its basic size and shape. The four ranges, their size and shape and that of the central courtyard, are almost the same, as are the entrances into the house, the location of the hall, and the path through the courtyard. The famous wall paintings and the giant columns came later. I get the feeling that the house as Smith first built it in 1557-59 was more of a temporary experiment in wood and brick foreshadowing what he would later solidify into the house he was probably already dreaming of building but hadn't the time or the money to realize fully.

Drury can't give us much description of the house as de Vere knew it, but there are some clues. He believes that Smith's library was located in a gallery on the ground floor in the northwest corner of the all-new west range (1.263), a narrow room (10' x 50'), probably lined with windows in the outer wall facing one with a fireplace and doors leading into other smaller rooms, in one of which a staircase led to the second floor, where I would imagine were bedrooms heated by the chimney. I would guess that this was the place where he instructed de Vere. If so, its location suggests that it would have been flooded with light on a sunny day in winter.

The kitchen, another site of interest to a small boy with an appetite, was located in the opposite or southeast corner of the quadrangle. Outbuildings to the northwest would have held the stables, brewhouse, and bakery. Gardens were located in several different places as were fishponds. Large plain tiles, glazed in brown, were found in several places on the ground floor.

The book is replete with illustrations, maps, and photographs of the house from many eras, schematics of the building's elevations during its many incarnations, and lists of the detritus found in waste pits, including pins and buttons, seeds of plants and bones of animals, evidence of the diet of Smith's household.

To visit Hill Hall, call English Heritage: 01799 522842 or e-mail **Linda.Dyer@english-heritage.org.uk**. Tours are on a Wednesday of your choice between April 1 and 30; charges and directions by car are available on the English Heritage website: **http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.12114**. It's also reachable by tube, the final stop at the north end of the Central line plus a short taxi ride. Copies of the book are available through Oxbowbooks.com and amazon.com.

S.H.H.

GET THIS ESSENTIAL BOOK

Richard Malim reviews

Peter R. Moore : ***The Lame Storyteller, Poor and Despised: Studies in Shakespeare***:
(editor: Gary Goldstein) - Verlag Uwe Laugwitz.
(introduction + 345 pages) :

The loss of Peter Moore, the American Scholar, at the early age of 57 in 2007 was bound, for Oxfordians, to be a savage blow to their cause. However another American sage has cleverly collected a body of his writings which has now been published. Now we can see the true extent of our loss as even more disastrous than we could imagine.

This book should form an essential part of every Oxfordian's library: many of its conclusions force 'orthodox' opinions into logically impossible distortions. Perhaps the first four essays on Sonnets 78 to 126 will prove the most important part of his legacy. Moore accepted that the first 126 Sonnets are set out in date order, and concentrated on this group, arguing that the 'rival poet' was the Earl of Essex and that the period covered by these Sonnets is that of his ascendancy over Southampton, his attempted putsch in 1601, the death of the Queen and the pardoning and restoration of Southampton. The bright light of Moore's intellect on the subject should outshine all other effort at dating and interpretation. Though I had read these essays when they first appeared in the *Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter* 1989 -90, to see them all in sequence together is not only a practical advantage for all scholars but a great delight as well.

In the middle section of essays is a large group on aspects of *Hamlet*, *Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Othello* and *Romeo and Juliet* with mention of others, which Moore managed to have published in orthodox literature by simply not mentioning Oxford: every Oxfordian will be able to bolt on Shakespeare's biography to use with these essays, whereas some of the difficulties of 'orthodox' biography are raised without solution – a clever opening of a fifth column of ideas within Fort Stratford. An essay taking up some 37 pages on the Chronology of the Plays appeared in an issue of the *Elizabethan Review* of 1997, with an effective denunciation of the methods of Chambers and his modern followers.

The last 140 pages are taken up with monographs and essays on specific Oxfordian questions published from 1988 to 2004. There are some splendid original nuggets. My favourite is the gloss on Fortunatus , Greene's illegitimate son, whom the writer of Groatsworth in the guise of the dying

Greene, entrusts to his legitimate wife, *'in whose face regard not the father so much as thine own perfections'*(a quotation which is omitted in the book), as if the bastard took after the legitimate wife.

Peter Moore wades into the stylistic argument and his review of Nelson's *Monstrous Adversary* is particularly damning and will please every Oxfordian, including Nina Green. Particularly witty and apposite is the verdict: 'Unfortunately Nelson the analyst relates to Nelson the researcher as Hyde relates to Jekyll – moreover Nelson's excessive denigration of Oxford carries him from error into fantasy.'

Gary Goldstein's deep care and attention as editor and Uwe Laugwitz's enthusiasm for the production and publishing of the project are some compensation for the loss of the diamond brain of Peter Moore.

R.M.

The Stella Cover-up

by Peter Moore

I am delighted to have obtained permission from Gary Goldstein to reproduce one of Peter Moore's shorter articles here in the Newsletter. I hope it will whet readers' appetites for the book, copies of which are available from Parapress (address on bottom of page 1), Ed.

If 'William Shakespeare' was, as many of us believe, the 17th Earl of Oxford, one implication seems inescapable: Oxford's comtemporaries - courtiers, writers and theatre people - must have maintained a remarkable conspiracy of silence. We can go further. The silence must have been maintained well into the next generation, long after Oxford was dead.

Lady Penelope Rich
(Lambeth Palace Library)

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

Yet anyone familiar with human history or modern American society knows that some things are not discussed in public, and that open conspiracies of silence are common events. The number of examples - political, military or social - that could be cited is endless. We might begin with the motto of the *New York Times*, 'All the News that's Fit to Print', which clearly implies that some news is not fit to print. American journalists have often suppressed what they knew about the sex lives of politicians they reported on - though we may well ask whether this amounts to a 'cover-up' or is simply a matter of respecting privacy. When issues of decorum are at stake, it can be misleading to think of suppression purely in terms of sinister 'conspiracies'. Thomas Bowdler became infamous for producing a censored edition of Shakespeare in 1807, but it was discovered in 1966 that Bowdler's sister Henrietta was really responsible for ridding the Bard of ribaldry. The motive behind the Bowdler cover-up was a simple matter of sexual modesty. If Henrietta admitted reading and understanding the bawdy parts of Shakespeare that she excised, then she could no longer be a decent woman, and so her physician brother pretended to be the editor. However, a cover-up far more relevant to the Shakespeare authorship question occurred in Elizabethan England, spread to the English colonies in America, and continued into the 20th century.

Saint Sidney,
early 17th-century
engraving:
Renold Elstrack

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

'Stella' was Penelope Devereux, Lady Rich. Various writers covertly but unmistakably alluded to this identity, but nobody directly said so in print until 1691, a full century after the sequence was published. What is interesting for our purpose is that the Stella cover-up (to call it that), involved the same society, the same mores and even the same