Anonymous (2011)

Rhys Ifans stars in “Anonymous,” directed by Roland Emmerich.

How Could a Commoner Write Such Great Plays?

By A. O. SCOTT
Published: October 27, 2011

“Anonymous,” a costume spectacle directed by Roland Emmerich, from a script by John Orloff, is a vulgar prank on the English literary tradition, a travesty of British history and a brutal insult to the human imagination. Apart from that, it’s not bad.
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First things first. The film’s premise is that the plays and poems commonly attributed to William Shakespeare are actually the work of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford. This notion, sometimes granted the unwarranted dignity of being called a theory, is hardly new. It represents a hoary form of literary birtherism that has persisted for a century or so, in happy defiance of reason and evidence. The arrival of “Anonymous” has roused Shakespearians more learned...
than I to the weary task of re-debunking — in the past two weeks The New York Times has published both an Op-Ed piece and a Sunday magazine Riff opposing the Oxfordian position — and to their cogent arguments I can offer only a small corrective. This is a Roland Emmerich film. (At least I assume it is, though I guess, in the spirit of the enterprise, I should be open to other possibilities. Joe Swanberg? Brett Ratner? Zhang Yimou? It all seems eerily plausible, once you start to think about it.)

My point is that it might be a mistake to suppose that the director of "10,000 B.C." — to mention only the most salient example — should be taken as a reliable guide to history. Perhaps he and Mr. Orloff ("Legend of the Guardians: The Owls of Ga’Hoole"), rather than advancing the case for Edward de Vere, set out to undermine it by exposing the absurd prejudices and fallacies on which the hypothesis rests. These can be boiled down to a sentimental and reactionary fantasy of class. How could Shakespeare, the half-educated son of an unlettered provincial glove maker, have written all those masterpieces? Surely it is more plausible to suppose that they were the work of one of his betters.

"Anonymous" has great fun with this insight, and it is amusing to watch Rafe Spall turn his Shakespeare into a shallow, duplicitous fraud (not to mention a whoremonger, a blackmailer and a murderer). Rhys Ifans, who plays the Earl of Oxford, is a touching picture of aristocratic melancholy, his long face and hooded eyes suggesting the weariness of a decent, disappointed soul. The poor Earl, prevented by family circumstances from pursuing his literary dreams, has spent a lifetime quilling up secret masterpieces about gloomy Danish princes, midsummer night’s dreams and other curious subjects.

When he was younger (and played, poutily and prettily, by Jamie Campbell Bower), Edward presented his pieces at court, where they delighted the young Queen Elizabeth I (Joely Richardson) so much that she went to bed with him. Later, when she has aged into a regal Vanessa Redgrave (Ms. Richardson’s mother), she will be so worked up by a “Shakespearean” performance that she will be compelled to undo the buttons of her bodice.

The filmmakers take a literal view of the power of poetry in the public arena as well. Give the masses a play with a hunchbacked villain, and they will take to the streets against an actual hunchback (Sir Robert Cecil, played by Edward Hogg. David Thewlis is Sir Robert’s equally sinister father, William, Elizabeth’s most trusted and least trustworthy adviser, as well as de Vere’s father-in-law).

It is an Oxfordian commonplace that de Vere composed some of his history plays ("Henry V," "Richard III") to assert some behind-the-scenes influence over the affairs of state.
“Anonymous” gives him complicated reasons for wanting to keep King James of Scotland off the English throne once Elizabeth is gone, and to sustain the Tudor line by promoting the ascendance of the Earl of Southampton (Xavier Samuel). The Earl of Southampton is a close friend of the Earl of Essex (Sam Reid), to whom de Vere is close for reasons that may shock you, or else reduce you to incredulous giggling.

“All plays are political,” Edward de Vere insists, and “Anonymous” proposes as a corollary that only political players can produce theater of real consequence. A mere professional, like Shakespeare or his colleague and sometime rival Ben Jonson, could never dream of committing masterpieces like “King Lear” or “Macbeth.” Only an inspired, noble amateur could achieve such greatness. The history of English letters refutes this notion at almost every turn — there are far more hacks than gentlemen to be found in the canon — and it seems disingenuous for Hollywood hacks to be endorsing it.

Or maybe just modest. Still, the show-business professionalism that “Anonymous” goes to such great lengths to disdain turns out to be its saving virtue. As a work of serious history, it is beyond useless. You would never know that Ben Jonson, played with thick-tongued mopiness by Sebastian Armesto, was a great comic writer, nor that Elizabeth was a shrewd and ruthless political operator, as opposed to the dreamy, dithering mooncalf depicted here. (Don’t get me started on poor Christopher Marlowe.) And yet there is no reason to deny Mr. Emmerich and Mr. Orloff the liberties that Shakespeare himself — and I do mean Shakespeare, the commercial entertainer, not some sad peer of the realm — was so free in taking.

Which is not to say that “Anonymous” rises to any great heights of art. Only, as I said before, that it is in many ways not bad. Mr. Orloff’s puffed-up dialogue is enlivened by infusions of actual Shakespeare, some of it performed by Mark Rylance, one of Shakespeare’s leading modern interpreters. (It is, by contrast, a little depressing to see another, Derek Jacobi, lending his imprimatur to this folly in the role of a present-day narrator). The production design (by Sebastian T. Krawinkel) and the costumes (by Lisy Christl) are superb, blending with Anna J. Foerster’s dark and rich cinematography to produce a plausibly Elizabethan atmosphere, with interiors that often look like Holbein paintings.

And in the end the players are the thing. Mediocre actors are often undone by great material, but good ones can burnish even meretricious nonsense with craft and conviction. And so it is here. Ms. Redgrave and Mr. Ifans are so full of feeling, Mr. Thewlis and Mr. Hogg are so full of bile and fanaticism, and Mr. Spall is so full of baloney that you are tempted to suspend disbelief, even if Mr. Emmerich finally makes it impossible.

“Anonymous” is rated PG-13 (Parents strongly cautioned). Swordplay, bodice ripping, bawdy speech and the cold-blooded murder of the truth.

ANONYMOUS

Opens on Friday nationwide.

Directed by Roland Emmerich; written by John Orloff; director of photography, Anna J. Foerster; edited by Peter R. Adam; music by Thomas Wander and Harald Kloser; production design by Sebastian T. Krawinkel; costumes by Lisy Christl; produced by Mr. Emmerich, Larry Franco and Robert Léger; released by Columbia Pictures. Running time: 2 hours 10 minutes.

WITH: Rhys Ifans (Earl of Oxford), Vanessa Redgrave (Queen Elizabeth I), Joely Richardson (Young Queen Elizabeth), David Thewlis (William Cecil), Xavier Samuel (Earl
of Southampton), Sebastian Armesto (Ben Jonson), Rafe Spall (William Shakespeare), Sam Reid (Earl of Essex), Jamie Campbell Bower (Young Earl of Oxford), Edward Hogg (Robert Cecil), Mark Rylance (Condell) and Derek Jacobi (Prologue).

A version of this review appeared in print on October 28, 2011, on page C1 of the New York edition with the headline: How Could a Commoner Write Such Great Plays?.
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Edward de Vere, William Shakespeare - Does it matter what the name of the author was? It’s not as if we could have known him, so I’m not offended for the true author. There are bigger issues in this movie than who really wrote the plays and sonnets. How about a cacophony of English accents to the American ear, constant flitting from past to present and back to the point of utter confusion, actors who look nothing alike (except for Redgrave & Richardson) playing the same person in youth and maturity and the whole thing being filmed in the dark. I watched it on cable (stuff like this doesn’t often make it in real time to the nether corners of Massachusetts) and will watch it again if repeated for the joy of seeing Mark Rylance on stage and Rhys Ifans redeem himself after playing the dolt in Notting Hill. Adding Derek Jacobi as a narrator is akin to Steven Spielberg ruining Saving Private Ryan with the unnecessary use of flashbacks. I avoided Shakespeare like the plague in high school and college in the ‘60s and ‘70s because I knew the classes would consist of demands to “read King Lear over the weekend and write 10 pages about the use of blah blah blah”. Had a class been offered in which one play would be dissected over the course of a semester, the political and social references explained in their context and the dense language made comprehensible, I might have signed up, but it wasn’t and I didn’t. On the whole, I am prepared to like this movie, despite its faults if for no other reason than to watch English actors do the thing they do best - Shakespeare.

– Kamp54, Massachusetts
87. A Review of the Review

I would instead like to review the review of the movie. I liked ANONYMOUS, and reviewers who dislike the film seem to complain about the fact that this fictional film isn’t historically accurate enough and do not recognize the individual Shakespeare as a genius enough. The facts of history that the movie does get right are never mentioned: the level of political intrigue in the Elizabethan court, the placement of the various court favorites, the general low-brow world of the theater at the time (Shakespeare himself, evidence suggests, had been in trouble with the law for behaving like a thug), the squalor of London, the portrayal of bear-baiting as an entertainment, the details of what we do know about Shakespeare (of whom we know very little) woven into the story, the murder of Kit Marlowe, etc. Curiously, the one thing the film does get wrong that no one seems to comment on is the fact that Shakespeare was not the most popular writer of his day. He was perhaps the third or fifth most popular playwright and it was only after writers appearing well after his death lionized him that he began to become the icon now defended in reviews like the NYTimes one above. Shakespeare himself was not concerned with historical accuracy so its odd that the issue comes up in critiques of a film about him.

– egaeus, Ohio

86. Professor of English emeritus

I loved this movie. Comparisons to “Amadeus” are much more appropriate than ad hominem attacks comparing authorship doubters to “birthers”. The film captures Elizabethan England much as it really was -- full of schemes, spying, plots against anyone with a claim to the English throne, murder, torture, and the splendor of great drama with magnificent insights into human nature. I have researched this subject for 26 years, having read over 50 books and countless articles about it. I’m convinced that “william Shakespeare” was a pen name of Edward de Vere, whose love affair with Queen Elizabeth was noted in 1573. The pen name was necessary to protect the image of the Virgin Queen, supposedly available for marriage to crowned heads of Europe, and to allow their love-child to grow up as a ward of the court from the age of 9, bearing the title of the Third Earl of Southampton. The sonnets tell an even more intimate story of the emotional ups and downs of a beautiful love story that had to be suppressed for political reasons. The Fair Youth is Henry Wriothesley, Third Earl of Southampton. The rival poet is Sir Walter Raleigh, and the dark ladies are Ann Vavasor and Elizabeth Tudor in her darker moods. The puzzle of the Dedication uses the Rosicrucian secret code.

Helen Heightsman Gordon, M.A., Ed.D.,
Author of the book THE SECRET LOVE STORY IN SHAKESPEARE’S SONNETS [2008].

– H. H. Gordon, M.A., Ed.D., Santa Barbara, CA, USA

85. He either wrote them or he did not.

Either way it really doesnt matter to anyone it will not change anyone’s life. Even if he didnt write them you cant really figure it out the are all dead. I dont see the point in researching something that will not change becase it can not change. And there is people out the wasting there valuable time and life on earth researching this when it will not change anything

– Dustin, white, sd

84. Seriously?

What is it about all this craving for truth? And what is this truth anyways! It’s a film about fiction. About the most surpassing fiction of all time. Why not just delight in those alluring impressions, take in the magic of this long gone era and set imagination free to float off. Why not just read it as tribute, an approach to embrace the works of a genius, an ode to the spirit of Shakespeare, whoever it is that is worthy of that title. A homage to any literary masterpiece, to the significance of writing.

An inspiring movie.
Darn it, I enjoyed the movie

Years ago, I read "Shakespeare by Another Name" and became convinced that de Vere was the true author of Shakespeare's plays. Having studied all the plays in college as an English Lit major, and watched most of them several times, it just made sense.

I disagreed with some parts of the movie, because they played too loosely with things we actually know. But, with that in mind, it was great fun. To argue that the movie failed because it suggested de Vere was the author seems childish to me. It's a reasonable theory. But even if it wasn't, it's a fun movie. It doesn't hold itself out to be a documentary, but an exercise in "what if?" At the worst, it's a Star Trek episode describing an alternate reality.

I go into more detail on my blog about the movie at clearwaterpublishing.com/alembic

-- Kenn Amdahl, Broomfield, Colorado

Disappointed

I just got home from viewing the movie, which gives new meaning to the genre of travesty. Where shall I begin, though? With anachronism? Or with the episodic script? Perhaps the soaring music right out of Shakespeare in Love, as we weep over clips from The Greatest Lines from Shakespeare? Or the reduction of The Bard to an illiterate wencher? Or Derek Jacobi's pompous paean to Shakespeare at the end? The script written by a college sophomore? No! It has to be Vanessa Redgrave's trivialization of Elizabeth into a silly, doddering fool. Oh well. Go see it and judge for yourself.

-- burningtree, Shelburne Falls, MA

Loved It

Why not go and see this theory played out? See it on the big screen and just be taken in by all the wonderful acting, costumes, set, photography. Hear and see Shakespeare's words played, whoever he is! Rhys Ifans is outstanding. You just want to keep your eyes on him. He deserves nominations for all the acting awards. I'd love to see him in more of these period pieces. Edward Hogg is outstanding. The scene between him and Rhys Ifans at the end is memorable. Also deserves award nominations.

-- Mary, Boston

Review of the Review

As I have not seen the movie, like A. O. Scott, I confine myself to a review of the review, which I have not deigned to read closely.

Scott, being of the new New York Times (cf. Jack Cashill on this subject) takes issue with the only point of the movie that is supported by the bulk of credible evidence, that Edward de Vere was Shakespeare, a pen name after the goddess of theater, always shown shaking a spear. Scott's claim is that "the plays and poems commonly attributed to William Shakespeare are actually the work of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford. This notion, sometimes granted the unwarranted dignity of being called a theory, is hardly new. It represents a hoary form of literary birtherism that has persisted for a century or so, in happy defiance of reason and evidence."

I confess to a ground of possible bias, as I share a de Vere line from the one who was among the barons who forced John Lackland to accede to the Magna Carta (not "signing" it, as John could neither read nor
write, but authorizing before witnesses at Runnymede the affixing of the royal seal to duplicate originals, distributed to sundry churches for safekeeping).

However, the existence of a substantial body of original evidence and reason exists to support the "notion" that Edward was Shakespeare. A. O. Scott's knowing representation to the contrary is a lie that flies in the face of any decent journalistic ethic. A. O. Scott's unlikely ignorance of this substantial supporting evidence would be gross journalistic negligence.

And this is disclosed evidence. As I recall, A. O. Smith authored a book of bunk about Stanley Ann Dunham, concealing her role in the murder of hundreds of thousands of Indonesian communists and based on the false premise that she was the mother of Barack Hussein Obama II.

— eingriff, Independence, Missouri

76. movie
I really liked this movie, it is getting people talking about Shakespeare. I do believe in the theories that Shakespeare didn't write anything. I like the theory of Francis Bacon and the research Wilmot did. but this is a great film and I would go see it again.

— Ky, London

79. True believers rail against inquiry
The controversy over the authorial status of the man from Stratford appears to mirror the religious faith of many versus the agnosticism of the fewer. Adherents to the long-established Shakespeare religion are devotees of faith alone as proof. Mr. Scott is such a one. Like the New Testament documents, no original handwritten plays exist in Shakespeare's hand. Not one. All are copies of something earlier - now lost. Agnostics like myself are open to possibilities because of the lack of originals, not in spite of them. That's it; no insistence that a privileged college man must've written the plays, just no evidence the divinity from Stratford did either. The movie's intriguing, especially if you've not already been baptized.

— phylum chordata, earth

77. Still an entertaining film boulderdash or not
The movie Amadeus wasn't accurate either but was still an engrossing film. Historical inaccuracies aside, Anonymous is a love letter to the power of great writing. I'll leave it to the Oxfordians and Stratfordians to fight it out

— tres, NY, NY

76. True Authorship
I'm surprised no one has come to the defense of the true author(s) of Shakespeare's plays: An infinite number of monkeys furiously pounding on typewriters.

— D.J.R. Sweeney, Zhuhai, Guangdong, China

75. Some folk don't have much imagination
Doubtless some future entertainment producer will theorize that Walt Disney couldn't possibly have been
behind the Disney empire, having declared bankruptcy at an early age, and having no college degree; that Steve Jobs couldn’t possibly have generated the technology that he did (without a corporation behind him to start with); and that the Beatles couldn’t have created the music they did, as they were musically illiterate. What it boils down to is that the nay-sayers have too little imagination to conceive that anyone could do great things, because if they were in that set of circumstances, they couldn’t do it themselves. Genius knows no lineage, no title, no corporate attachments. It pops up here and there, and cannot be predicted. Some people are terrified of this, as it puts in question their concept of self worth which is based not on their own intellect and potential, but on money, title, or a family name. The theory of Shakespeare’s authorship would have come about because of the perceived audacity of a commoner showing up the aristocracy. How dare a commoner outshine their own brilliance (however dull and unimaginative). In our own time, creativity is stifled by corporations whose sole purpose is to make money, and we wonder why we get the drek we get in books, film, and television, which cater not to the imagination, but to the lowest common denominator, and to greed. Sad

— WestCoastCarl, Los Angeles

74. can you be so sure?
Alice, MA says: “The question is not whether any commoner could have written the plays of Shakespeare, it is whether this PARTICULAR commoner, William Shaksper of Stratford, could have. It seems rather unlikely, since he could barely sign his name and left no written works other than six signatures. As someone else noted, Marlowe and Jonson came from similarly humble backgrounds and wrote works of genius; however, there is ample evidence to connect them to the works to which they are credited. Not so for the man from Stratford, once that case is examined closely—the first 10 plays now credited to Shakespeare were published anonymously, and many other plays published under the name Shakespeare or the initials W.S. are not considered the work of "William Shakespeare" by experts (whether Stratfordian or Oxfordian).”

I guess you mean he left only six signatures . . . aside from the grandest collection of work in the English language. And as to documentary evidence -- how was the record keeping back then? Really accurate, or a bit spotty? And of the records that were created, is there any chance that some of them might have been lost over four hundred years? Just asking . . .

— siverson, MA

73. Senior programmer Analyst
I am quite disturbed by this review. As I recall there are an number of historical dramas that get details wrong talking of the lives of Motzart, Custard, even Ike and the reviewers did not spend so much time on these theries and review the acting and how the fiction of the tale unfolds.

Here is it outrage. the reviewer is seeong red and can not get past it.

On the matter of Shakespear. I have not doupt he did not write the plays. Three most impatant amoung many facts. He lack the education and life experienc. The Play contain better than 36,000 words may four time the vobulary of a moderatly educated commoner. He left it all behind and went into business.

No man can write so much and leave it behind. time to realize maybe all that priming for shakespear be left behind and cede that his attribution to all tose could not add up.

By the way, dispite the liberties made with the time (who has not taken liberties with this particular era). not a bad movie.

— Mark, Ft Worth, Texas

72. Typical Thinking of an Anti-Stratfordian
I can’t believe someone posted argument that Shakespeare couldn’t have written the plays because the
house in Stratford was too small. Shakespeare wrote the works in London! Well, that’s typical thinking among people who don’t think William Shakespeare wrote the plays.

– R Nathan, Burbank, CA

October 29th, 2011 5:40 pm

Rating:

71. ::applause::

Now, THAT is a review! Honestly, I don’t care either way about the film, but a review like this is a delight to read on a rainy Saturday morning.

– YoBimbo, Washington, DC

October 29th, 2011 5:39 pm

Rating:

70. Class?

In reply to: "The authorship question is not about class—that's a cheap, long discredited shot—it's about evidence, and [spam plug deleted] it's virtually all in De Vere's corner."

Okay, I'll bite. The original proponents of the Edward Devere conspiracy theory did not stumble upon suggestive material and conclude from it that Shakespeare did not write the plays. No, they concluded Shakespeare did not write the plays and then searched for the best candidate—the one with the most concurrences (an emblem with a "shaking spear" and so on). This is why the question is indeed about "class" and not about "evidence". This is why their argument is disingenuous and fundamentally illogical.

If you search hard enough of course you will find concurrences; that means nothing—and long denied, by the way, is not the same as "long discredited".

– Cat, Missouri

October 29th, 2011 5:39 pm

Rating:

69. Shaikspeer, O Dere, DeVere

Much ado bout nuttin.

Like the English language moving on with arguments about word and idea sources, authors themselves are in the game.

Do authors even worry about where they found the inspirations, ideas and facts? They simply write compulsively. However, money and fame change the game.

I was there in Stratford - on - Avon and know that Shakey, his pals' name for him in case you are illiterate fake scholarly researchers, was a pure soul who preferred writing and imagining to rolling the loop with us. We became loopier, but he was a savant and what could we do?

– byron, Shandong, China

October 29th, 2011 5:39 pm

Rating:

68. Copycat

Shakespeare or whoever wrote those works did certainly copied real anonymous popular stories from Italy and Spain. Anyone who has read "Los Amantes de Teruel" can easily know where Romeo and Juliet came from, and this is just a sample out of many.

– McEivy, Earth

October 29th, 2011 5:39 pm

Rating:
"Anonymous" examines the life of Mary Sidney, the sister of Sir Philip Sidney, and the result is a thoroughly persuasive case that Mary Sidney wrote the plays. I have been waiting for someone without preconceptions to read this book and explain where it goes wrong. No one has done so. Any arguments by Scott or Shapiro supporting the man from Stratford are simply uninformed, if the case for Mary Sidney has not been seriously considered. Shapiro in his book treats all of the other candidates as equivalent and dismisses them all with criticism of DeVere, and his book is discredited by his refusal to examine the case for Mary Sidney. Unlike Shakespeare, some of Mary Sidney's writings in her own name survive and show remarkable talent, training and effort. The subjects of the sonnets become clear when read in the context of Mary Sidney's life. One of them was probably written to her broker, probably a guy named Shakespeare. Mary's home at Wilton House was a salon and training ground for fine writers. The First Folio is dedicated to the two sons of Mary Sidney. So get off your high horses and save your invective until you have read "Sweet Swan of Avon". Do not take my word for it, as the case for Mary Sidney is much greater than I can summarize in a comment here. Read the book and spare us the certitude until you do.

– Jed, Pennsylvania

October 29th, 2011 5:39 pm  Rating:

66. go willy!

familiar issues once more raised,
those here and gone scorned and praised.
the truth lies just beneath the mold,
and matters not what hand did craft,
plain or noble, long years past,
for, once again, at the times round table,
we meet will's peers, inspired and able,
giving our language, common tho it may be,
their observations and benediction,
doth it matter, fact or fiction?

– mango chutney, los angeles

October 29th, 2011 5:39 pm  Rating:

65. Huh?

Much ado about nothing.

– Jay, L.A.

October 29th, 2011 5:39 pm

64. the future view of college dropouts Jobs and Gates?

It seems the author of the article didn't realize that Mark Rylance along with Jacobi also doubts that Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare. I've seen an online petition one can sign if you agree with the doubters. To what purpose I don't know. The belief that Shakespeare couldn't have written these things is a many years old snobbery which always seems to circle back to the education question. I imagine that in a few hundred years people will not believe that Steve Jobs or Bill Gates have accomplished what they have. After all, they were college drop outs. Note to intellectuals....not everyone that is brilliant has a wonderful and completed official education or needs it to self educate and contribute to the world. I have two degrees, but grew up in back country where I was very humbly acquainted with people of genius who only had the chance to graduate from high school. But snobbery never goes out of fashion apparently.

– julie, seattle

October 29th, 2011 5:39 pm  Rating:

Average Reader Rating

3 rating, 135 votes
Here are the six most common writing mistakes identified by fiction editors, with simple fixes that can be done in the revision stage.

The second most common writing mistake is "telling" rather than "showing." This comes from explaining too much and not trusting the reader to understand or not giving the reader the opportunity to fill in the spaces with his own imagination. A subset of this, as one editor said, is having characters discuss things in dialogue that no rational person would: "Did you know, Ian, that the agricultural sector in England was transformed by the Black Death, which arrived in England in 1348 and killed many laborers, and by the Hundred Years’ War, which was actually a series of conflicts waged from 13..."

Maybe being a great writer has been your dream since you were barely old enough to scribble on the walls in spaghetti sauce. If so, you’ve probably already imbibed lots of writing advice. You know what all these successful writers have in common? A honed writing system. Hemingway, King, and Jacobs didn’t just throw words on paper whenever they felt like it. You won’t become a good writer if you only "write a lot," just like a child learning the piano will not get better if s/he mindlessly plays the same piece over and over again. You need mindful, deliberate practice to improve. Learning how to hone your craft is a topic that I could probably write hundreds of articles on, so for now, I will leave it at that. For more ideas on deliberate practice, you can check out this article. With these headline writing tips, I’ll show you how to capture attention immediately and compel readers to stop in their tracks. This is fundamental, because, according to Copyblogger, 80% of your visitors will read your headline but only 20% will go on to finish the article. In other words, a great headline isn’t just something you wish you could create. It’s crucial. Game changing, you could say. And bad headlines can cause your content marketing to fail. And with these headline writing tips, I’ll show you how even the smallest tweak can make an enormous impact on the catchiness of yo