culture and habits of upperclass English society of that time, when poorly documented palace, salon, Blackfriars, and other private entertainments were far more important drivers of art than they are today.

C] The 7 anonymous poems (among 11 that Chiljan calls “orphan poems”, pp. 74-75) that this author dates as “1594^{*}”, were related in subject or form to Sh’s 1593 V&A, and may be earlier (as any MS of V&A likely was before its publication!).

D] Chiljan (75, from Rollins, 278) noted that #4, #6, & #9 each had links to Sh’s *Taming of the Shrew* (TOS), where the setting in #4 & #9 “puts Cytherea (Venus) and Adonis in a setting very similar” to the painting of Venus & Adonis described in TOS (Induction ii.43-47). Thus, note this author’s Vol. II, pp. 217-19 dates TOS’ “origination” to 1575-76, with revisions 1578-82 & 94. Chiljan continued by stating that #6 “presents perhaps the best claim to Sh’s authorship on the grounds of vocabulary, subject matter and imagery...” (p. 75, from C.H. Hobday’s 1973 “Sh’s Venus and Adonis Sonnets”, *Sh. Survey* 26, pp. 103-99).

E] Dating rationale are given in the text below for #8, #11, & #12 based on their publication in prior anthologies; but note that the editors or publishers of anthologies did not necessarily write each and every poem in their anthologies (or none, as with John Bodenham), and these may still have been “originated” earlier by Sh!

F] Chiljan (75, from Rollins, 296) notes that #10 “resembles Sh’s *Sonnet* #54” (“If the dull substance of my flesh were thought”), for which see my note A] above dating at 1586-94.

G] *TPP* was originally unnumbered, and in the extant copy at the Folger library of “by 1599” *TPP* Q1, #14 was only 2 stanzas, skipping to today’s #16. In 1599 *TPP* Q2, #14 was 5 stanzas followed by a separate title page of “Sonnets to sundry notes of Musicke”, then #15 and onward (still unnumbered). So, many systems make it #14 & #15, adding 1 to each higher #, as in the system used here from the Wiki chart. Chiljan (75, from Rollins, 296) notes that *TPP* #14 “echoes *Romeo and Juliet* [R&J] (III.v.43-47)”. For which note that this author’s Vol. II, pp. 252-55 dates R&J “origination” to 1578-83, with revisions 1591-95 & 97.

H] Some Oxfordians see #15 as an apt description of Oxford’s Vere family, with his 3 daughters. The eldest (or “fairest”?), Elizabeth Vere, wed at Court in Jan 1594/5 to William Stanley (W.S.), who had recently become 6th Earl of Derby, which may also have been occasion for a performance of Sh’s *Midsummer Nights Dreame*. Yet, the Jan. 1594/5 wedding had been postponed for nearly a year pending birth of W.S.’ niece (if she had been a he, W.S. would not have inherited his late brother’s earldom, remaining “a Knight”). There was an earlier romance going back to their meeting at a royal visitation at Elvinden in 1591; so #15 could date years earlier.

I] About #18, more is given below and Wiki says, “Three versions of the poem exist in manuscript miscellanies”, giving no details, though this author has noted a 1585-90 version, and another may be Folger MS 2071.7, a circa-1650 handwritten commonplace. Chiljan (75-76) suggests that #18 “mirrors Canto 47 in *Willobie His Avis* ([WHA] 1594), a satire that was pointedly directed at Sh. and the Earl of Southampton”. This mirroring is also discussed in John Roe’s e-book article. This author mostly agrees, but his website Article #14 denies that WHA’s “Mr. H.W.” = Henry Wriothesley (3rd Earl of Southampton), largely on grounds that “H.W.” was defined in WHA as an Italianate Spaniard who slowly pined away and died for unrequited love by the end, and that all of the suitors of “Avisa” were from the 1550s to 70s, not from the 1590s. These and other points better match the 1574-78 suit for Q. Elizabeth’s hand by the heroic half-brother of Spain’s Philip II, Don Juan of Austria (d. 1578),

and thus dates *WHA*'s "origination" to circa 1579-83, when the marriage contract of "the Frenchman" (= Duc d'Anjou-Alençon) with Q. Elizabeth was in force. In *WHA*, "the Frenchman" was apparently alive at the end—thus, another clue is that after departing England in 1583, the syphalitic Anjou-Alençon famously died in 1584, leaving his Protestant cousin Henri de Navarre as heir presumptive to the throne of France, and precipitating continuance of their half century of religion-based Civil Wars. The end result, apparently overlooked by all prior analysts to this author, was that *WHA* dated its own "origination" to after Don Juan's death in 1578 and before Anjou-Alençon's death in 1584.

JJ Raleigh's small part of #19 may date later (more on Raleigh below), but Marlowe's 1593 death delimits his much larger part. Of course, this assumes that later attributions to the two (vs. to Sh.) have merit, which this author greatly doubts.

Let's begin our chronology with the 1580s, and a manuscript (MS) at the Folger Library ("Cornwallis-Lyons MS" Folger MSS 1.112) described by the late Ruth Lloyd Miller in 1975 (369-94). In 1588, the 17th Earl of Oxford sold his "Fisher's Folly" estate (just outside of London's Bishopsgate) to his friend and distant relative Sir William Cornwallis. Along with the estate went Oxford's servant, the exquisite poet of Latin & English, Thomas Watson, who had dedicated his 1582 *Hekatompathia* to Oxford. Watson lived there until his death in 1592, serving as tutor to the Cornwallis children, possibly including Anne. She was born c.1575 in Scotland, after 1610 was the Catholic 2nd wife of the 7th Earl of Argyll (or Argyle), was later a reputed author herself, died 1635, and a print of her is available from the National Portrait Gallery, London³.

Whether via Watson, via her cousin the future Sir George Buc (Miller, 392-93, from 1608 to 22 he was Master of the Revels with censorship authority, but in 1582 he had contributed a dedicatory poem to Watson's *Hekatompathia*), or via her father in accessing Oxford's circle, Anne had an acquaintance with poets' MS works which were in private circulation in the mid-to-late 1580s. We can tell as much from her leather-bound 19-leaves "Common-place Book" (i.e., a scrapbook of MS poems) with her name on the owner's signature page and the spine's title "*Poems by Vere Earl of Oxford & c.*" Miller (p. 371) noted that in the mid-1800s, J.O. Halliway-Phillips had owned the MS and dated its contents to before 1590. Of its 33 poems, 16 had open names or initials attributed (thus, 17 were anonymous), 2 were by Sir Philip Sidney (died 1586), 2 by Oxford's ex-mistress of 1580-81, Anne Vavasour (mother of his natural son), 7 by John Bentley (died 1585, an actor in the Oxford's Men troupe), and 2 were openly attributed to Oxford himself ("Were I a King" and "When I was Fair and Young"). Not all scholars agree with every attribution made in the MS; still, we've seen here that dating the whole MS to circa 1585-90 is objectively not difficult.

Two of the Cornwallis MSS poems have been attributed to Sir Walter Raleigh, which merits comment. In the early-to-mid 1580s, the now-famous Raleigh was rising rapidly, even to the point that he was able in 1583 to facilitate Oxford's return to Court (the latter had been banished after the March 1581 ill-favored birth of his natural son by Anne Vavasour in the Queen's own chambers at Court). But in the 1570s, Raleigh had begun as a retainer or hanger-on to Oxford (Peck, 428), even to the point of apparently conveying a letter on Oxford's behalf dated Nov 27, 1574 to Cornwall (this author's Vol. II, pp. 63-70). The often reviled John Aubrey's late-1690s

³ Retrieved from www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw134590/Anne-Cornwallis-Countess-of-Argyll.

MSS *Brief Lives* depicted Raleigh as Oxford's second in a duel (Brown, 255), and Oxford was known to have been wounded in a 1581 duel with Sir Thomas Vavasour (Anne's uncle); Aubrey also claimed that Raleigh was in a poetry group including Oxford, his cousins Francis & Horatio Vere, Ben Jonson, and others (256). Thus, finding Raleigh's poetry amidst Oxford's circle is not surprising, pushing back into the 1580s the one *TPP* poem (#19) credited partly to Raleigh.

The most striking poem in the Cornwallis MS (among the 17 with no name attributions) was this one beginning/ending:

"When that thine eye hath chose the dame/... To heare her secrets thus bewrayede".

In the later *TPP* a very similar version (*TPP* #18) of that poem read:

"When as thine eie hath chose the dame,/... To hear her secrets so bewray'd".

Chiljan (75) says in her opinion the MS is the better version. Regardless, we can conclude that at least some of *TPP* existed as early as 1585-90, and as with much of the dating that we do here, it may have existed and been in private circulation even earlier. Rather than Shakespeare "stealing" poems from others, they much more likely stole from him (we'll see in 1612, T. Heywood feared the appearance of having stolen from Shakespeare)!

Before we leave the Cornwallis MS, although it was never published, it still constituted an anthology of poems. So, why is it that modern scholars fail to apply to it the same standard that they do to other *TPP* poems from early anthologies? Why do they not credit *TPP* #18 to the collector/editor of that MS, as they do for Barnfield or Deloney? For example, in certain collections of 1600, they do not credit poems to the collector, John Bodenham. So, why do so for Barnfield or Deloney unless orthodox scholars are desperate to avoid having the poems credited to Oxford-Shakespeare? One possible answer is that the downgrading in orthodox estimation of *TPP* seems to parallel the rise of Oxfordianism (the first Oxfordian book was in 1920).

Next in our cavalcade, note that *TPP* #8 makes mention of composer John Dowland (1563-1626) and "Spencer" (i.e., Edmund Spenser, 1552?-99), reading in part:

...Because thou lov'st the one, and I the other./ Dowland to thee is dear, whose heavenly touch/ Upon the lute doth ravish human sense;/ Spencer to me, whose deep conceit is such,/ As passing all conceit, needs no defence... (Sh's *TPP* # 8)

Obviously, this poem was "originated" prior to Spenser's death in 1599 (though his *Shepherd's Calendar* had made him famous since the early-1580s), thus at least pre-dating *TPP*'s 1599 2nd edition. The poem is now attributed to Richard Barnfield on the strength of its inclusion in his 1598 *The Encomion of Lady Pecunia*, in its appended "*Poems in Divers Humors*" (along with *TPP*'s #20). But the allusion to "Dowland" may provide us with a much earlier dating, because he was little known until in circa 1594-95 his "Lachrimae" (= "Flow My Tears") was made public and rapidly became the most popular song in the Jacobean era. Part of the reason for its popularity was that it was dedicated by Dowland to the young wife of King James VI of Scotland, Anne of Denmark. The Danish Court was so pleased with it that Dowland was hired as their Court Composer and music tutor to the royal children, and he was essentially in Denmark for most of the next decade. But, when did Dowland really write and dedicate it, since it could have remained in private circulation for years before it became public, yet certainly available to Oxford's circle? A beginning date would be 1589, when James sailed to Norway and Denmark to wed his bride. Thus, a "1589 to early-1590s" dating for *TPP* #8 should apply!

Before we leave Barnsfield's 1598 *Lady Pecunia* (printed by John Jaggard, older brother of the more famous printer William Jaggard), note that its appendix also contained one of the earliest poetic tributes to Shakespeare, in the context that he was worthy of comparison with the immortal fame shared by Edmond Spenser, Samuel Daniel, and Michael Drayton. This author includes it here because it hasn't been much noted in Oxfordian literature. One might say it wasn't quite as "immortall" as its topic:

A Remembrance Of Some English Poets (from 1598 & 1605 *Lady Pecunia*)

Live Spenser ever, in thy Fairy Queene:
Whose like (for deepe Conceit) was never seene.
Crownd mayst thou bee, unto thy more renowe,
(As King of Poets) with a Lawrell Crowne.

And Daniell, praised for thy sweet-chast Verse:
Whose Fame is grav'd on Rosamonds blacke Herse.
Still mayst thou live: and still be honored,
For that rare Worke, The White Rose and the Red.

And Drayton, whose wel-written Tragedies,
And sweete Epistles, soare thy fame to skies.
Thy learned Name, is aequall with the rest;
Whose stately Numbers are so well adress.

And Shakespeare thou, whose hony-flowing Vaine,
(Pleasing the World) thy Praises doth obtaine.
Whose Venus, and whose Lucrece (sweete, and chaste)
Thy Name in fames immortall Booke have plac't.
Live ever you, at least in Fame live ever:
Well may the Bodye dye, but Fame dies never.

(from 1598 & 1605 *Lady Pecunia*, as included in the Spenserians website⁴)

The 1605 2nd edition of *Pecunia* (printed by Wm. Jaggard and James Roberts) omitted the appendix with *TPP* #8 & #20, but still included this "Remembrance" poem. Wouldn't Jaggard and Roberts, both printers of Shakespeare-related books, have known that by 1605 at least one of "Remembrance's" immortals was dead? Note that it addresses all four poets (each alive in 1598) as if they were already dead, but immortal through the greatness of their poetry. As such, it invites comparison to the "ever-living poet" used in the dedication to 1609 *Sonnets*, where "ever" and "never" may be notable too. But it seems plausible that the omission of Watson (d. 1592) and Marlowe (d. 1593) as 5th and 6th honorees is a clue to c. 1594 as an earlier date for preparation of Barnfield's *Pecunia* project. Q. Elizabeth had named Spenser as her "Poet Laureate" (= "king of poets") in circa 1593, based on his 1591 *Fairie Queene*. Watson and Marlowe had died, but were still revered; thus, the "Remembrance" might be recognition that England had lost great poets in the unmentioned Watson and Marlowe, but those surviving four still deserved praise for taking up the slack! Nevertheless, this does diminish some of the force of the Oxfordian argument that "Ever-living Poet" in 1609 *Sonnets* meant that the Bard was dead at that time, since some of the honorees in this poem were alive even in 1605, though extorted to "live ever".

⁴ Retrieved from <http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=32914>.

Proceeding onward, the Wikipedia entry for *TPP* lists the first lines for each of the 20 (or 21) poems and who those are attributed to, in many cases from earlier publications with attributions to other men. A number of the *TPP* poems were first published earlier than 1598, including these two:

#17 1597 in Thomas Weelkes' *Madrigals to 3, 4, 5 and 6 Voices*.

#11 1596 in Bartholomew Griffin's (?) *Fidessa* (On the theme of Venus and Adonis, as is Shakespeare's 1593 V&A poem).

But the one most intriguing may be #12 ("Crabbed age and youth"). It has been doubtfully attributed to Thomas Deloney on the strength of it appearing in his *The Garden of Good Will* (*GGW*). But that was entered in the Stationer's Register (S.R.) in March 5, 1592/3 (i.e., before the calendar year change on March 25 of our modern 1593, because the official year was reckoned from the holiday celebrating the annunciation of Mary's pregnancy, or "Lady Day", each year, or nine months before the birth of Jesus). This author examined relevant titles in the English Short Title Index (ESTC) and Early English Books Online (EEBO), finding that *GGW* contained *TPP* #12 in all extant editions, the earliest extant being 1628. The Wiki entry states:

Deloney died in 1600; he might be the author of 12, though collections of his verse issued after his death contain poems by other authors. Critic Hallett Smith [in 1974 *The Riverside Sh.*, pg. 1,787] has identified poem 12 as the one most often favoured by readers as possibly Shakespearean—"but there is nothing to support the attribution". (See the Wikipedia entry for *TPP*)

The S.R. entry date for *GGW* was over a month before Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* (V&A) was entered. The practice at the time was for the printer or publisher to come before the Wardens with a copy of whatever was to be published, to allow inspection before official authorization of the project, and then entry into the S.R. Presumably, #12 would have been in what was presented in March 1592/3. And thus, this date plus others pre-1593 above enable us to date some component poems of *TPP* to before V&A was published.

Now we get to the greatest dating problem about *TTP*: we do not really have a date for *TTP*'s 1st edition Octavo (8to, where each page was half the size of a Quarto page, or a quarter size of a Folio page; see Adams-1939 for a facsimile of the entire O1)! As stated in this article's Abstract and Introduction, the sole extant copy is 11 sheaves at the Folger Library, lacking the title-page, and thus lacking a date. And because there's no record of it ever being entered in the S.R. for the "by-1599" 8to 1 or 1599 8to 2, the presumption is that it was "unauthorized" (meaning put together without permission of the authors involved) or even "pirated" (meaning the printer-publishers did not have ownership of the project, technically illegal). In fact, we do not even know for sure that *TTP* 8to 1 was attributed to Shakespeare on its title-page like 1599 8to 2 was. Scholars have confirmed that 8to 1 was in a different setting, but printed with the same type that was used for 8to 2 by Wm. Jaggard (Adams, iv; might W.J. have used his brother John's type?). But Jaggard's career as a printer-publisher had begun in late 1591 when he was freed of his eight years of apprenticeship under Henry Denham. He may have been a journeyman under Denham or in his brother's shop. He might have even been under John Charlewood (whose business Jaggard would eventually buy), and then by 1594 he was already active in the trade (Plomer et al., 1910, pp. 151-153).

In his studies of the Elizabethan publishing industry, this author has even found isolated examples of apprentices or journeymen printing or publishing projects before starting their own businesses (e.g., the two 1590 eds. of the *Travels* of Edw. Webbe were each printed by teams of apprentices-journeymen; and Anthony Munday

was listed as “publisher” in dedications to at least two 1580s works, while he had apparently never completed his 1576-84 apprenticeship to printer John Allde). And many journeymen for practical economic reasons found themselves no longer welcome in the shops they had apprenticed in. As a matter of survival they either went elsewhere or simply disappeared into the underground (as it appears Wm. Jaggard did 1591-1605!). One can use the ESTC or EEBO to trace printers’ or publishers’ careers, and it is not unusual to find them dropping out of history, not entering projects into the S.R. for example, only to reemerge a decade or more later as full-fledged operators (e.g., Anthony Munday’s kinsman and fellow printer’s apprentice William Hall disappeared from 1584 until the early 1600s, when he re-emerged as largely a printer of religious tracts and perhaps a shady dealer in publishing projects, likely including the “pirated” 1609 *Sonnets by William Shake-speare*, where he seems to have been the “Mr. W. H. ALL” of the *Sonnets* dedication). How did these men survive in their dark years? This author’s opinion is that a good many of them likely found work with “pirate printers”, with secret presses, or executing projects during curfew hours (Sundays, holidays, after dark, etc.). Munday’s career is checkered with projects which use his many pseudonyms, often hint at hiding secrets, in many cases appear to have been type-set separately by Munday and whatever crews he might assemble, then brought to his printer and publisher friends for illicit publication, etc. And Munday’s relationship with nearly all of the Shakespeare-related printers and publishers makes it appear, as discussed in this author’s Vol. II, pp. 480-495, as a prime suspect for “the Publishing Shepherd of ‘the Shakespeare Enterprise’”.

In fact, many journeymen printers never became Master Printers, because technically only 25 Master Printers were allowed to own and operate presses at any time (though, some of the 25 owned multiple presses and shops!). And periodically there would be purges of “pirate presses”, as in June 1599 when the Archbishop issued a list of printers to be punished (some of them Shakespeare-related) and works to be burned (e.g., 1594 & 98 *Willobie His Avisa*)! Ironically, one of the men whose official tasks included arresting pirate printers was Oxford’s former servant, Anthony Munday, who had circa 1586-1604 been granted the office of “Messenger at Her Majesties Chamber”. On that note, we may rhetorically ask, who better to guard the henhouse than the great fox himself? Although Munday was officially a Draper (a guild allied to the Stationers), this author believes he was a secret (thus illegal) printer-publisher from 1577 to 1633, and during his first 15 years he was a de facto partner with printer John Charlewood (by this author’s count from ESTC and EEBO, about 1/2 of Munday’s projects went to Charlewood’s shops, and about 1/4 of Charlewood’s inventory was Munday projects)!

Table 1 hypothesized existence of a circa 1589-94 aborted project to publish *TPP* and other poetry by Shakespeare. We know that Shakespeare’s *V&A* and *RofL* were being prepared, and his *Sonnets*, or a good many of them, were being circulated, as Meres alluded to in 1598 *Palladis Tamia* (Halliday, 1952, p. 12):

...so the sweete wittie soule of *Ovid* lives in mellifluous & hony-tongued *Shakespeare*, witness his *Venus* and *Adonis*, his *Lucrece*, his sugred *Sonnets* among his private friends, &c.

Presumably some of the rest of Shakespeare’s canon poetry was similarly in the air. And as we know, Jaggard (or whoever published *TPP* 8to 1) somehow got hold of 5 genuine Shakespeare works, including 2 of the sonnets. So, why should we assume that *TPP* was a lonely anthology, when there were likely so many other poems Shakespeare may have intended to be published in c. 1589-94, or at least were circulating among his friends?

For point of argument, let's assume that our hypothesized project did exist c. 1589-94. Why would it have been aborted rather than published? As always, one can suggest many reasons. But this author's favorite theory is that Munday's virtual partnership with Charlewood was intended to produce said project in circa 1593-94. If so, all the MSS were gathered and in Charlewood's hands, and all that remained was for Munday's team to block and set the print, and deliver it to Charlewood for the above mentioned illegal but profitable curfew printing. And then the unforeseen happened when Charlewood died in Feb 1592/3. His widow tried to keep the business going for nearly a year, and then she wed James Roberts, who saved the business, and was to later be a major printer of Shakespeare works, until he was bought out piece-by-piece by Wm. Jaggard in 1605-08. Jaggard's last purchase from Roberts in 1615 was transference of the franchise's monopoly for printing playbills (first acquired by Charlewood in 1587, the monopoly went through Roberts, Jaggard, on to the Cotes brothers, all the way to 1583, and gave the franchise obvious advantages in getting prime opportunities to print plays as well).

In that interregnum after Charlewood's death, what became of the hypothetical Shakespeare MSS and preset type blocks? We can only guess based on when they emerged and under which stationers. But if the project existed, its components appear to have been scattered to the winds circa 1593-94, emerging over time in scattered projects. And what would our hypothesized project have contained? Likely it would have been much of the same content, in much the same format, as was used for the material attributed to Shakespeare in the 1640 *Poems*, which we will discuss in the third part to this article, "End Game, up to 1640". Still, this author believes *V&A* and *RofL* were originally also intended to be in it (in this article's second part, "Middle Game, up to 1612", we discuss nine Ovid-based poems similar to *V&A*, and above we noted 10 authorship "unknown" *TPP* poems that were redolent of *V&A*). Of course, in c. 1593 there were likely fewer than 154 of the sonnets, because Shakespeare did not cease to write sonnets and other poetry after 1593. But we'll see there may have been a good reason why specifically 146 of the eventual 154 sonnets were likely in the project. And of course, much that Shakespeare wrote before 1604 may have been lost forever. As noted in this author's Oct. 2004 article, John Benson, the publisher of 1640 *Poems Written by Wil. Shake-speare, Gent.*, stated this in his letter to the Reader:

...some excellent and sweetely/composed Poems, of Master/*William Shakespeare*/Which in themselves ap-/peare of the same purity, **the Authour him-/selfe then living avouched**; they had not the/fortune by reason of their Infancie in his/death, to have the due accomodatio[n] of propor-/tionable glory, with the rest of his everliving/Workes, yet the lines of themselves will afford/you a more authentick approbation than my as-/surance any way can, to invite your allowance,///in your perusall **you shall finde them *Seren*,/cleere and eligantly plaine**, such gentle/ straines as shall recreate and not perplexe your/braine, **no intricate or cloudy stuffe to puzzell/intellect**, but perfect eloquence; such as will/raise your admiration to his praise... [Bold emphasis mine] (Hess, 2004, p. 1)

Considering that 1640 *Poems* contained 146 of Shakespeare's notoriously mysterious sonnets, plus enigmatic *A Lover's Complaint* among other puzzling poetry, the "seren [serene], cleere, and eligantly plaine" assertion is itself puzzling, to be sure. There seems no other way to interpret Benson's affirmation of Shakespeare's "avouching" for the poems in the 1640 project than that they devolved from a project existing prior to Shakespeare's death (i.e., pre-1604) and that the 1640 format and content was largely what the Bard had directly intended. And so, in the 1590s the meanings of most of the sonnets and other poems would have been less unclear to the general public. What re-emerged in 1640 *Poems* apparently was a "snapshot" of much of the content and format of that corpus which existed pre-1600!

Back to our dating of *TPP* 8to 1 into the early 1590s, let's just say that William Jaggard could have printed that project as an apprentice or journeyman under either Denham or Charlewood as far back as the late-1580s; or under his brother John from 1594; but certainly not in his own printing shop, which he did not acquire until 1605. Thus, Table 1 dated *TPP* 8to 1 to circa 1589-94, and if true it becomes more likely that Shakespeare wrote nearly all of *TPP*; or at least more doubtful that Deloney, Barnfield, etc. wrote any of it!

Qualitatively, there are excellent poems in *TPP*, nearly all of them comparable to Shakespeare's other poetry (see Hess' 1998 article for a proposed automated system capable of proving this point). So, orthodoxy has this choice: a) accept that Shakespeare wrote all of *TPP*, except for any of the poems that can be definitively proved otherwise; b) choose to believe that the other men had somehow obtained Shakespeare's poetry for their collections and did not give him credit as it was used; c) choose to believe that Shakespeare "stole" earlier works by others, passing them off as his own; or d) choose to believe that Wm. Jaggard was a "pirate printer-publisher" producing *TPP* without proper authorization, despite his illustrious career after 1611 as appointee of the Bishop of London in the post of Official Printer to the City of London. This author has chosen to believe choices a) and b), and hold that the burden of evidence is upon orthodox scholars to prove contrary authorship. Thus far, what passes among them for "proof" hardly dignifies the concept.

One "proof" that they assert, and we'll see that they believe they have the evidence to prove it, was that Shakespeare was noted as living in the London area in 1609-12, when the 17th Earl of Oxford was only a memory. We shall next study the matter, which is a critical problem for Oxfordians.

Middle Game, up to 1612

Our history of *TPP* reaches a pivotal point for the Oxfordian cause, because the 1612 3rd ed. of *TPP* presents an opportunity for orthodox scholars to affirm that a printed note in another 1612 work claimed Shakespeare was still available to be consulted by a poet-playwright in the London vicinity. Yet, the language was not clear, allowing for multiple counter-interpretations. Here is a standard orthodox recitation of the facts:

[*TPP*] (1599) is an anthology of 20 poems that were attributed to "W. Shakespeare" on the title page, only five of which are accepted by present-day scholars as authentically Shakespearean. [*TPP*] was published by William Jaggard, later the publisher of Shakespeare's *First Folio*. The first edition survives only in a single fragmentary copy; its date cannot be fixed with certainty since its title page is missing, though many scholars judge it likely to be from 1599, the year the second edition appeared with the attribution to Shakespeare. The title page of this second edition states that the book is to be sold by stationer William Leake; Leake had obtained the rights to Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* in 1596 and published five octavo editions of that poem (the third edition through the eighth) in the 1599-1602 period. **Jaggard issued an expanded edition of [*TPP*] in 1612, containing an additional nine poems—though all nine [sic, see note] were by Thomas Heywood, from his *Troia Britannica*, which Jaggard had published in 1609. Heywood protested the piracy in his *Apology for Actors* (1612), writing that Shakespeare was "much offended" with Jaggard for making "so bold with his name". Jaggard withdrew the attribution to Shakespeare from unsold copies of the 1612 edition.** All the early editions of [*TPP*] are in octavo format. They were carelessly printed with many errors, in contrast to the carefully-printed early editions of *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*... (bold emphasis mine)⁵

Note that of the 9 additions to 1612 *TPP* 3rd ed., Heywood actually complained about only *Paris to Helen* (in 1609 *Troia* Canto IX) and *Helen to Paris* (*Troia* Canto X), which were verse translations/paraphrases from

⁵ Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Susanne_van_Soldt_Manuscript.

Ovid, together longer than all of *TPP* put together. Seven shorter additions to 1612 *TPP* were not mentioned by Heywood (and were **not** in 1609 *Troia*), so may as well still be works of Shakespeare: **A)** *Menelaus-1*, **B)** *Menelaus-2*, **C)** *Cephalus & Procris*, **D)** *Mars & Venus*, **E)** *How the Mynotaure was Begot*, **F)** *The Laborinth of Dedalaus*, and **G)** *Achilles in the Court of Lycomedes*. Oddly, there appears to be no serious analysis of the shorter 7 poems, despite the unrelated 1595 *Cephalus & Procris* by Thomas Edwards having been the earliest poem to likely allude to Shakespeare as a nobleman (Stritmatter-2007, 1 & 18). All 9 were repeated in 1640 *Poems by Will Shake-speare Gent.*, and this author has often suggested in Oxfordian circles that with 1593 *V&A* they are bridges between Shakespeare and 1565-67 *Ovid's Metamorphosis* as translated by Oxford's uncle, Arthur Golding, while living with Oxford in the mansion of William Cecil, future Lord Burghley.

Also note that the last sentence of the cited text ("They were carelessly printed...") essentially says that Shakespeare had authorized *V&A* and *RofL*, because they each bore his signed dedication to a patron, plus they were relatively error-free—in contrast to unauthorized, error prone *TPP* (a verdict true for the 1609 *Sonnets* project as well!). From the facts presented above, a careful reader should sense that Heywood's 1612 complaint is a highly complex issue, where orthodox scholars can get key parts wrong. Certainly Oxfordians can be perplexed by "Heywood's complaint". Here is this author's 2006 article's discussion of this issue, which in turn cited from Downs (1993, pp. 18-35):

So, did Heywood really know "Will Shake-speare" and who the real author of the works credited to that name was? Apparently he did, for as said in [Hess' article's] short bio for [Heywood], several of Heywood's poems had been improperly put into the 1612 edition of *Passionate Pilgrim* and thereby credited to W.S., which Heywood in his 1612 *Apology for Actors* then protested. The error was likely made by the important W.S.-related printer Wm. Jaggard (printer of W.S.'s 1599 *Passionate Pilgrim*, 1619 "Pavier Quartos" of ten plays attributed to W.S., and of the 1623 *FL* of W.S.'s authentic plays). The orthodox view is that Heywood's 1612 complaint about Jaggard's mischief ended with a statement that he was satisfied about W.S.'s honesty in the matter (Halliday, 356). Yet, curiously, Heywood further stated that "I must acknowledge my lines not worthy his patronage" (see Downs, 19). So, did Heywood claim "Shake-speare" was a patron?

Gerald Downs' 1993 article thoroughly analyzed Heywood's 1612 complaint, opining that Heywood's "not worthy his patronage" had greater meaning (28), and that Heywood meant:

My lines do not deserve to be published in association with the name of William Shakespeare... I find it offensive that the originator of this corrupt volume, William Shakspere, took credit for the contents as if he were really the poet Shakespeare (34).

This neatly brushed aside Mr. Shakspere as author, even if he bore the name of and could be confused with "Shake-speare". Though Mr. Shakspere was alive in 1612, he was a pale shade for the "real" W.S., who was likely dead if we read Heywood's description very carefully. (bold emphasis mine) (Hess, 2006, pp. 21-27)

Katherine Chiljan paraphrased Heywood's 1612 complaint as the following, transferring the "his patronage" over to the Earl of Worcester (patron of Heywood's 1609 *Troia*) instead of to Shakespeare. Her's is an innovative argument, borne up excellently by the evidence, saying Heywood meant this:

Jaggard published *The Passionate Pilgrim* in Shakespeare's name without his knowledge, and I know that Shakespeare was much offended with Jaggard for presuming to make so bold with his name. Contrast this with another book published by Jaggard, my *Troia Britanica*: in the preface, I made bold with the Earl of Worcester's name by dedicating the work to him. While I acknowledge the work was unworthy of the Earl of Worcester, the dedication was made with his knowledge, because Jaggard printed it under Worcester's patronage. Jaggard is dishonest. (Chiljan, 2012, p. 77)

Chiljan's equation of "his patronage" with the Earl of Worcester is all the more important, because from circa 1598 to 1603 and beyond, the Oxford's Men had "amalgamated" with Worcester's Men and were acting at the Blue Boar Inn in Aldgate, just north of the Tower and outside of the London City wall. It was a matter discussed in a 1602 Privy Council order allowing the combined troupes to continue their trade despite attacks from the Puritans of the London City Council. In 1603-12 the combination became "Queen Anne's Men". Even better, Heywood was one of the combination's actors and playwrights to 1604 (Halliday, 225-26, 535-36), which meant he likely knew Oxford as one of the combination's two patrons!

Downs and Chiljan have offered valuable insights, but this author confesses to not being altogether happy with our Oxfordian interpretations, although they are better than orthodox views. To begin, the reader should examine the full wording used by Heywood in the last 2 pages of his 1612 *Apology* (my underlines, bracketted notes, and slight modernizations):

To my approued good Friend, Mr. Nicholas Okes.

THE infinite faults escaped in my booke of *Britaines Troy*, by the negligence of the Printer [A], as the misquotations, mistaking of sillables, misplacing halfe lines, coining of strange and never heard of words. These being without number, when I would have taken a particular account of the *Errata*, the Printer answered me, hee would not publish his owne disworkemanship, but rather let his owne fault lye upon the necke of the Author [B]: and being fearefull that others of his quality [C], had been of the same nature, and condition, and finding you [D] on the contrary, so carefull, and industrious, so serious and laborious to doe the Author all the rights of the presse, I could not choose but gratulate your honest indeavours with this short remembrance. Here likewise, I must necessarily insert [E] a manifest injury done me in that worke, [F] by taking the two Epistles of *Paris* to *Helen*, and *Helen* to *Paris*, and printing them in a lesse volume, under the name of another [G], which may put the world in opinion I might steale them from him; and hee to doe himselfe right, hath since published them in his owne name [H]: but as I must acknowledge my lines not worthy his patronage [I], under whom he hath publisht them, [J] so the Author [K] I know much offended with M. *Jaggard* (that altogether unknowne to him) presumed to make so bold with his name [L]. These, and the like dishonesties [M] I know you to bee cleere of; and I could wish but to bee the happy Author of so worthy a worke as I could willingly commit to your care and workmanship.

Yours ever, Thomas Heywood.

(From EEBO STC-13309-890_05, 1612 *Apology for Actors*, images 32 & 33 of 33)

Notes: **A]** Wm. Jaggard was "the Printer" of both 1609 *Troia* and 1612 *TPP*, although this author theorizes that for *Troia* it may have been that N. Okes was among Jaggard's assistants; note that Heywood explicitly took credit for authorship "in my booke" of *Troia*, though not necessarily for the two *Paris-Helen* poems. **B]** Was "the Author" Heywood or some other? **C]** Were the "others of his quality" printers; if so who? **D]** The "you" was Okes, addressee of this complaint. **E]** Apparently, "necessarily insert" signaled an insertion into an earlier-prepared complaint! **F]** Was "that work" 1609 *Troia*, 1612 *TPP*, or some other? **G]** "Under the name of another" appeared to allude to Shakespeare or to Heywood himself, depending on whether or not Heywood actually wrote the two *Paris-Helen* poems; note he did not explicitly claim authorship of the two poems, in contrast to the book they first appeared in, 1609 *Troia*! **H]** Was "his owne name" Shakespeare's name or Jaggard's? **I]** Was this Worcester's "patronage" or Shakespeare's? Note that if Oxford was "the real Shakespeare", then as co-patrons of the amalgamated troupe of actors, both Oxford-Sh. and Worcester were patrons of Heywood, a playwright for the troupe, in the late 1590s to 1604! **J]** Was "publisht them" alluding to Jaggard, Shakespeare, or Worcester, and who specifically were "them?" **K]** Was "the Author" Shakespeare or some other? **L]** Was "his name"

Shakespeare's name or Worcester's (dedicatee of 1609 *Troia*), and precisely how was the name abused? Could it be that "Shake-speare", the true author, was abusing Mr. Shakspeare's name, or vice versa? M] "Dishonesties" of Jaggard, or maybe a sly poke at Okes too? Could "dishonesties" have encompassed the use of a pseudonym in this matter?

To begin our discussion, that complaint was placed at the very end of 1612 *Apology*, as if a hastily inserted afterthought. Note that N. Okes was printer of Heywood's 1612 *Apology* and had been at the very beginning of his career when the 1609 *Troia Britanica* printing project was done (*Troia* was entered in the Stationer's Registry [S.R.] Dec 5, 1608). By 1609, Jaggard's purchase of nearly all of Roberts' printing business had proven very successful, running multiple presses, and so it is unlikely that he or Roberts would have personally set the type and overseen the *Troia* project in much detail. So, it is worth considering that Okes or others in Okes' later crew may have been on the team assisting Jaggard-Roberts to print *Troia*. If so, Heywood's 1612 address to his "good Friend" would have been in part a chiding of Okes for his crew's part in the 1609 *Troia* sloppy print job. Think about it—it was most unlikely that Jaggard (by then one of England's most busy printers) micromanaged the typesetting done in 1609 (by Okes?). So, how much blame should Okes have borne, what opportunity did Heywood have in 1609 to provide "fair copy" before the expense of printing had already been made, and was Jaggard really wrong to have not wished to execute a lengthy belated errata (which, from Heywood's description, appears to have been pages long)? We're not really told, only getting Heywood's side of the ranting story. This author's hunch is that Okes' agreement to insert this complaint into 1612 *Apology* was less intended to embarrass Jaggard than it was Okes' effort to mollify Heywood for Okes' own 1609 errors—for which Heywood himself may have been partly to blame! Or, from *Hamlet's* Queen, both Heywood and Okes "doth protest too much, methinks!"

Next, Heywood's 1612 *Apology* (never entered into the S.R., and thus technically published illegally) is thought to have been written in circa 1608—the book was in fact a plea for respect for public adult troupes, who had lost income and preferment to boys troupes 1600-1608, after which the Second Blackfriars Theater was taken over by the King's Men, ending the chief venue for boys troupes (Halliday, 65-66, which notes investors in Blackfriars enabling this transfer included Richard Burbage, Mr. Shakspeare, Heminge, Condell, and others). Of course, the boys' later ascendancy had begun 1583-84 when the 17th Oxford and his secretary John Lyly consolidated the Chapel and Paules Boys, leased the First Blackfriars, and Lyly ran the operation as a venue for featuring his Court Plays, before Blackfriars was closed until 1600-08. Indeed, 1612 *Apology* was a continuation of an ongoing "Puritans vs. the Stage" controversy that had begun in Stephen Gosson's 1579 *School of Abuse* (a satirical attack on plays and actors), then responded to by Thomas Lodge's quickly suppressed pamphlet, c. 1582 *A Defence of Poetry, Music, and Stage-plays*. Heywood's early career had largely been a tribute to Shakespeare, such as his 1608 play *The Rape of Lucrece* (entered into the S.R. June 3, 1608), which was obviously inspired by 1594 *Lucrece* (RofL). Similarly, Heywood is thought by many to be author of the anonymous 1605 play *Edward the fourth*, which fits in between Shakespeare's *Henry VI* Pt. 1 and *Richard III*, overlapping *Henry VI* 2 & 3. Might *Apology* have been "originated" before 1599? If so, the complaint at the end of it may have originally been intended to refer to a much earlier work than 1609 *Troia*, but was hastily reworked in 1612 to insert the later grudge against Jaggard.

As with other pillars of their dysfunctional mythology, such as 1592 *Groatsworth of Wit* (see Hess' Sum. 2004 article), orthodox scholars pretend that everything in Heywood's complaint was absolutely clear, with no possible variant interpretations. But, from the many notes/queries above for Heywood's complaint, it becomes clear that he roved all over the place, using "the Author" at times for himself, and at times for (presumably) Shakespeare; "his patronage" was ambiguous; and "the Printer" was jumbled as well. Chiljan's epiphany about the "patronage" allusion being to the Earl of Worcester clears up some of the confusion. But the greatest confusion was delivered when Heywood expanded his complaint near its middle with the words, "I must necessarily insert..." signaling that a more recent modification was inserted into an older complaint, one possibly originated many years earlier. And it was in that later insert that Heywood discussed the two *Paris-Helen* poems, which orthodox scholars believe first appeared in 1609 *Troia*. **But, had the two poems really debuted in 1609?**

Suppose that *Paris to Helen* and *Helen to Paris* had appeared earlier than in 1609 *Troia*, or that the core of Heywood's complaint is really that the two poems credited to his book were actually originally unpublished works by Shakespeare, that Heywood feared being accused of plagiarizing from Shakespeare? That's a paradigm orthodox scholars seem to be oblivious to, and if you read the complaint with such a paradigm in mind, you'll be surprised that its text makes at least as much sense as the interpretations that the orthodox favor. But, even better, let's hypothesize that the two were (now non-extant) additions to the "by-1599" 1st ed. of *TPP*. After all, the sole extant copy of *TPP* 1st ed. at the Folger (part of "the Burton Collection") now has only 11 sheeves, and may have originally had far more material than was in the 1599 2nd ed. It would certainly give Heywood's complaint an entirely different reading, and the reference to "the Author I know much offended with M. Jaggard" would date back to "by 1599" (which Table 1 suggested should be "c.1589-94" based on dating rationale for each poem in it). Changing the dating paradigm makes a great difference!

As a result of the original "by-1599" complaint, and implied pressure by Shakespeare (i.e., Oxford) on Jaggard, the *TPP* 1st ed. would have been suppressed, thus explaining why there is only one partial copy left today. Note that in the 1590s Jaggard was a newly-begun printer-publisher, in a much weaker position than he would be in 1609-12. So, as we can see from extant copies, the two offending poems would have been stripped out of the 1599 2nd ed.; but we also know that the poems would be added again in 1612. After all, from an Oxfordian perspective, in 1609 and 1612, Shakespeare had been long dead, and Jaggard (by then the Official Printer for London City) no longer needed to worry about pressure, least of all pressure from a mere actor-poet-playwright like Heywood! How else would one explain Jaggard's hubris in misusing Shakespeare's name, and hypothetically the Bard's poetry as well?

But what about the assertion, "Jaggard withdrew the attribution to Shakespeare from unsold copies of the 1612 edition?" First of all, it could mean that Jaggard did begin using Shakespeare's name on the title-page in 1612, but decided to remove it, thus leaving only "his" (i.e., Jaggard's) name on the title-page (i.e., the sequence taken for granted by orthodox scholars). The approach above can accept that, while the orthodox interpretation has to admit confusion in what Heywood said on this point. Still, this author's preferred interpretation, and change of paradigm, is that orthodox scholars have it backwards. Let's hypothesize that Jaggard began printing the 1612 *TPP* 3rd ed. with no author's name on the title-page, only Jaggard's as printer (i.e., the reverse order assumed by orthodox scholars). If so, after Heywood's brusque reminder of the "by 1599" *TPP* controversy, Jaggard did bend a little by making sure that Shakespeare's name was on the title-page for the rest of the printing.

And so that helps to explain the Heywood complaint puzzling line, “hee to doe himselfe right, hath since published them in his owne name”, which seems to be a garbled misidentification with two separate men as “he”. The “to doe himselfe right” = Jaggard realizing that the 1612 *TPP* would sell better with Shakespeare’s name on it (after all, the Bard wasn’t a “publisher”, but Jaggard was, and the action of the sentence’s subject was “to publish”). And yet, the “in his owne name” referred to Shakespeare. If you read the entire complaint again, you’ll find several lines which whipsaw the reader with similar misidentifications, which seem to be further indication that the complaint was written over several widely-spaced time periods, and then quickly and not very carefully cut and pasted together into the 1612 complaint.

Although conjectural, this new slant on *TPP* ties up so many loose ends for trying to interpret Heywood’s garbled 1612 complaint, while avoiding the **1st conundrum** for Oxfordians of Shakespeare being alive in 1609-12, at that time taking offense with Jaggard. It also avoids the **2nd conundrum** (for both Oxfordians and the orthodox) of neither lowly Mr. Shakspeare nor lowly Heywood having any real leverage over the by-1609 wildly successful and powerful Jaggard (the very linch-pin to the orthodox interpretation). And it avoids the **3rd conundrum** of Jaggard continuing to have legal ownership of *TPP* and its 1612 additions, such that in 1627 the rights were passed on quite legally by his son’s estate, along with rights to most of the rest of Shakespeare’s poetry and plays, to the Cotes brothers, later appearing in their 1640 *Poems* project. Obviously, some accommodation had been reached early on which gave Jaggard those rights, or he wouldn’t have exercised them in 1612 nor been able to pass them on. Let’s assume that Oxford-Shakespeare had forced Jaggard to remove the additions for the 1599 *TPP* 2nd ed., private permission for which was granted on condition that the additions not be used again during Oxford’s lifetime, thus explaining the apparent suppression of the “by-1599” *TPP* 1st ed.! Why the condition? Perhaps Oxford had circulated the additions among his friends too widely—so that allowing their publication under “Shakespeare” violated “the Stigma of Print” (Hess, 2011, pp. 23-26).

Rather than to blithely ignore the three conundrums about *TPP* and Heywood’s 1612 complaint, we need to find ways to deal with them. And so a “by-1599” much earlier dating for all of the 11 poems that were (re)added to *TPP* in 1612 helps in that regard. In particular, it allows for Oxford-Shakespeare to have authored all of the 11 poems prior to 1604, possibly back to the 1590s. But that would be at least back in the era of c.1598-1604, when Oxford’s Men and Worcester’s Men were “amalgamated” and acting at the “Boar’s Head Inn” in Aldgate, with actor-poet-playwright Thomas Heywood writing plays for them to perform!

Here’s a question that likely nobody has thought to ask: Why did Jaggard choose 1612 for printing the 3rd ed. of *TPP*? Again the answer is conjectural, but evidence arose 11 years later with the “sacred” 1623 *FI*, as well as some 28 years later when *TPP* next appeared, which we will discuss in our third part to this article.

End Game, up to 1640

Before we proceed to the next occurrence of *TPP*, we need to discuss a few oddities in the 1623 *FI*, which was a remarkably large, complex, and variable project where no two extant copies are exactly the same. In it were 12 pages of dedicatory front material, including a Table of Contents and a List of Principle Actors, before the first page of *The Tempest* was featured. A strange anomaly occurred in many of the *FI* copies (e.g., Greenblatt, 1997, pp. 3345-3357; Kokeritz, 1955, material between xxix & 1.2.6). In those copies, between the Contents Table and the Actors List lay the last page of dedicatory poems. Even stranger, although all the dedicatory poems other than

the anomaly consistently avoided any hyphenation of the name “Shakespeare”, both the poems in the anomaly page contained gratuitous hyphenations of “Shake-speare” (3 in the 1st poem, 2 in the 2nd). It was as if ALL occurrences of the Bard’s name had been hyphenated until some late-minute decision to excise the naughty hyphens, with that one page overlooked in the scramble to avoid what might have signaled a “made-up name” or pseudonym!

Stranger yet, in the anomalous page both poets had older relatives who had reasonably been familiar with the 17th Earl of Oxford. The 8 lines 2nd poem (“To the memorie of M. W.*Shake-speare*”) was signed “I.M.”. The I.M. poem occurred again in 1632 F2, alongside of an “I.M.S.” poem (“The friendly admirer of his Endowments, I.M.S.”), which itself reoccurred in a 1645 anthology by the poet John Milton Jr., of 1667 *Paradise Lost* fame. His father, John Milton Sr., had been a forester in Oxfordshire, a composer-poet himself, had moved to London in 1583 to become a Scrivener, and until 1620 had been a Trustee for Blackfriars Theater. Thus, note that 1583-84 Oxford had leased the Blackfriars Theater and turned its operation over to his secretary, John Lyly. But J.Milton Jr. was an unpublished 15 year old in 1623, still barely heard from in 1632. Thus, this author believes “I.M.” was really the senior Milton (or my second choice, John Marston [1575?-1634], who was linked even closer to Oxford’s circle of poet-playwrights), and there is little doubt that “I.M.S.” was Milton Jr.’s identifier, both in 1632 and 45.

The 1st dedicatory poem (22 lines, “To The Memories of the deceased Authour Maister W. Shakespeare”) is notable for containing the principle link between *F1* and a “Stratford” location (“And Time dissolves thy Stratford Moniment”). This didn’t necessarily point to the man of Stratford-upon-Avon, because “Stratford” merely meant “river ford”, and there are multiples of that name. Indeed, Oxford’s 1592-1604 Hackney residence was just three miles upstream on the River Bowe from the most prominent “Stratford” of all, the greater-London suburb of “Stratford-on-Bowe”. An e-mail to this author from Jean Holmes in the U.K. said that her late husband left a box of notes (now donated to Brunel University), among which was reference to a dove cote and other buildings in Stratford-on-Bowe owned by Oxford (the town was on the Thames, en route to Oxford’s Essex estates). We should look for more evidence of these matters.

The 1st poem was signed by “L. Digges”, or Leonard Digges II (1588-1635), the mathematician-astrologer, who “may” have been at Oxford U. with a John Mabbe (the orthodox favorite for “I.M.”). Digges’ grandfather, L.Digges I (c.1515-59) was an engineer credited with inventing a refracting telescope. He had the misfortune to join the Wyatt Rebellion against “Bloody Mary” in 1554 and was heavily fined (where Wyatt’s father had been a close friend to the uncle of the 17th Oxford, the poet Earl of Surrey). The connection of course was the father of L.Digges II, Thomas Digges (c.1546-95), a friend of Dr. John Dee (who was an astrologer known to Oxford and patronized by his Stanley in-laws). He was another scientist, whose works 1571 *Pantometria*, 1573 *Aleu seu scalae mathematica*, 1576 *A Perfit Description*, and 1579 *Stratiticos* are said to have influenced the Bard’s *Hamlet* and general knowledge of the sky (Usher, 2001, p. 29; Hotson, 1937, pp. 118-21).

The anomaly’s two poems (complete with the naughty hyphens) were included in the 1632 *Second Folio* (F2), which was a generally faithful reproduction from *F1*, but there they were moved to before the Actors List, and a number of new dedicatory poems were added between the List and the Contents Table.

Eight years later we reconnect with *TPP* in the 1640 *Poems: Written by Wil. Shake-speare, Gent.*, which included the entire contents of 1612 *TPP* 3rd ed., albeit broken up among a scattered arrangement of other poetry,

including 146 of the 154 poems that had been featured in 1609 *Shake-speare's Sonnets* (followed by the falacious "*Never before Imprinted*", since *TPP* 1st & 2nd eds. had featured several of them). It is notable that Thomas Heywood was still very much active in 1640, with three of his projects published in 1641, the year of his death: a) *The life of Merlin.*, b) *Machiavel, as he lately appeared to his deare sons.*, and c) *A preparative to study: or the vertue of sack.* So, it is reasonable to ask why Heywood failed to complain about his two poems from 1609 *Troia* being included under the name of "Shake-speare" in 1640? Because, as Hess' 2006 article noted (pp. 24-27), Heywood did take a particular interest in "Will Shake-speare", as listed twice in his 1635 *The hierachie of the blessed angells*, depicting the name as among his catalog of 15 English authors who had been collaborators, imitators, fronts, or even pseudonyms, often used by noble authors who hid their identities, as compared to his catalog of 10 ancient Roman authors notable for similar suspicions!

And in Hess' 2004 and 2007 articles, was discussed the possibility that an early project had existed for publishing all of Shakespeare's poetry, which was likely laid out closer to the "scattered" format of 1640 *Poems* than to the formats of its predecessor poetry editions. Indeed, those articles noted that it may be possible the number of 146 sonnets was not merely coincidence with the 146 sonnets included along with longer poems in the 1573 & 83 *Diane Sonnets* by Filipe Desportes, the French Poet Laureate from 1576 to 1604. We don't have room for discussing *Poems* or *Diane* further here, except that Hess' forthcoming Volume III to *The Dark Side of Shakespeare* will feature a translation of all 146 *Diane Sonnets*, which are not one-for-one matches for any of the Bard's sonnets, but rather the two cycles contain similar themes, characters, and poetic devices. So, it seems that the progenitor for 1640 *Poems* was meant to be a patriotic English "one-upping" of the earlier *Diane* cycle—to demonstrate that the best that the French could dish up would be bested by England's greatest poet-playwright!

Continuing our discussion here, let's note that 1640 *Poems* led off with the publisher, John Benson, giving a two-page Letter to the Reader, followed immediately by a new three-page 68 lines dedicatory poem by Leonard Digges II ("Upon Master William Shakespeare, the *Deceased Author, and his POEMS*"). And we should note that by 1640, most of the dedication writers were dead (e.g., L.Digges II had died in 1635, and Jonson in 1637). This author suggests that L.Digges II's 1640 dedication and his 1623 dedication had at one time been a single poem intended to be a dedication to a combined project of nearly all of Shakespeare's plays and poems, and that the two together actually date an approximate timeframe for that joint project. Here they are listed back-to-back:

TO THE MEMORIE/of the deceased Authour Maister/

W. SHAKESPEARE/

SHake-speare, at length thy pious fellowes give/
 The world thy Workes: thy Workes, by which, out-live/
 Thy Tombe, thy name must. when that stone is rent,
 And Time dissolves thy *Stratford* Monument,
 Here we alive shall view thee still. This Booke,
 When Brasse and Marble fade, shall make thee looke/
 Fresh to all Ages: when Posteritie/
 Shall loath what's new, thinke all is prodegie/
 That is not *Shake-speares*; ev'ry Line, each Verse/
 Here shall revive, redeeme thee from thy Herse./
 Nor Fire, nor cankring Age, as *Naso* said,
 Of his, thy wit-fraught Booke shall once invade./

[A]

Nor shall I e're beleewe, or thinke thee dead/

(Though mist) untill our bankrout Stage be sped/

(Impossible) with some new straine t' out-do/

Passions of *Iuliet*, and her *Romeo*;/

[B] [1597]

Or till I heare a Scene more nobly take,/

Then when thy half-Sword parlying *Romans* spake./

Till these, till any of thy Volumes rest/

Shall with more fire, more feeling be exprest,/

Be sure, our *Shake-speare*, thou canst never dye/

But crown'd with Lawrell, live eternally./

[C]

L. Digges.//

(From Sh's 1623 *FI*, front material, position differs from copy to copy)

Upon Master William/ SHAKESPEARE, the/

Deceased Authour, and his/ POEMS.//

P Oets are borne not made, when I would prove/

[D]

This truth, the glad remembrance I must love/

Of never dying *Shakespeare*, who alone./

Is argument enough to make that one./

First, that he was a Poet none would doubt,/

That heard th' applause of what he sees set out/

Imprinted; where thou hast (I will not say)/

Reader his Workes for to contrive a Play:/

To him twas none) the patterne of all wit,/

Art without Art unpareld as yet./

Next Nature onely helpt him, for looke thorow/

This whole Booke, thou shalt find he doth not borrow./

One phrase from Greekes, nor Latines imitate./

[E]

Nor once from vulgar Languages Translate,/

Nor Plagiari- like from others gleane,/

Nor begges he from each witty friend a Scene/

To peece his Acts with, all that he doth write,///

Is pure his owne, plot, language exquisite,/

But oh! what praise more powerfull can we give/

The dead, then that by him the Kings men live,/

His Players, which should they but have shar'd the Fate,/

All else expir'd within the short Termes date;/

How could the Globe have prospered, since through want/

[F] [by-1613]

Of change, the Plaies and Poems had growne scant./

But happy Verse though shalt be sung, and heard,/

When hungry quills shall be such honour bard./

Then vanish upstart Writers to each Stage,/

You needy Poetasters of this Age,/

[G] [1602?]

Where *Shakespeare* liv'd or spake, Vermine forbear,/

Least with your froth you spot them, come not neere;/

But if you needs must write, if poverty/

So pinch, that otherwise you starve and die,/

On Gods name may the Bull or Cockpit have/ [H]
 You lame blancke Verse, to keepe you from the grave:/ [I]
 Or let ne Fortunes younger brethren see/ [J]
 What they can picke from your leane industry./
 I doe not wonder when you offer at /
 Blacke-Friers, that you suffer: tis the fate/ [K] [by-1608]
 Of richer veines, prime judgements that have far'd/
 The worse, with this deceased man compar'd./
 So have I seene, when *Cesar* would appeare,/
 An on the Stage at halfe-sword parley were,/
Brutus and *Cassius*: oh how the Audience,/ [L] [1602]
 Were ravish'd, with what wonder they went thence,/
 When some new day they would not brooke a line,/
 Of tedious (though well laboured) *Catilines*;/ [M] [1611]
Sejanus too was irkesome, they prix'de more/ [N] [1605]
 Honest *Iago*, or the jealous Moore./ [O] [1605]
 And though the Fox and subtill Alchemist,/// [P] [1607
 & 1610-12]

 Long intermitted could not quite be mist,/
 Though these have sham'd all the Ancients, and might raise,/
 Their Authours merit with a crowne of Bayes./ [Q]
 Yet these sometimes, even at a friends desire/
 Acted, have scarce defrai'd the Seacoale fire/
 And doore-keepers: when let but *Falstaffe* come,/
Hall, *Poines*, the rest you scarce shall have a roome/ [R] [1596-1601]
 All is so pester'd: let but *Beatrice*/
 And *Benedicke* be seene, loe in a trice/ [S] [1598-99]
 The Cockpit Galleries, Boxes, all are full/
 To heare *Malvoglio* that crosse garter'd Gull./ [T] [1601-02]
 Briefe, there is nothing in his wit fraught Booke,/
 Whose sound we would not heare, on whose worth looke/
 Like old coynd gold, whose lines in every page,/
 Shall pass true currant to succeeding age./
 But why doe I dead *Sheakespeares* praise recite,/
 Some second *Shakespeare* must of *Shakespeare* write;/
 For me tis needlesse, since an host of men,/
 Will pay to clap his praise, to free my Pen.// [U]
Leon. Digges:///

(From 1640 *Poems by Will. Shake-speare*, EEBO STC-22344-1156_05, images 3 & 4 of 97)

Notes to Leonard Digges II's two Poems:

A] Naso = Roman poet Ovid, famously translated by Oxford's uncle Arthur Golding 1565-67, while Oxford and his uncle both lived in the mansion of Wm. Cecil, future Lord Burghley. There is some indication of 2 styles used in the 1567 *Metamorphosis* translation, with some Oxfordians suggesting teenaged Oxford helped his uncle.

B] Sh's *Romeo and Juliet* (*R&J*) orthodox dated 1594-96; its "bad" Q1 was 1597, & "good" Q2 1598 (this was the first play ever to have Sh's name on its title-page, all earlier ones were anonymous); it was noted in Francis Meres' Sept. 1598 *Palladis Tamia* list of 6 Sh. comedies and 6 Sh. tragedies. Hess' Vol. II, pp. 298-99, dated "origination" to 1578-83, with significant revisions 1591-95 and 1597.

C] Although one play (by-1597 *R&J*) was mentioned in L.Digges II's dedication to the 1623 *FI* set of plays, there was a strangely greater emphasis on Sh's poetry. E.g., Laurel = Poet Laureate, and the earlier allusion to Naso/Ovid. Compare with Note U below.

D] L.Digges II's "POets are borne not made" from 1640 *Poems* may be a commentary on Ben Jonson's 1623 *FI* two dedications, which had lines like "For though the Poets matter, Nature be,/His Art doth give the fashion..." and "For a good Poet's made, as well as borne". This author suggests that L.D. II's thought on Poets was definite and terse, whereas Jonson's was a less definite amplification of L.Digges II's thought. In short, it makes more sense than the other way around that Jonson's 1623 commentary had seen, and reacted to, what later became L.Digges II's 1640 dedication!

E] The claim that Sh. hadn't imitated or translated is of course only affectation, since scholars are agreed that he imitated or adapted from many sources (as attested throughout Gillespie's 2001 book), a good number of which weren't translated into English in the Bard's lifetime. Orthodox scholars address this by positing that Sh. somehow accessed obscure MSS of translations that didn't get published until years later. We however have no problem, since Oxford was adept in all the important languages (Latin, French, Italian, possibly some Greek, Spanish, even Hebrew). This affectation (or gross deception?) is again amplified upon by Jonson's *FI* lines, such as "And though thou hadst small Latine, and lesse Greeke". Sh's prolific original coining from Latin, French and possibly other languages belies Jonson's claim on its face.

F] The Globe Theater was built in 1599 from timbers carted down from the 1576-1598 "Theater", burned in 1613 during a performance of Sh's *Henry VIII*, was rebuilt in 1614, and continued to 1644. Mr. Shakspeare of Stratford had part ownership of the pre-1613 Globe; moreover, he had an actor's share of the 1594-1603 Lord Chamberlain's Men and post-1603 King's Men troupes. And an Actor's List in Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio of his works included "William Shakspeare", as did the List in the 1623 *FI*. These are the chief pillars for orthodox beliefs that he was the source for the Sh. canon. Also, he had two nephews who were later actors in London, and a brother who is buried in London, and he owned a share in the Blackfriars gatehouse (not to be confused with the nearby theater). Other than these financial transactions and investments, little about Mr. Shakspeare supported him as other than a local Warwickshire money lender and real-estate investor (e.g., his Stratford properties, enclosing of public lands, disinheritance of his younger daughter, and petty law suits).

G] Possibly a sly allusion to Jonson's 1602 *Poetaster* play.

H] Allusions to two theaters, the Red Bull 1557-1625+ and Cockpit 1600-60+.

I] Christopher Marlowe (1564-May 30, 1593) was famous for use of his "mighty line" or Blank Verse, but that innovation was introduced c. 1545 by Sir Th. Wyatt and the Earl of Surrey (Oxford's poet uncle), the two who also introduced the "Shakespearean Sonnet Form" (with rhyme scheme abab cdcd efef gg).

J] Possibly a sly allusion to the Fortune Theater 1600-21.

K] Blackfriars Theater 1576-84, was leased by Oxford 1583-84 for his secretary John Lyly to run, with the combined boys' troupes acting, and Lyly presumably then writing the 8 court plays published under his name in the 1590s and later. Closed 1585-99, Blackfriars reopened 1600-08, where boy actors became so popular with the public that some professionals (like Heywood, in his 1612 *Apology*) complained about its debasement of their profession.

L] Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* had in it the characters "*Cesar*", *Cassius*, and *Brutus*. It is orthodox dated 1599-1600; it was 1st published in 1623 *FI*; and it was **not** noted by Francis Meres in 1598. Hess' Vol. II, pp. 283-84, dated "origination" to 1583-86, with significant revisions 1598-1602.

M] Allusion to Jonson's 1611 *Catiline* play.

N] Allusion to Jonson's 1605 *Sejanus* play.

O] Shakespeare's *Othello* had in it the villain "*Iago*" and eponymous "the jealous Moor". It is orthodox dated 1604-05, was 1st published in the 1622 "good" *Q1* (with many differences from its 1623 *FI* version) but performed at Court in 1604; and it was **not** noted by Francis Meres in 1598. Hess' Vol. II, pp. 272-77, dated "origination" to 1583-86, with significant revisions 1588-89 & 1597-1604.

P] Allusions to Jonson's plays 1607 *Volpone* (which means "Fox") and 1612 *Alchemist* (acted 1610).

Q] Authors wearing a "Crown of Bays" = Crown of Laurel = Poets Laureate, royal appointees. Edmund Spenser held the Laureate c. 1593-99, Samuel Daniel 1599-1619, Ben Jonson 1619-37, Sir William Davenant 1638-68, followed by John Dryden. Given that Shakespeare's 1593 *V&A* and 94 *RofL* were so wildly successful, and that Daniel's works to 1599 were comparatively derivative and less successful, we should wonder why orthodox scholars haven't seemed to be puzzled by the Bard not having been named Spenser's successor. For Oxfordians, the explanation is that her majesty knew that Shakespeare was merely a front for one of her nobles, and the "stigma of print" prohibited nobles to allow their poetry to be publicly associated with their names in their lifetimes. Thus, the Laureate passed only from commoner to commoner.

R] Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Pts. 1 & 2*, *Henry V*, and *Merry Wives of Windsor* all have *Falstaff*, the first 3 each have Prince Hal (or *Halle* = Henry V), and the first 2 have *Poins* (the popular characters of "Bardolph" and "Pistol" were omitted here). The two *H4*'s were alluded to as one play by Meres in 1598, but **not** the other two. The two *H4*'s are orthodox dated 1596-98, *H5* to 1598-99, and *MWW* to 1597-1601. Hess' Vol. II, pp. 298-99, dated *1H4* "origination" to 1578-83, with revisions 1595-97; *2H4* to 1578-83, revs. 1595-96 & 1604; *H5* to 1578-83, revs. 1586, 92, & 1599-1603; and *MWW* to 1576-77, revs. 1585, 93, & 97. There was an anonymous "bad" quarto or source of the first 3 published in 1598, *1H4* "good" *Q1* in 1598, good *Q2* 1599, *2H4* good *Q1* in 1600, *H5* bad *Q1* in 1600, bad *Q2* in 1602, *MWW* bad *Q1* in 1602, *1H4* good *Q3* in 1604, and other eds. (no "good" *H5* or *MWW*) to 1623 *FI*.

S] Shakespeare's *Much Ado* had *Beatrice* and *Benedick*. It is orthodox dated 1598-99; it had a "good" *Q1* in 1600, entered in the S.R. Aug. 23, the very first time Sh's name was noted in the S.R.; and it was **not** noted by Francis Meres in 1598. Hess' Vol. II, pp. 243-45, dated "origination" to 1577-78, with significant revisions 1580-83, & 87.

T] Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* had the character *Malvolio*. It is orthodox dated 1601-02; it was 1st published in the 1623 *FI*; and it was **not** noted by Francis Meres in 1598; it may have been performed at Court on Jan. 6 1601, but first certain performance was in 1618. Hess' Vol. II, pp. 225-27, dated "origination" to 1576-77, with significant revisions 1580-87 & 1600.

U] Although there was mention of "Bay" = Laurel = Poet Laureate in L.Digges II's dedication to 1640 *Poems*, there was a strangely greater, nearly total, emphasis on the plays of both Shakespeare and Ben Jonson. Compare with Note C above.

Therefore, what are we to make of our comparing, or joining together, the two Leonard Digges II poems from 1623 (& 32) with 1640? Here's a summary:

(1) Aside from the hyphenated "Shake-speare" used three times in the 1623 poem, and the shortness of its two stanzas, it seems to be a fairly good match for the 1640 poem, as if the two may have at one time been joined together as one poem.

(2) The 1623 poem was in a book of Shakespeare's plays, and yet its allusions were primarily to his poetry. Meanwhile, the reverse was true for the 1640 poem, where Ben Jonson's plays were given nearly equal billing to Shakespeare's, and next to no interest in Shakespeare's poems. This is another argument that the two poems were composed at the same time and intended to be united in a single grand project.

(3) The dates for the alluded-to Shakespeare plays were all in the 1590s or early 1600s. Thus, the best-focused dates come from those for the Ben Jonson plays. And those were datable from the early 1600s to at latest 1610-12.

(4) Since the orthodox claim is that Shakespeare wrote a few plays, mostly in collaboration, beyond 1612 (e.g., *Cardenio*, *Henry VIII*), and of course Ben Jonson's career went on to very near his death in 1637, it made no sense for Digges to stop allusions at 1610-12—UNLESS that was the timeframe in which or for which he authored the two poems!

So, the question remains, why did Digges hypothetically write the two poems circa 1610-12? Obviously, they had no purpose unless intended to be dedicatory introduction(s) to a grand project to publish nearly all of Shakespeare's available plays and poetry about that timeframe. But the project collapsed for some reason. And yet its collapse freed Jaggard to publish the 1612 *TPP* 3rd ed. This answers the question posed at the end of Part 2 above: Jaggard's 1612 *TPP* was a residue of a collapsed grand 1612 project for all of Shakespeare's works.

What might have made the project collapse? Of course there are many possible answers, most of them speculative, but here are a few suggestions:

(A) From an orthodox perspective, 1612 was when Mr. Shakspeare was preparing to retire from the London literary world and concentrate on petty suits, money lending, lands enclosure, disinheriting his daughter, and other assorted trivia in Warwickshire. But this model fails when compared to Ben Jonson's 1616 *Folio* of his own works, after which he toiled until his death in 1637. Then an enhanced edition of his *Folio* was issued in 1640 by the same stationer's team who would do 1640 *Poems*.

(B) From an Oxfordian perspective, 1612 was when Oxford's 2nd wife died, after which projects she had been urging may have fallen by the way, and manuscripts she may have held made their "scape". Also, this author has argued that Oxford had a "literary mentor" in Thomas Sackville (after 1599 Lord Treasurer and 1603 Earl of Dorset, see Hess, 2011). Sackville's death in 1608 may have suddenly put considerable burden on his son Robert and Oxford's widow to see that Shakespeare works were saved and published. Then Robert suddenly died in Feb 1609, three months before the "pirated" May 1609 *Sonnets* was published, leaving the grand project adrift. The key element of the "stigma of print", as originally propounded in Castiglioni's 1522 *The Courtier*, was that a courtier's poetry was not to be published in his/her lifetime, but collected and cherished by friends and relatives (this was the model of "the poet knight" exemplified by Oxford's poet uncle the Earl of Surrey and by Sir Philip Sidney, both of who were dead for years before their works were published). But, what happened if the courtier outlived those friends and relatives who had been entrusted with their works? That appears to have happened to

Sackville himself when he and his son died so closely together. And to some extent the death of Oxford's 2nd wife in 1612 may have undone his artistic legacy.

(C) From a patriotic perspective, Oxford's "Fighting Veres" cousins, Francis and Horace Vere seem to have welcomed English drama for entertaining their English anti-Spanish expeditionary forces 1585-1629. In 1604 Horace relieved the severely wounded Francis of overall command, and in August 1609 Horace succeeded Francis in the post of Governor of the key town of Brill after Francis had signed the "Twelve Years Truce", and days later Francis passed away. It may be that Francis had been urging the grand project, but interest flagged as other project complexities grew. Recall that John Aubrey would claim nearly a century later that the two Veres had been in a private poets group with Oxford, Raleigh, Jonson, and others.

(D) From a publishers-printers perspective, a complexity might have been unavailability of *Venus and Adonis*, *Rape of Lucrece*, and a good number of the plays, because they legally belonged to all the publishers or printers who had published them earlier. In 1623 *FI*, 17 of the 36 plays had never before been published, but the others were the property of a welter of printers and publishers, some of whom were "pirate publishers" to be sure, but others were willing to sue to defend their rights. Several may have been "holding out" for more than the printer-publisher was willing to pay (i.e., Jaggard, as Official Printer for London City). So, after a few years of trying, our grand project was cancelled, and Jaggard cut his losses by printing only 1612 TPP 3rd ed. instead. He may well have been fed up with all things Shakespearean just then, reflected in his alleged peevishness with Heywood.

(E) From a romantic perspective, it may be that the strongest reason for targeting 1612 was the sudden death in November of that year (likely from Typhoid) of Henry, Prince of Wales (b. 1594).

Henry was the great hope of the Protestants, who saw in him a Protestant [modeled on] Henry V, who would lead troops to the continent on a crusade against Catholic Spain. Others thought that a fertile time in the arts would take place at the court of the future King Harry.⁶

It may be that Prince Henry backed the "patriotic perspective" (C above), and that his death, and the mourning of same, killed the grand project!

(F) The curious placing of Jonson's plays on a nearly equal footing with the Bard's in the poem of 1640 may mean that Jonson was prominent in our hypothetical grand project of 1610-12. So, it may be relevant that Prince Henry was a patron of Jonson's, even acting Jan 1611 in Jonson's court masque *Oberon, the Fairy Prince*, apparently influenced by the Bard's "Oberon" in *A Midsummer's Night's Dreame* (orthodox 1595-96, noted by Meres in 1598, "good" Q1 1600). With Henry's death, Jonson may have lost interest in a grand folio project to eulogize Shakespeare. And so, he turned his talents to producing a Folio collection of his own works, which was published in 1616 (and 1640), only a few weeks after Mr. Shakspeare died. But by the early 1620s Jonson would again take a key role in the 1623 *FI* project, witnessed by his two dedicatory poems, each full of strange ambiguities which we've all puzzled over.

(G) Therefore, perhaps the strongest reason for a 1610-12 likely date for a hypothetical grand project of nearly all of Shakespeare's works was a combination of one or more of the above. In particular, all but A above compliment each other, and even A fits in well enough if Mr. Shakspeare was merely a "spokesman" or "front" for a group behind the hypothetical grand project. When his usefulness was ended, he was free to return to

⁶ Retrieved from Luminarium Site www.luminarium.org/encyclopedia/princehenry.htm.

Warwickshire and the trivia that really suited his talents and interests best!

Conclusion

With this we conclude our survey of the “significant history” of *The Passionate Pilgrim*. Though it has brought up more questions than it has answered, perhaps more conjecture than facts, it will have at least spurred more interest in this subject by future scholars. Because, if we fail to meet *TPP* forthrightly and head-on, we may fall victim to the rationalization that Heywood’s 1612 *Apology for Actors* seems to have testified that the Bard was alive and well in 1609-1612 (an orthodox position which you’ve seen rejected here as neither clear or factual). Heywood surely knew the 17th Earl of Oxford, since he acted and wrote for the Oxford’s-Worcester’s Men c. 1598-1604 (they became “Queen Anne’s Men” in 1604-12). And Heywood showed in his 1635 *Hierarchie of the blessed angells* that he knew “Will Shake-speare” for what he was—an imitator, a front, or even a pseudonym!

References

- Adams, J. Q. (1939). *The passionate pilgrim by William Shakespeare*. NY: Scribner’s.
- Brazil, R. S. (2000). *The true story of the Shakespeare publications*. Retrieved from <http://www.elizabethanauthors.com>
- Brown, J. B. (1949). *John Aubrey: Brief lives*. London: Penguin.
- Chiljan, K. (2012). Reclaiming the passionate pilgrim for Shakespeare. *The Oxfordian (TOX)*, 14, 74-81.
- Downs, G. E. (1993). A reconsideration of Heywood’s allusion to Shakespeare. *Elizabethan Review*, 1(2), 18-35.
- Gillespie, S. (2001). *Shakespeare’s books: A dictionary of Shakespeare’s sources*. London: Continuum.
- Greenblatt, S. (1997). *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford edition* (3rd ed.). NY: W.W. Norton & Co..
- Halliday, F. E. (1952). *A Shakespeare companion 1550-1950*. London: Gerald Duckworth Co..
- Hess, W. R. (1998). *Hotwiring the bard into cyberspace*. Retrieved from <http://www.shakespeare-oxford.com/?p=929>
- Hess, W. R. (2003). *Discussing Willobie His Avis*. Retrieved from <http://home.earthlink.net/~beornshall/index.html/id27.html>
- Hess, W. R. (2003). *The dark side of Shakespeare*. Lincoln, NE: Writers Club Press.
- Hess, W. R. (2004). *Update on Greene’s groats-worth*. Retrieved from http://shakespeare-oxford.com/wp-content/Oxfordian/SOSNL_2004_3.pdf
- Hess, W. R. (2004). *When Shakespeare “originated” his sonnets, did they have a “Euphues” meaning?*. Retrieved from <http://home.earthlink.net/~beornshall/index.html/id21.html>
- Hess, W. R. (2006). *Did Thomas Heywood List “Will Shake-Speare” as an imitator or front?*. *Shakespeare Matters*, 6(2), 21-27.
- Hess, W. R. (2007). Searching under the Lamp-posts for dating Sh’s sonnets. *Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter*, 43(2), 14-20.
- Hess, W. R. (2011). Did Thomas Sackville influence Shake-speare’s sonnets?. *DeVere Society Newsletter*, 18(1), 21-30.
- Heywood, T. (1612). *An apology for actors*. London: Sage.
- Hotson, L. (1937). *I. William Shakespeare: Do appoint Thomas Russel, Esquire...* Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press.
- Kokeritz, H., & Prouty, C. T. (1955). *Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies: A facsimile edition*. Oxford: Oxford U. Press.
- Lodge, T. (1582). *A defence of poetry, music, and stage-plays*. London: The Shakespeare Soc..
- Miller, R., & Looney, J. T. (1920). *Shakespeare identified in Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford* (3rd ed.). Jennings, LA: Minos Publ.
- Peck, D. C. (1978). Raleigh, Sidney, Oxford, & the Catholics, 1579. *Notes and Queries*, 25, 427-31.
- Plomer, H. R., Aldis, H. G., Bushnell, G. H., McC. Dix, E. R., Esdaile, A. E., & McKerrow, R. B. (1910). *Dictionaries of the printers and booksellers who where at work in England, Scotland and Ireland 1557-1775*. Ilkley, Yorkshire: Grove Press.
- Roe, J. (1991). *Willobie his avisa and the passionate pilgrim, precedence, parody, and development*. Retrieved from http://repository.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2433/135248/1/ebk00061_035.pdf
- Roe, J. (1992). *The poems: Venus and Adonis, The Rape of Lucrece, The phoenix and the turtle, the passionate pilgrim*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- Rollins, H. E. (1938). *A new variorum edition of Shakespeare: The poems* (Vol. 22). Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Stritmatter, R. (2007). Tilting under frieries... *Shakespeare Matters*, 6(2), 1-18.
- Usher, P. (2001). Advances in the Hamlet cosmic allegory. *The Oxfordian*, IV, 25-49.