

Brief Chronicles:  
An Interdisciplinary Journal of Authorship Studies IV  
(2012-13)



The Players....are the abstract and brief  
chronicles of the time: after your death you  
were better have a bad epitaph than their ill  
report while you live.

-Hamlet to Polonius



Copyright 2013  
The Shakespeare Fellowship  
Designed in Baltimore, MD.  
Online ISSN: 2157-6793  
Print ISSN: 2157-6785



This 2012-13 volume IV of *Brief Chronicles*, in keeping with our tradition, was set in **Chaparral Pro**. Our ornament selection continues to be inspired not only by early modern semiotics, but by the generosity of contemporary designers, such as Rob Anderson, who designed the **Flight of the Dragon** Celtic Knot Caps that contribute so much to our leading paragraphs. T. Olsson's 1993 **Ornament Scrolls**, available for free download from **typOasis**, have once again furnished an inviting opportunity to apply some of the theoretical principles discussed by our more distinguished contributors. **Mente Videberit.**



## Contributor Biographies

**Katherine Chiljan** (BA, History, UCLA) is the author of *Shakespeare Suppressed: the Uncensored Truth about Shakespeare and his Works* (2011), an anti-Stratfordian book that took nearly seven years to research. This work earned her an award for distinguished scholarship at Concordia University in April 2012. Chiljan has debated the Shakespeare Authorship Question at the Smithsonian Institution, The Mechanics' Institute Library, and UC Berkeley. She is the former editor of the *Shakespeare-Oxford Newsletter*, and has published two Oxfordian anthologies, *Dedication Letters to the Earl of Oxford* (1994) and *Letters and Poems of Edward, Earl of Oxford* (1998).

**Bonner Miller Cutting**, a Trustee of the Shakespeare Fellowship, has presented papers at several authorship conferences and is working to expand her article, "Shakespeare's Will....Considered Too Curiously" (*BCI* (2009), 169-191) into a book. Ms. Cutting holds a BFA from Tulane University in New Orleans, where she was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and an MA in music from McNeese State University in Lake Charles, LA.

**Kevin Gilvary** obtained his BA and MA in Classics and later his MA in Applied Linguistics from the University of Southampton, UK. He has taught at UBC in Vancouver, BC, Canada, at Markham College, Lima, Peru, and for 20 years at Barton Peveril College, Hampshire, UK. He was first alerted to the Authorship Question by inquisitive students and has been a member of the De Vere Society for 15 years, and is currently chairman. He has contributed articles to *Great Oxford* (2004) and edited *Dating Shakespeare's Plays* (2010) for which he was awarded the prize of Oxfordian of the Year at a joint SF/SOS meeting in 2011. He is presently conducting doctoral research on Shakespearean Biography at Brunel University, west London.

**Thomas Regnier** is an attorney based in Miami, Florida. He holds law degrees from Columbia Law School in New York (LLM) and the University of Miami School of Law (JD), both with honors. He has clerked for Judge Harry Leinenweber in the U.S. District Court in Chicago and for Judge Melvia Green in the Third District Court of Appeal of Florida. He has taught at the University of Miami School of Law (including a course on Shakespeare and the Law) and The John Marshall Law School in Chicago. His scholarly articles on the law have appeared in such publications as *NYU Journal of Legislation and Public Policy*, *Santa Clara Law Review*, *Akron Law Review*, and *UMKC Law Review*.

**Earl Showerman** graduated from Harvard College and the University of Michigan Medical School, has been a patron of the Oregon Shakespeare Festival since 1974, and reads at the Hannon Library of Southern Oregon University in pursuit of the Shakespeare authorship question. He has served as a Trustee of the Shakespeare Fellowship and The Shakespeare Authorship Coalition. Since 2005 he has presented and published a series of papers on the topic of Shakespeare's "greater Greek," explicating the Greek dramatic sources in *Hamlet*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Pericles*, *Much Ado about Nothing*, *Timon of Athens*, *Troilus and Cressida* and the Tudor interlude, *Horestes*.

**Roger Stritmatter** is an Associate Professor of Humanities at Coppin State University and the general editor of *Brief Chronicles*. He has published articles on early modern literature and cultural studies in such journals as *Critical Survey*, *Notes and Queries*, *Review of English Studies*, *Cahiers Élisabéthains*, *University of Tennessee Law Review*, and *The Oxfordian*, and has debated Stanley Wells in the *Washington Post*. His first book, *Shakespeare's Tempest: A Movable Feast*, co-written with Lynne Kositsky, is forthcoming from McFarland. He is grateful for the double-blind peer review process employed at *Brief Chronicles* for generating many insightful improvements to his article in this issue on Henry Peacham's *Minerva Britannia*.

**Richard Waugaman, MD**, is a Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Georgetown University School of Medicine, a Training Analyst Emeritus at the Washington Psychoanalytic Institute, and a recognized expert on multiple personality disorder. He is a regular reader at the Folger Shakespeare Library, and has written extensively on Shakespeare, the psychology of anonymity, and the case for Oxford's authorship of the Shakespearean canon.

**Richard Whalen** is co-editor with Ren Draya of Blackburn College of *Othello* in the Oxfordian Shakespeare Series. He is co-general editor of the series with Daniel Wright of Concordia University and the author of *Shakespeare Who Was He? The Oxford Challenge to the Bard of Avon* (Greenwood-Praeger, 1994).

## Vol IV (2013) Table of Contents

### Articles

#### **Epistle Dedicatory**

Roger A. Stritmatter viii-xvii

#### **The *Chronicles of Hall and Holinshed*: Published under Pseudonyms ?**

Kevin Gilvary 1-21

#### **The Importance of *Love's Martyr* in the Shakespeare Authorship Question**

Katherine Chiljan 23-38

#### **Did Tudor Succession Law Permit Royal Bastards to Inherit the Crown?**

Thomas Regnier 39-58

#### **The Scottish/Classical Hybrid *Witches in Macbeth***

Richard F. Whalen 59-72

#### **Biblical Sources for Sonnets 24, 33, and Henry VIII: Implications for de Vere's Authorship**

Richard M. Waugaman 73-87

#### **Triangular Numbers in Henry Peacham's *Minerva Britannia*: A Study in Jacobean Literary Form**

Roger Stritmatter 89-118

#### **A Countess Transformed: How Lady Susan Vere Became Lady Anne Clifford**

Bonner Miller Cutting 117-134

#### **Reviews and Communications 135-141**



## Epistle Dedicatory:


### A Remembrance of Things Past

The man who is satisfied with the name of the author on the title page regardless of how it got there will read fourteen Gospels, I think, instead of four. Nothing is easier than to place any name you want on the front of a book.

— St Jerome<sup>1</sup>

The truth is that the majority of minds are but mediocre recording cameras of the surrounding world....[and] since evidence, strictly speaking, is no more than the expression of remembrance, the first errors of perception run the constant risk of being entangled in the errors of memory.

— Marc Bloch <sup>2</sup>

n the title page of his copy of the anonymous classic *The Arte of English Poesie* (1586), now owned by the British Museum, Ben Jonson inscribed the legend “Introite: Name hic dij sunt – Enter: for there are Gods here.”<sup>3</sup> The saying is attributed to Heraclitus, the Greek philosopher for whom transmutation was the first law of being.

On my own bookshelf, somewhere between Roland McKerrow’s 1927 *Introduction to Bibliography* and William Sherman’s 2008 *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*, is a disintegrating 1953 paperback copy, with unglued helter-skelter pages, crumbling spine, and a faint quintessence of book mold, of a volume for which I confess to holding a comparable admiration bordering on awe. *The Historian’s Craft*, the posthumously published handbook of historiography by the Annales<sup>4</sup> economic historian Marc Bloch (1886-1944) has, like all great books, its own history.



By common consent among the greatest of 20<sup>th</sup>-century historians, Bloch was executed by the Gestapo on June 16, 1944, for his role in the French resistance, and *The Historian’s Craft* is consequently not only posthumous but incomplete – a fragment, however substantial, of a larger and unfinished project. Planned sections

on “explanation in history” and “the problem of prevision” were cut short by Bloch’s execution at the hands of Hitler’s cronies, who had by the summer of 1944 lost the war but in their denial still could not admit it.<sup>5</sup> Even incomplete, however, Bloch’s book was destined to become one of the greatest ever written on the methodology and epistemology of history. Among the sections completed before his death are “the transmission of evidence” and “in pursuit of fraud and error” – from which my epigraph on the frailty of perception and memory is extracted. On these and other topics the book’s clarity of concept, selection of relevant evidence, and lucidity of style of have never been surpassed.

On returning to Bloch’s book after many years absence in preparation for completing this volume of *Brief Chronicles*, I was surprised to find my mother’s signature inscribed in pencil on the flyleaf. In truth I had wholly forgotten that my copy was from her library and was at one time read by her. Only the benefit of documentary evidence could rectify the frailty of memory.

As a historian, Bloch is, of course, concerned not merely with the sort of forgetting that results from the failure of a single memory, but, more consequentially, with the collective amnesia of historians or entire nations: “for the error of a single witness to become that of many men, for an inaccurate observation to be transformed into a false rumor, social conditions must be such as to favor its circulation.”<sup>6</sup>

In his discussion of the genesis of historical error Bloch identifies two primary types of cause: deceit as to the “author and date” of documents (i.e., forgery), and “misrepresentation of facts” (i.e., self-serving or mendacious accounts).<sup>7</sup> There is, however, a further complication:

The peaceable continuity of social existence is much less favorable to the transmission of memory than is sometimes supposed....[The historian] must come to grips with the two principles responsible for forgetfulness and ignorance: that negligence which loses documents; and, even more dangerous, that passion for secrecy—diplomatic secrecy, business secrecy, family secrecy—which hides or destroys them....our civilization will take an immense forward stride on the day when concealment, raised to a rule of action and almost to a bourgeois virtue, shall give way to the desire for information, which is necessarily the desire to exchange information.<sup>8</sup>

While the role of the “passion for secrecy” in history is a topic that fascinates Shakespeare, forming a major thematic element in many of the plays, the average Shakespearean scholar rarely if ever acknowledges it as relevant to the genesis of the plays. But whatever 21<sup>st</sup> century Stratfordians believe, Shakespeare – and his contemporaries – believed in the existence of conspiracies, as the slightest acquaintance with a Shakespeare Concordance reveals. Still less is the average Shakespeare professional trained to consider the prominent role that calculated misdirection and equivocating truth-telling have played in the early modern rhetorical tradition that preserves our earliest witness for the existence



of “Shakespeare.” As Francis Meres, citing Seneca, says in the work which put Shakespeare on the literary map in 1598:

As the soule is hid in the body whence very part hath his vigour and motion; and the mysteries, which are the best part of those holy thinges doe not lie open, but to those that are intiated into them: so the precepts of philosophie are knowne to every body, but that which is best in philosophy lyeth hid.<sup>9</sup>

In his posthumous *Discoveries*, Ben Jonson confirms that many

Labour onely to ostentation; and are ever more busie about the colours, and the surface of a worke, then in the matter, and foundation: For that is hid, the other is seene.<sup>10</sup>

This theory of knowledge as a privileged sanctuary, accessible only to the deserving, and zealously guarded from the prying eyes of unworthy readers, was of course shared by the contemporaries of Meres and Jonson whose commentary furnishes the basis of the orthodox Shakespearean biography.

But, as Bloch himself insists, fraud – or willful misrepresentation – is itself a form of evidence. Among the most potent contemporary examples is the frequent claim that the authorship question originates in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and that before the age of romanticism no one bothered to question the bard’s identity. As the Wikipedia entry on the authorship question baldly asserts, “The authorship question emerged only after Shakespeare had come to be regarded as the English national poet and a unique genius.”<sup>11</sup> “The nonsense started in 1785,” confirms Stratford Birthplace Trust chairman Stanley Wells, and “has grown into an immense monument to modern folly.”<sup>12</sup>

According to an Italian proverb, a little truth makes the whole lie pass. The first overt, modern, *expository*, doubts about the authorship of the plays do originate under the influence of 19<sup>th</sup> century trends of Romanticism and Rationalism. By the age of Keats and Coleridge it had become obvious to many that it was impossible to reconcile the evidence of the Stratford biography with an enlightenment view of the creative genesis of the Shakespearean works. From this point of view it should be uncontroversial to observe that modern Shakespearean skepticism is the undoubted offspring of significant historical trends involving the rise of enlightenment rationalism across a broad sphere of human activities. As Warren Hope and Kim Holston summarize the social and historical circumstances that shaped late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century doubts about the bard:

Two political upheavals, the American and French Revolutions, make up part of the backdrop for Delia Bacon’s [anti-Stratfordian] thought and work. These upheavals brought in their wake a new spirit, a new outlook, that elevated humanity’s reasoning faculty as an authority. With an almost religious fervor,

people thought for themselves, toppled venerated idols, reexamined old dogmas, and set out to discover the truth.<sup>13</sup>

The spirit of the times was difficult to resist: “Are we to have miracles in sport?” asked an exasperated Coleridge in 1811. “Does God chose idiots by whom to convey divine truths to man?”

Apparently so, according to James Shapiro. In *Contested Will* – the only book by a high-profile scholar devoted to answering authorship heretics and negating the entire question as merely “a footnote to the larger story of the way we read now”<sup>14</sup> – Shapiro purports to trace the origin of doubts about Shakespeare to the gregarious Samuel Mosheim Schmucker, author of *Historic Doubts Respecting Shakespeare; Illustrating Infidel Objections Against the Bible* (1853). Shapiro approves of Schmucker because he not only “carefully mapped out almost all the arguments subsequently used to question Shakespeare’s authorship” but did so, paradoxically, while “never for a moment doubt[ing] that Shakespeare was Shakespeare”<sup>15</sup> and confidently espousing the opposite of what he seemed to be arguing. Ironically, Schmucker’s exercise in Shakespeare doubting was, as the subtitle of his book implies, intended as a shot across the bow against Higher Criticism.

Higher Criticism, also known as Historical Criticism, or Historical-critical Method, was the application of the principles of enlightenment secular reasoning to the genesis and interpretation of historical texts, including the Bible. More specifically, Schmucker had in his crosshairs David Friedrich Strauss’ *The Life of Jesus* (1835), a seminal work in the development of Higher Criticism.<sup>16</sup> Strauss’ rationalist inquiry into the life of Christ had scandalized Christian Europe, and Schmucker was among those leading the charge to refute “infidel” criticism that raised doubts about the divinity of Christ. Schmucker, in other words, hung his religious faith in Christ on his secular faith in Shakespeare; according to this logic, anyone who doubts “Shakespeare” must be an infidel who denies Christianity.

To enlist an outspoken critic of the enlightenment and defender of religious fundamentalism as the founding father of Stratfordian revanchism was a daring move on Shapiro’s part, but not one likely to win him the enduring approval of literary historians. Shapiro does not seem to grasp, perhaps because he does not want to, the reversibility of Schmucker’s argument. As Heward Wilkinson suggests, “without realizing what he has done, Shapiro, as an argument of convenience, repudiates the whole of trend of modern Higher Critical thought and methodology,” painting himself into “a position as obscurantist as the most extreme American Evangelical Fundamentalist Creationist.”<sup>17</sup>

To acknowledge the social origins of 19<sup>th</sup> century doubts about authorship, then, is not the same thing as to collude in the Wells-Shapiro-Wikipedia whitewashing operation. As many have argued, citing specific evidence, at least since Ruth Loyd Miller’s “Oxfordian Vistas” (1975) or Charlton Ogburn’s *The Mysterious William Shakespeare* (1984),<sup>18</sup> the authorship question began in the 1590s, not the 1790s. Indeed, the evidence for the widespread existence of a “creative conspiracy” (1593-1623) to recognize the real author while simultaneously protecting him

from unwanted attention is ubiquitous, if not always self-evident, in the historical record. Elements of this practice are readily observable in the earliest 18<sup>th</sup> century scholarship on the bard and were already conspicuous as early as Clement Ingleby's first *Shakespeare Allusion Book* (1874, etc.), which may help to explain Ingleby's own admission that the traditional attribution rested on testimonials both "few and meagre."<sup>19</sup>

In truth, under the spotlight of the Oxfordian paradigm these testimonials are more abundant and considerably more evocative than Ingleby could possibly have imagined. Such early allusions to Shakespeare as the satiric invocation of the William Kempe character in the university satire *Second Returne From Parnassus* (c. 1600), who contrasts "Shakespeare" to "that writer Metamorphoses"<sup>20</sup> frequently assume the form of adopting the pseudonym as the authorized version of the author's name, while hinting at the truth through various tropes of half-concealed literary logic – in this case a dramatic irony that ridicules the speaker as one who cannot distinguish between an author and a book. Understanding this evidence, therefore, requires a close study of the relevant texts that orthodox Shakespeareans are rarely willing to undertake. Organized around the medieval and Renaissance tradition of "wit" (*ingenium*) – the goal of the discourse was to earn the accolades of colleagues by exercising the most superlative "triumphal" equivocation – to excel at a "juggling trick – to be secretly open," as Thersites puts it in *Troilus and Cressida*.<sup>21</sup>

Given the amount of intellectual energy that has been expended in festooning Shakespearean biography with such entertaining exotica as the "detailed account[s] of how the timbers of the Shoreditch theatre were salvaged and stored... and just what kind of carpentry conditions were required for reusing them in the globe,"<sup>22</sup> or in inventing factually erroneous explanations for the disappearing and reappearing hyphen in the name "Shake-speare"<sup>23</sup> as it appears on so many documents of the period, or in confusing Terence with Seneca,<sup>24</sup> it is perhaps not surprising that orthodox Shakespeareans have had so little time to contemplate the implications of this testimony from a modern critical perspective. Ignoring something does not make it go away; this evidence has been so well represented in a whole series of recent books and articles that can be found on the bookshelves of every major research library in the world as to scarcely require detailed elaboration here. As Katherine Chiljan, in one of the most valuable surveys in recent years, ably summarizes the cumulative evidence for a 16<sup>th</sup> and early 17<sup>th</sup> century authorship question:

Years before the First Folio created the myth of the Stratford Man as Shakespeare, literary contemporaries were describing the great author as a very different person: a nobleman who wrote plays and poetry anonymously or with a pseudonym; a supreme poet who could not be publicly recognized or acknowledged by his actual name, or even by his pen name in some cases.<sup>25</sup>

The sport included a veritable who's who of Elizabethan and Jacobean literary writers: Thomas Nashe,<sup>26</sup> Gabriel Harvey,<sup>27</sup> Richard Barnefield,<sup>28</sup> Thomas Freeman,<sup>29</sup>

William Basse,<sup>30</sup> William Barkstead,<sup>31</sup> Thomas Thorpe,<sup>32</sup> Richard Edwards,<sup>33</sup> Francis Meres,<sup>34</sup> Henry Chettle,<sup>35</sup> Hugh Holland,<sup>36</sup> Charles Fitzgeffrey,<sup>37</sup> William Basse,<sup>38</sup> John Davies of Hereford,<sup>39</sup> M.L.,<sup>40</sup> Sir John Davies,<sup>41</sup> Gervase Markham,<sup>42</sup> Robert Armin,<sup>43</sup> Joseph Hall,<sup>44</sup> John Marston,<sup>45</sup> Edmund Spenser,<sup>46</sup> Thomas Vicars,<sup>47</sup> Henry Peacham,<sup>48</sup> and above all Ben Jonson,<sup>49</sup> among others – all of whom left testimony establishing the presence of an Elizabethan/Jacobean authorship question if not, directly or indirectly, pointing to de Vere as the actual author.

In his analysis of the history of fraud and error in historical scholarship Bloch refers to the 18<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries – precisely the period to which the foundations of modern Shakespearean historiography and biography owe their genesis – as one of two major “mythomaniac” periods of European history consumed by a “passion for lying,” as exemplified in the Ossian fraud (1760) and Chatterton’s pseudo-Medieval forgeries (1769). Not since the high Middle Ages, in Bloch’s account, had Europe witnessed such a rash of literary hoaxes.

Bloch’s analysis is of some interest to the historian of Shakespeare scholarship. In his account, the period during which the remnants of the official Shakespeare biography were first reconstructed – from the far side of the great cataclysms of 17<sup>th</sup> century civil war, regicide, and restoration – by Rowe (1710), Steevens and Johnson (1773), Malone (1788), or Boswell (1821) was one in which “a vast symphony of deception resounded from one end of Europe to the other.”<sup>50</sup> Of course the labors of these honest and industrious men were not deceptive by intent, but even the unintentional lie begets many children, and Shakespearean criticism was not immune from the temptation to self-aggrandizing fraud of a more intentional and obvious kind. By 1776, when the brilliant self-fashioning actor William Garrick established the Stratford Jubilee, the socioeconomic forces that would shape the modern Shakespeare were already gathering head. It was not long before William Henry Ireland (1775 –1835), conscious of the hunger of both scholars and public for artifacts to solidify an already wobbly Stratford biography, embarked on a career of forgery that would eventually hornswoggle such gullible giants of the London scene as the Johnson biographer and Shakespearean editor James Boswell, who was so moved by Ireland’s haul that he knelt before the forgeries and kissed them.<sup>51</sup> Long before Edmund Malone floundered for sixteen years after telling a colleague that he had completed “half” of his life of the bard, before dying without publishing,<sup>52</sup> Ben Jonson had warned them: “What never was, will not easily be found; not by the most curious.”<sup>53</sup>

With respect to Bloch’s historiography, the subtle practices of 16<sup>th</sup> century truth-telling contrast starkly with the deceptive literalism of the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The way the scholarly tradition of our own century is remembered will hinge significantly on how it chooses to adapt to the challenges posed by the continued durability of Shakespearean apostasy. So far the response, to say the least, remains underwhelming. Repeating phrases like “Shakespeare beyond doubt”<sup>54</sup> is not scholarship, and is indeed not even good public relations. Literary historians taking their cue from Rowe, Boswell, or even Malone (who exposed Ireland’s forgeries), have missed the mark entirely when it comes to appreciating the greatest lesson

that Shakespeare's contemporaries bequeathed to posterity: the art of literature as a subversive activity. Richard Barnefield's 1598 poem is a fine specimen in the genre:

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

For the orthodox Shakespearean, everything runs according to plan here until the last two lines. Whatever has Barnefield in mind with this obscure *anadiplosis* of "ever,"<sup>55</sup> followed by the emphatic rhyming of "ever" and "never"? No wonder that when James Shapiro reproduces this poem, he cannot bring himself to print the last two lines.<sup>56</sup> *Mutatis mutandis*, the censor replaces the literary historian. What does not compute must – and will – be erased.



This issue of *Brief Chronicles* includes seven new articles from some of the leading scholars in the Oxfordian community. As usual, they span a wide range of perspectives and methodology – all of them, however, owe a methodological genesis in one way or another to the "Higher Criticism" of the 19<sup>th</sup> century rather than to the animadversions of the esteemed theologian Schmucker. The first of these, by British scholar and PhD candidate Kevin Gilvary, departs from the simple yet powerful observation that in the age of Shakespeare being a historian – like being a Bible translator or a comedian – was risky business. The telling of history was consciously ideological, as the story of Polydore Vergil's frequent revisions designed to please Henry VIII shows. And yet it is a mistake to conclude that historians, any more than poets, were all content to capitulate on matters of conscience. On the contrary, they followed the example of the ancients: as is well known to historians of the ancient world, Tacitus among others employed figurative speech and sly deviation in narrative structure to communicate dangerous ideas by innuendo, and this practice was imitated not only by such early modern literary writers as Shakespeare or Ben Jonson, but by historians like William Camden or John Haywarde.<sup>57</sup> Subtlety of speech did not respect any boundaries of genre in early modern England. Both poet and historian could follow the advice of Quintillian:

You can speak as openly as you like against...tyrants, as long as you can be understood differently, because you are not trying to avoid offense, only its dangerous repercussions. If danger can be avoided by some ambiguity of expression, everyone will admit its cunning.<sup>58</sup>

To such strategies of indirection, suggests Gilvary, we must add pseudonymous collaborative authorship. He argues convincingly that the actual writing by the authors of record of the two most important Elizabethan chronicles, Edward Hall and Raphael Holinshed has, like rumors of the death of Samuel Clemens, been greatly exaggerated. In the case of Hall, the final half of the book that bears his name seems instead to have been authored by the publisher and Protestant controversialist Richard Grafton, who took advantage of Halle's 1547 decease to publish an allegedly posthumous work containing his own controversial history of the early Tudors as a lengthy addendum to a work started by his deceased colleague Hall.

According to Gilvary the alleged author of Holinshed's *History of England, Ireland, and Scotland* (1577, 1587) was, like Hall, at least in part a front for other writers, in this case a consortium of effectively anonymous historians, hired by the triumvirate of the book's three dedicatees, William Cecil, Robert Dudley, and Baron Cobham, to write the history of what was still becoming the "United Kingdom." Drawing on the work of the editors of the massive Oxford University Press Holinshed project, Gilvary suggests that the consortium included William Harrison, Richard Stanihurst, and Edmund Campion. Later, in preparation for the second 1587 edition, Abraham Fleming, John Stow, William Patten, and Francis Thynne are each well known to have played a significant role in preparing the volume's supplementary materials. All these writers, in contrast to Holinshed himself, have well documented biographies revealing their active interest in literary or historical matters. As for the author of record, in Gilvary's analysis he "was a front man, his name being in effect a pseudonym, intended to deflect criticism and reaction away from the actual authors and from Cecil, who had promoted it."<sup>59</sup>

Katherine Chiljan's contribution to this issue, which examines the significance of the obscurely enigmatic rare 1601 book, *Love's Martyr*, spotlights a specific instance of the confabulation of the historical record. The book, which appears to survive in as few as four copies, claims to be a translation of the "venerable" – but also non-existent – "Italian Torquato Cæliano." This claim is a stunning example of a popular form of literary misdirection. Annabel Patterson, in her *Censorship and Interpretation*, specifically refers to the category of "translations from the classics," which simultaneously "allowed an author to limit his authorial responsibility for a text ('Tacitus wrote this, not I') and, paradoxically, provided an interpretative mechanism."<sup>60</sup> In the case of *Love's Martyr*, even the text's status as a "translation" is, however, a fiction; the author "Torquato Cæliano" is a phantasm.

Shakespearean scholars rarely acknowledge that this is the subversive context of the original publication of the enigmatic poem – by "William Shakespeare" – "The Phoenix and the Turtle." As Chiljan notes, the symbolism of this poem is part of the book's common mythographic stock and unifying symbolism of the martyrdom of true love. The entire first half of the book is devoted to a long narrative poem of the same title, by Robert Chester, who is generally regarded as the book's editor. Evidently a significant number of early modern literary figures shared an understanding of the book's symbolism; it contains thematically apt contributions

by Ben Jonson, John Marston, and George Chapman, among others. Dipping her toe in the choppy waters of the so-called “Prince Tudor” debate, Chiljan argues that the poem “can only be viewed as a thinly veiled commentary about the succession of Queen Elizabeth”,<sup>61</sup> closely read, the book encodes an allegory in which the “Phoenix queen” – as Elizabeth I was widely known in both literary and pictorial documents of the period – “had a lover and a child who should be recognized to settle the succession crisis.”<sup>62</sup> Tom Regnier’s article, “Did Tudor Succession Law Permit Royal Bastards to Inherit the Crown” provides a contrasting view of the controversial theory by examining the much-debated point of whether the notorious 1571 Treason Act could have been invoked,<sup>63</sup> as some have argued, to retroactively legitimize a hypothetical heir of the Queen’s body. Regnier judiciously concludes that, in light of the legal context,

The choice of the phrase “natural issue” over “lawful issue” in the 1571 Treason Act had almost no practical effect. It didn’t allow for bastards to inherit the crown; all it did was to leave a little wiggle room about what one could say about the succession. Most of those who have found great significance in the wording, both then and now, have done so because they have read much more into the statute than it actually says.<sup>64</sup>

This, of course, does not settle the “Prince Tudor”<sup>65</sup> question; we know that the Act, as we might expect if Regnier’s analysis is correct, was *not* invoked in an attempt to legitimize a Tudor heir. Instead, even though Elizabeth notoriously refused to name a successor, and even if to Shakespeare in 1603 “incertainties now crown[ed] themselves assured” (Sonnet 107), the Cecils guided the succession – with the tacit consent of most observers – to the Stuarts.

The inclusion of these two essays in this issue of *Brief Chronicles* exemplifies this journal’s serious commitment to open scholarship and debate, even on highly controversial topics. True scholarship does not avoid controversy – it embraces it, and seeks to examine contradictory hypotheses from as many perspectives as possible.

Likewise, Richard Whalen’s “Witches of *Macbeth*” illustrates the ongoing Oxfordian tradition of textual criticism that has contributed so much in recent years to a deeper apprehension of the complex unities of the Shakespearean plays. In this case Whalen focuses on the paradoxically dual character of the Macbeth witches, who function both as the deadly serious prophetic “weird sisters” of Norse tradition (allied to the Roman *Parcae*, or Fates), who tempt Macbeth to his fate, and also – in a role only rarely acknowledged in the critical literature – as Scottish hags who embody salacious brokers of vulgar jest. Whalen reasonably wonders how are we to take the Sisters’ prophecies seriously, intermingled as they are with coarse talk of sailors’ “chestnuts” and breaking wind. Drawing attention to the absence of critical attention to this dual character of the witches, which points to the author’s sophisticated knowledge of the history and practice of witchcraft, Whalen concludes that the problem of interpretation is central to the play’s dynamic:

Regardless of the author's identity, a fuller appreciation of the contrasting but complementary roles of the hybrid Weird Sisters/Scottish witches can lead to a better understanding of the dramatist's intention. He debunks witchcraft with bitter burlesque, which undermines the credibility of the witches' alter egos, the supernatural Weird Sisters, who personify Macbeth's unexamined interior promptings with their ambiguous prophecies. It is Macbeth's self-deception about these interior promptings, not simply overweening ambition, that leads to his tragic downfall and fate.<sup>66</sup>


In the most recent of his series of articles on the previously unrecognized influence of the Sternhold and Hopkins metrical psalms (*WBP*) in Shakespeare, Richard Waugaman in his contribution to this issue explores the significant imprint left by the *WBP* in *Henry VIII* and in Sonnets 24 and 33. Such psalms as the *WBP* 139, 51, 30, 12, 8, 34, 118, and 88 – all but the last three marked with manicules in the Sternhold and Hopkins psalms bound with de Vere Geneva Bible – argues Waugaman, are often echoed by intent (and sometimes unconsciously) in these Shakespearean texts: although the bard “was so familiar with the language of the Bible that its phrases seemed to flow from his pen spontaneously,”<sup>67</sup> such echoes as those of Psalm 139 in Sonnet 24 must be by intent since they

remind the fair youth that the psalms are a moral measure against which the Youth's inward character falls short....such Biblical allusions provide a window into de Vere's creativity, and into the conscious and unconscious associative processes that contribute to that creativity.<sup>68</sup>

Henry Peacham's 1611 *Minerva Britannia*, the most rhetorically sophisticated and historically consequential emblem book of the Jacobean era, has long played a significant role in the authorship question, primarily because its evocative title page illustrates the trope of concealed authorship (Figure One) accompanied by the provocative motto: “Mente Videbor – by the mind, I shall be seen.”







**Figure One: Title page of *Minerva Britannica* (1612) with *Mente Videbor* inscription.**

*Minerva Britannica*, an expression of the Elizabethan revival that grew up around Prince Henry Stuart (1594-1612), is a superlative expression of the Early Modern genre of the “wit” or puzzle book. The analyses of Eva Turner Clark<sup>69</sup> and the present writer<sup>70</sup> have argued that the book’s title page invokes a sophisticated anagram identifying Edward de Vere, 17<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford, as the real author of the Shakespearean plays. The present article explores a different and distinct dimension of Peacham’s book, namely its intense arithmetic structure. Arguing that the book is unified through a coherent designed based on the series of Pythagorean triangular numbers ( $t(n) = n(n+1)/2$ ), the article suggests that *Minerva Britannica* is

organized around a subliminal but coherent numerical schema...[which] not only communicates Peacham’s mystical affirmation of the Pythagorean doctrine, that all things are composed of number, but also reiterates, through its concealed design and esoteric symbolism, a preoccupation with the Renaissance ideal of the monumental and memorializing function of literature.<sup>71</sup>

Like Richard Waugaman's study of the influence of the *WPB* psalms in Shakespeare, Bonner Miller Cutting's "A Countess Transformed: How Lady Susan Vere Became Lady Anne Clifford" represents another chapter in a series of important articles by the author, in this case on early English portraiture.<sup>72</sup> The present article elaborates arguments first presented in the spring 2009 issue of *Shakespeare Matters* regarding the famous Wilton portrait of the family of Phillip Herbert, 4<sup>th</sup> earl of Pembroke, the son-in-law of Edward de Vere, 17<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford. The painting conspicuously includes among the family a portrait long believed – correctly, as Cutting shows – to be Herbert's first wife, the Lady Susan de Vere Herbert (1587–1628/29). In 1900 Sir Lionel Cust, against all the evidence of tradition and protocols of scholarly analysis, transformed the lady into Pembroke's second wife, Anne Clifford (1590 – 1676) – and she has remained so misidentified ever since. Cutting's article constitutes a dramatic illustration of the processes by which the error of a single witness is transmuted into the perpetration of a falsehood that lasts for generations in the historical record. Only industrious independent scholarship such as that exemplified in Cutting's article can set the record straight.

The incredulous reader may wonder why, in light of the impressive evidence Cutting cites, over a hundred years of scholarly dissimulation has tried to erase Susan de Vere from the Wilton portrait and why it takes an independent scholar, without a university affiliation, to begin to set the record straight, when all the king's horses and all the king's men couldn't do it. From the point of view of the authorship skeptic, however, the reason is uncomfortably obvious; "social circumstances" favored the misconception. By 1920 when J. Thomas Looney published his "*Shakespeare Identified*," it was apparent that Susan de Vere's father was the leading candidate among alternative theories of the genesis of the Shakespearean works. Given that her husband, the 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Pembroke, was, with his elder brother William, the dedicatee of the 1623 Shakespeare folio, the ghostly presence of Susan Vere in the family portrait had become a potent and disturbing symbol of the close family ties between de Vere and the two folio patrons:

If the Wilton House catalogues and the family biographies are any indication, the Pembroke family descendants – her *own* descendants – have systematically removed from her rightful place in the family chronicles. Only one little problem remains after centuries of a deliberate effort to erase her memory: Countess Susan Vere's face cannot be erased from the Van Dyck masterpiece on the wall at Wilton House.<sup>73</sup>

— From the General Editor



❧ **Endnotes** ❧



- <sup>1</sup> *Patristic Scholarship. The Edition of St. Jerome*, ed., trans. and annotated by James Brady and John C. Olin, LXI of *Collected Works of Erasmus*, Toronto: University Press, 1972, 75. As Harold Love observes in his excellent survey, *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction*, Cambridge: The University Press, 2002, 19, Erasmus in his 1516 introduction to the second volume of his edition of Jerome declares a purpose “first to set forth the causes that give rise to...*spuria* and secondly to demonstrate the signs and inferential evidence by which false attribution may be detected” (see Brady and Olin, 71). The possible influence of this volume on Ben Jonson’s construction of the preliminary matter of the 1623 Shakespeare First Folio may be a rich topic for further inquiry.
- <sup>2</sup> Maurice Bloch, *The Historian’s Craft*. Introduction by Joseph R. Strayer. Translated from the French by Peter Putnam. New York: Vintage Books, 1953, 101.
- <sup>3</sup> David McPherson, *Ben Jonson’s Library and Marginalia: an Annotated Catalog*. Vol. 5. Studies in Philology, 1974 71. University of North Carolina Press, 1974.
- <sup>4</sup> Annales historians emphasized social and economic, as opposed to diplomatic or military history, and were instrumental in introducing the use of statistical and sociological models into historiography. Annales school historians considered mental frameworks that shape practice as more fundamental than particular historical events. Fernand Braudel’s epic *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Phillip II* (1949, English translation 1972) is perhaps the most outstanding popular exemplar of the genre.
- <sup>5</sup> Bloch was executed ten days *after* D-day, and Paris was liberated on August 25, less than three months later.
- <sup>6</sup> Bloch, 107.
- <sup>7</sup> Bloch, 90-91.
- <sup>8</sup> Bloch, 74, 75-76.
- <sup>9</sup> Francis Meres, *Palladis Tamia; Wits Treasury. With a preface for the Garland Edition by Arthur Freeman*. New York: Garland, 1972, 271. Originally published 1598.
- <sup>10</sup> C.H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, eds. *Ben Jonson, Vol. VIII, The Poems & The Prose Works*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1954, 585.

- <sup>11</sup> “Shakespeare Authorship Question,” Wikipedia, accessed 3/29/2013.
- <sup>12</sup> Stanley Wells, “Is This the Bard We See Before Us? Or Someone Else,” *Washington Post* B2, March 18, 2007.
- <sup>13</sup> Warren Hope and Kim Holston, *The Shakespeare Controversy: An Analysis of the Claimants to Authorship, and Their Champions and Detractors*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 1992.
- <sup>14</sup> James Shapiro, *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 2010, 263.
- <sup>15</sup> Shapiro, 76. Needless to say, this claim to have read Schmucker’s mind is not justified in his book. Hank Sanders more accurately summarizes Schmucker’s argument as one in which “It is easier to believe Jesus rose from the dead than to believe Shaksper wrote Shakespeare.” “Shakesvere” Facebook discussion page, 3/26/2013.
- <sup>16</sup> The antecedents of 19<sup>th</sup> century Higher criticism lie in the work of the Dutch scholars Desiderius Erasmus (1466? – 1536) and Benedict Spinoza (1632–1677), and later, specifically in New Testament criticism, Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834).
- <sup>17</sup> Heward Wilkinson, “On the Significance of the Longevity of the Shakespeare Authorship Question,” *Shake-Speares-Bible.com* October 31, 2011.
- <sup>18</sup> Ruth Loyd Miller, ed. “*Shakespeare*” *Identified in Edward De Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford*, by J. Thomas Looney. Vol. II, *Oxfordian Vistas*. 3rd ed. Jennings, Louisiana: Minos Publishing Company, 1975. Charlton Ogburn, *The Mysterious William Shakespeare: The Myth and the Reality*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1984.
- <sup>19</sup> Cited in Edwin Reed, *Noteworthy Opinions, Pro and Con. Bacon vrs. Shaksper*. Boston: Coburn Publishing, 1905, 46.
- <sup>20</sup> J.B. Leishman, *The Three Parnassus Plays*. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1949, 337 (line 1767). The play is the third in a series also including *Pilgrimage to Parnassus* and *First Returne from Parnassus*, all dated 1598-1601 by editor Leishman. The plays were written and performed for a student audience at St. John’s College Cambridge. Only the *Second Returne* was published, in 1606, the other two being extant only in manuscript (See Leishman 1-23 for a detailed and lucid textual history).
- <sup>21</sup> *Troilus*, 5.2.25.
- <sup>22</sup> Anne Barton, reviewing James Shapiro’s *A Year In the Life*. *New York Review of Books*, May 11, 2006.
- <sup>23</sup> On this remarkable saga of conspicuous error, see Roger Stritmatter, “James Shapiro and the Hunt for the ‘Notorious Hyphen,’ Parts I & II,” *Shake-Speares-Bible.com*. Web. Accessed 3/29/2013.
- <sup>24</sup> Shapiro, 236: “Meres likens modern English writers to ancient Roman ones... when it comes to finding a match for both Plautus and Terence, ‘the best for comedy and tragedy.’” Needless to say, Francis Meres did not think, as Shapiro seems to, that Terence was a writer of tragedies. The actual wording of the *Palladis Tamia* passage to which Shapiro refers is “As Plautus and *Seneca* are accounted the best for Comedy and Tragedy among the Latins,

so Shakespeare among ye English is the most excellent in both kinds for the stage” (282; emphasis added).

- <sup>25</sup> Chiljan, 266.
- <sup>26</sup> Charles Wisner Barrell, “New Milestone in Shakespearean Research: ‘Gentle Master William.’” *Shakespeare Fellowship Quarterly* V, no. 4 (October 1944): 49–66. See also Chiljan, Katherine. *Shakespeare Suppressed: The Uncensored Truth About Shakespeare and His Works*. San Francisco: Faire Editions, 2011, 247-50, 244-45.
- <sup>27</sup> Mark K. Anderson & Roger Stritmatter. “The Potent Testimony of Gabriel Harvey.” *Shakespeare Matters* 1, no. 2 (Winter 2002): 26–29; Mark Anderson, “Shakespeare” *By Another Name: The Life of Edward De Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, the Man Who Was Shakespeare*. New York: Gotham Books, 2005, 138-41; Chiljan, 250-53.
- <sup>28</sup> Miller, 23. For a more comprehensive consideration of Barnfield’s comments on the “Shake-speare,” see Peter W. Dickson, *Bardgate: Shake-speare and the Royalists who Stole the Bard*. Mt. Vernon, Ohio: Printing Arts Press, 2011, 142-46.
- <sup>29</sup> Miller, 24.
- <sup>30</sup> Miller, 31-35.
- <sup>31</sup> Miller, 27; Chiljan, 260-61.
- <sup>32</sup> John M. Rollett, “Secrets of the Dedication to Shakespeare’s Sonnets.” *The Oxfordian* II (1999): 59–75. See also the fine discussion of Steven McClarran (pseud.), *I Come to Bury Shaksper*, 2011, 128-29, which analyzes the Stratfordian avoidance pattern that typifies their treatment of early evidence that undermines or contradicts conventional assumptions.
- <sup>33</sup> Roger Stritmatter, “‘Tilting Under Frieries’: Narcissus (1595) and the Affair at Blackfriars.” *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 70 (fall 2006): 39–41; Chiljan, 253-54.
- <sup>34</sup> Robert Detobel and K.C. Ligon. “Francis Meres and the Earl of Oxford.” *Brief Chronicles I* (2009): 97–108.
- <sup>35</sup> Chiljan, 258-59.
- <sup>36</sup> Miller, 25; Draft manuscript, Roger Stritmatter and John Tanke, “Themes and Variations on the Shakespeare Enigma: Hugh Holland and the ‘Sweet Swan of Avon.’”
- <sup>37</sup> Mark Anderson, “Shakespeare” *By Another Name*, New York: Gotham Books, 2005, 336.
- <sup>38</sup> As Miller, II: 31-36, points out, Basse – the author of the one the most important manuscript poems on “Shakespeare” (circa 1623), was a retainer in the household in of Francis, Lord Norris, husband to Bridget de Vere, the youngest of the three daughters of the 17<sup>th</sup> Earl.
- <sup>39</sup> Chiljan, 259-60, 264-65.
- <sup>40</sup> Chiljan, 261-63.
- <sup>41</sup> Warren Hope, “The Singing Swallow: Sir John Davies and Shakespeare.” *The Elizabethan Review* 1:1 (Spring 1993): 21–39; Chiljan, 254-57.
- <sup>42</sup> On Markham’s remarkable 1623 statement about de Vere, coincident with the publication of the Shakespeare Folio, see Roger Stritmatter, *Edward de Vere’s*

- Geneva Bible* (University of Massachusetts PhD dissertation, 2001), 29.
- <sup>43</sup> Abraham Feldman, "Shakespeare's Jester—Oxford's Servant," *The Shakespeare Fellowship Quarterly* 8:3 (Autumn 1947), 39-43. Anderson, 325, 547.
- <sup>44</sup> McClarran, 353-55. Discussing both Hall and Marston, McClarran quotes tellingly from the orthodox H.N. Gibson (*The Shakespeare Claimants*, London: Methuen, 1972): "We may agree that Hall is patting himself on the back because he has guessed the identity of an author writing under a pseudonym and collaborating with an inferior poet, and that he is aiming his satire at the author [of Shakespeare], but that he believed Bacon to be the author in question is not so certain" (cited in McClarran, 353). Comments McClarran: "Gibson leaves no doubt whatsoever that he believed that both Hall and Marston considered the name Shakespeare to be a pseudonym, and that such doubts were alive in 1597-98" (355).
- <sup>44</sup> McClarran, 353-55.
- <sup>45</sup> Chiljan, 245-47.
- <sup>46</sup> Percy Allen, *Anne Cecil, Elizabeth & Oxford*. London: Dennis Archer, 1934, provides an excellent introduction to this fascinating topic.
- <sup>47</sup> Fred Schurink, "An Unnoticed Early Reference to Shakespeare," *Notes and Queries*, 53:1 March 2006), 72-75.
- <sup>48</sup> Eva Turner Clarke, *The Man Who Was Shakespeare*. (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1937), 253-57. Magri, Noemi "The Latin Mottoes on the Title-Page of H. Peacham's *Minerva Britannia*," *The De Vere Society Newsletter* 3:3 (May 1999), 5-6. Criticisms of Clarke are addressed in Roger Stritmatter, "The Not-Too-Hidden Key to *Minerva Britannia*: The Latin Phrase, 'by the Mind 'T' Shall be Seen' May Mean Just That..." *Shakespeare Oxford Newsletter* 36:2 (Summer 2000).
- <sup>49</sup> Miller, II: 17. *Sir George Greenwood, Ben Jonson and Shakespeare*, London: Cecil Palmer, 1921; Gerald H. Rendall, *Ben Jonson and the First Folio Edition of Shakespeare's Plays* (n.d.); Charlton Ogburn, *The Mysterious William Shakespeare: The Myth and the Reality*, New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1984, 221-235.
- <sup>50</sup> Bloch, 94.
- <sup>51</sup> Péter Dávidházi, "He Drew the Liturgy and Framed the Rites': The Changing Role of Religious Disposition and Shakespeare's Reception," *Shakespeare Survey* 54 (2001): 46-56.
- <sup>52</sup> On the history of this ill-fated project, see the instructive synopsis, verging on *peribathous*, of Samuel Schoenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives*, Oxford: The University Press, 1991, 169-178. Malone's "fragment of a biography" has "redeeming excellences": "Revising his earlier notes, he is able to show, once and for all, that John did not have ten (or eleven) children, but eight, of whom five lived to maturity; and that he was married not twice or three times, but only once. He correct identifies the source of the confusion, the shoemaker John Shakespeare, whom he shrewdly deduces – from the sum he paid to the

Company of Shoemakers and Saddlers for his freedom – not to have been a native of Stratford” (174), and etc.

<sup>53</sup> Herford and Simpson, 586.

<sup>54</sup> See the forthcoming 2013 Cambridge University Press volume, *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt*, Paul Edmondson and Stanley Wells, eds. – a book which, judging by its republication contents, seems to be guided by the editorial premise that repeating an already failing message in a louder and louder volume will persuade the skeptical.

<sup>55</sup> *Anadiplosis*, which the *Arte of English Poesie* also terms “the doubler,” is “one sort of repetition” involving “a speedie iteration of one word, but with some little intermission by inserting one or two words betweene” (Arber, ed., London, 1869, 211).

<sup>56</sup> Shapiro follows this glaring attempt to suborn the historical record by claiming that “the rhymes are a bit wooden, but the message was clear: Shakespeare is a writer to be reckoned with” (235). On the contrary, as Peter Dickson remarks, “this conspicuous, deliberate deletion is a sure sign that Stratfordians do not want readers to see those two extra lines because they might conclude that Barnfield was fingering Oxford as the true bard with this play on the words ‘ever’ and ‘never’ (being anagrams of ‘Vere’ and ‘N.ed Vere’), which again is also a pattern seen in the epistle to *Troilus and Cressida*” (146).

<sup>57</sup> See, for example, the huge controversy over the Latin preface to Haywarde’s controversial 1599 *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IV* or the questions put to Haywarde by the Attorney General, Sir Edward Coke, in Janet Clare, “*Art Made Tongue-tied by Authority*”: Elizabethan and Jacobean Censorship, Manchester: University Press, 1990, 61-68.

<sup>58</sup> On the use of purposeful ambiguity to avoid censorship, see Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Reading and Writing in Early Modern England*, Madison, WI, 1984. The citation is from Quintillian, *Institutio Oratoria*, IX.ii.67.

<sup>59</sup> Gilvary, 12.

<sup>60</sup> Patterson, 65.

<sup>61</sup> Chiljan, 25.

<sup>62</sup> Chiljan, 29.

<sup>63</sup> See, for example, Paul Streitz, (*Oxford: Son of Queen Elizabeth I*, Oxford Institute Press, 2001), for whom “the act in one stroke made Edward de Vere, 17<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford, heir to the throne, legitimate offspring of Elizabeth or not” (139). Streitz’ book argues that de Vere was actually the changeling child son of Elizabeth and Admiral Seymour.

<sup>64</sup> Regnier, 51.

<sup>65</sup> On the term “Tudor Heir,” see Bonner Miller Cutting, “She Will Not Be a Mother,” *Brief Chronicles III*, 169-99.

<sup>66</sup> Whalen, 67.

<sup>67</sup> Whalen, 73.

<sup>68</sup> Whalen, 75, 77.

<sup>69</sup> Eva Turner Clark, *The Man Who Was Shakespeare*. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1937, 253-57.

<sup>70</sup> Roger Stritmatter, "The Not-too-Hidden Key to *Minerva Britanna*," *Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter* 36:2 (Summer 2000): 1, 9–15, 17. The late Professor Noemi Magri, while questioning the existence of the anagram, concurs that "the Latin mottoes [of the title page] with their corroborating visual representation of the theatre curtain might lead one to the identification of Lord Oxford. It is unmistakable that the concepts expressed in the inscriptions can rightly be applied to his life." See Noemi Magri, "Latin Mottoes on the Title-Page of Henry Peacham's *Minerva Britanna*." *Elizabethan Review* 7, no. 1 (1999): 65–69.

<sup>71</sup> Stritmatter, 103.

<sup>72</sup> See Bonner Miller Cutting, "The Case of the Wrong Countess," *Shakespeare Matters* 8:2, 1, 13-22, 28 and "Time is Out of Joint: Chronological Incongruence in Early Modern English Portraitsures," *De Vere Society Newsletter*, 16:3, 20-24.

<sup>73</sup> Cutting, 128.