

## To Whom it May Concern: Greetings

Great floods have flown  
From simple sources, and great seas have dried  
When miracles have by the greatest been denied.

—Helena, *All's Well that Ends Well*

his third issue of *Brief Chronicles* goes to the electronic press at a watershed moment in authorship studies. The “seismic transformation in public awareness”<sup>1</sup> recently predicted by Shakespeare Fellowship President Earl Showerman is well underway. Stimulated not only by the massive exposure to the Oxford case brought on by *Anonymous* and at least two about-to-be-released independent documentaries, the shift is also being enabled by the vigorous development of new organs of scholarship and communication such as *Brief Chronicles*, and an entire spectrum of new authorship blogs. Given the intellectual inertia (or worse) involved in the authorship question, it would be rash to predict an optimistic timetable for the Oxford revolution – but there is no doubt that the “handwriting is on the wall” as never before.

New books on the authorship question, most of them by a new generation of talented and dedicated Oxfordians, continue to expand our intellectual horizons and inject both sense and sensibility into the study of the English literary renaissance. Check out the reviews in this issue if you don’t believe me. The editor could not stop them. As Ben Jonson said of the bard, “sufflimandus erat.” They just kept coming.

How else can one explain the extraordinary new energy that has been injected into the authorship debate by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust’s sponsorship of the new “Sixty Minutes with Shakespeare” attempt to rebut the anti-Stratfordian case? Released two full months before *Anonymous*, the online program prominently features such paragons of scholarship as the Prince of Wales, speaking out on behalf of the Birthplace on topics such as “Gaps in the record,” “Where did Shakespeare get his money?” or “Why aren’t there any books in the Shakespeare Will?” Despite enlisting sixty experts, the Trust apparently could not find anyone to address the topic of connections between the plays and the Earl of Oxford’s life, although the ubiquitous Professor Alan Nelson did weigh in on “Factual objections to Oxford” as the author.

The Trust has yet to learn the importance of Richard Feynman's first principle of inquiry: you must not fool yourself, and you are the easiest person to fool.

The editor has learned over the years that the best strategy for following Feynman's advice is to cultivate the ability to argue the contrary position in its strongest possible formulation. For example, the Stratfordians have a monument in Stratford, a name on some title pages, and even a 1623 folio that alludes convincingly to that monument and purports to represent an "author" associated with it. What they don't have, and never have had, is an *actual* author with a biographical footprint to match his literary remains. As Mark Twain put it, "when we find a vague file of chipmunk tracks stringing through the dust of Stratford village, we know by our reasoning powers that Hercules has been along there."<sup>2</sup> In words of William H. Furness, already quoted in an earlier issue of *Brief Chronicles* but deserving repetition until their significance becomes more readily apparent, anti-Stratfordians are those who have "never been able to bring the life of William Shakespeare within planetary space of the plays. Are there any two things in the world more incongruous?"<sup>3</sup>

It is this massive failure of biographical inquiry that lies behind the complaint that Oxfordians fail to apprehend the mysterious workings of literary creativity. As put by James Shapiro, "the claim that Shakespeare of Stratford lacked the life experiences to have written the plays" is "disheartening" because "it diminishes the very thing that makes him so exceptional: his imagination."<sup>4</sup> Implicit in this view is an unarticulated admission of orthodoxy's failure to discover meaningful connections between the life of their author and his "imagination." All that's left for them is *imagination* – which is for Stratfordians less a term of literary criticism than of ideology.

As Charles Beauclerk has said, Shakespearean traditionalists like Shapiro confuse imagination with fantasy. Imagination is the power of the mind to work upon what the senses provide. It is not the antithesis of what is given to the senses, but a creative, synthetic transformation. Rather than juxtaposing "imagination" and experience, a literary criticism committed to the inductive principles of post-enlightenment inquiry ought to be asking how they undergo fusion in the creative act. Like so much else in the current sophistic treatment of the authorship question, the idea that the Oxfordians are, as a school, insensitive to the creative process is more a matter of the convenient rewriting of intellectual history to suit complacent prejudices and reinforce pre-existing biases than an authentic representation of the view it purports to challenge. Here is how Charlton Ogburn, writing more than half a century ago, put the problem, now inherited by Shapiro's orthodox colleagues without – for them at least – any credible resolution in sight:

In a way, it may be considered a tribute to the works of this genius that almost from the time of his death the large majority of people have been content tacitly to assume that these works were given to the world like manna. All of a sudden, in the conventional view—or at best after a few years' gestation of a most mysterious kind—the dramas and poems simply appeared, full-panoplied, like Pallas from the brow of Zeus. What was their substance? Why were they written? More than three centuries of critical scholarship throw

no light upon these questions. Indeed, such questions seem hardly to have arisen in scholastic minds. What manner of man was he who brought forth the supreme works of literature of our language? "Little," we are told, "is known of the author of the plays"; or, in a shameless imposition upon our credulity, we are given "lives" of Shakespeare which are airy imaginings undisciplined except by a few facts largely irrelevant.<sup>5</sup>

An industry in denial – as the Shakespeare Authorship Coalition defines it in its recent rebuttal to the Birthplace Trust's "60 Minutes" – must eventually come face to face with whatever it's avoiding. As this passage from Ogburn suggests, Oxfordians have wrestled fruitfully for decades with the very problems Stratfordians conveniently accuse them of ignoring; indeed, the *status quo ante* in Shakespearean studies has over and over again pointed to the intellectual emptiness of appeals to the explanatory force of such abstractions as "creativity," "genius," or "imagination," ungrounded in historical, biographical, or artistic circumstance. This is not to deny that the search for relevant Oxfordian context has sometimes encouraged excessive indulgence in a kind of literalist reductionism. Stratfordians are right that imagination is important; they are wrong in accusing Oxfordians of trying to deny its importance, and even more wrong in supposing that it can substitute for actual experience – including rigorous training. Even the most talented musician must do scales, and a writer without books is no writer at all. At its best, as Ogburn suggests, Oxfordian scholarship has brought to bear an interdisciplinary methodology aimed at appreciating "the voice of the artist," which only speaks to us with "added force and illumination with the passage of centuries."<sup>6</sup>

The interdisciplinary nature of an authorship inquiry grounded in first principles is well represented in the essays included in this issue. Leading off our volume is Michael Wainwright's "Veering toward an Evolutionary *Hamlet*," a highly disciplined yet creative fusion of Darwin, Freud, and the great sociologist Edvard Westermarck, who first established that propinquity in childhood under normal conditions produces sexual avoidance in adults. This biologically based, natural pattern of incest avoidance breaks down, however, under conditions of the concentration of state power in royal families. It is also complicated by such social inventions as the Elizabethan wardship system in which Edward de Vere was raised, where adoptive siblings were often forced into marriage for reasons of the acquisition of power and property. In his application of a sociobiological model to the dynamics of Shakespearean authorship, Wainwright's essay fulfills the prediction

of William McFee in his introduction to the 1948 second edition of "*Shakespeare Identified*." The book, declared McFee, is "destined to occupy, in modern Shakespearean controversy, the place Darwin's great work occupies in Evolutionary theory. It may be superseded, but all modern discussion of the authorship of the plays and poems stems from it, and owes the author an inestimable debt."<sup>7</sup>

Drawing both from orthodox and Oxfordian criticism, Wainwright demonstrates that *Hamlet* bears the unmistakable imprint of Oxford's biography. Arguing that "one paradigm shift, from the Stratfordian to the Oxfordian, finds substantiation from another, the shift from the Cartesian to the Freudian,"<sup>8</sup> Wainwright delivers an

interdisciplinary *tour de force* that reads *Hamlet* as a “psychological palimpsest created by the displacement, condensation, and overdetermination”<sup>9</sup> of the dreamlike powers of the artist. Written from within the endogamous confines of the prison house of aristocratic wardship, the ontology invoked in *Hamlet* “describes a snare between the biological man, whom Freud underestimates, the man beset with unconscious psychological demands, whom Westermarck underestimates, and the conscientiously lawful prince [Hamlet] must be.”<sup>10</sup> In his successful negotiation, the artist “offered exogamous stock to the aristocracy, and thus succeeded where monarchies by necessity usually fail.”<sup>11</sup>

The eighth in a series of articles by Earl Showerman on Greek influences in the Shakespeare plays,<sup>12</sup> the offering in this volume, “Shakespeare’s Greater Greek: *Macbeth* and Aeschylus’ *Oresteia*,” reveals a longstanding contradiction in the orthodox scholarship on Shakespeare’s classical influences. Unlike Euripides, several of whose plays were widely available in vernacular translations within the lifetime of the author and were widely known among the Elizabethan literati, Aeschylus, even to the average literate Elizabethan, remained essentially an untranslated *terra incognita*; not even one of his plays had been translated into Italian, French, English, German or Spanish before 1600. Knowledge of the Greek original such as the Vettori (Henri Estienne Paris, 1557, 1567), or a Latin translation such as the Saint-Ravy (Basel, 1555)<sup>13</sup> was the forbidding prerequisite for a Shakespeare able to draw on Aeschylus. Yet Showerman documents an extensive tradition confirming Aeschylan influence on “the most classical of all Shakespearean plays,” a work exhibiting “innumerable instances of striking similarity” in “metaphorical mintage” from Aeschylus. Despite this, Showerman’s review of the critical literature on Shakespeare’s classical, and more specifically Aeschylan, influences reveals a clear pattern of avoidance behavior. Shakespearean scholars can’t really deny compelling evidence for the bard’s firsthand knowledge of Aeschylus, but they also don’t want to “go there.” Even J. Churton Collins, who “has gone farther than any 20<sup>th</sup> century scholar” in documenting the appearance of a direct link between the bard of Athens and the author of *Macbeth*, concludes that “we must *assume* that *instinct* led Shakespeare to the Greek conception of the scope and functions of tragedy.”<sup>14</sup>

*Assume....instinct....imagination.* Such keywords are the semantic flags of an industry in denial.

A very different kind of influence – one contemporary with the bard’s own life and times – is the focus of Richard Whalen’s survey of scholarship on the *commedia dell Arte*. Like Showerman’s essay, the key word here would be “comprehensive.” Whalen’s essay exemplifies how thoroughly the best Oxfordian scholarship has assimilated the insights of traditional scholars, and how effective it can be in exposing intrinsic contradictions that cry out for post-Stratfordian synthesis. The elusive, unscripted dramatic practice of the *commedia dell Arte*, arguably left a deeper and more pervasive stamp on *Othello* and other plays than any other theatrical art of the bard’s own generation.

The same ambivalence noted by Showerman – between the “he must have” and the “no evidence that he did” – is evident in Whalen’s study: while a surprising abundance of testimony points to a direct, resonant, and comprehensive influence of

the *commedia* on the characterizations, satiric tone, and improvisational ethos of the Shakespeare plays, these findings have readily been ignored for lack of any credible biographical context.

Such practices expose the essentially ideological role that “biography” has come to play in Shakespearean criticism by the early 21<sup>st</sup> century. At least one highly regarded hypothetical author “lived in Venice and traveled in northern Italy for about five months in 1575-76, when he was in his impressionable mid-20s and when *commedia dell’arte* was flourishing there,” where he “had ample opportunity to see *commedia* performances in the public squares and in the palaces of the rich and the nobility.”<sup>15</sup> But the response to this fact by traditional Shakespeareans is best summarized by the title of a recent biography: to the average Shakespearean scholar, the Earl of Oxford remains not just a biographical enigma, but a “monstrous adversary.”<sup>16</sup>

The third of our articles dealing with what might broadly be termed Shakespeare’s “domains of knowledge” is Thomas Regnier’s study of legal themes in *Hamlet*. Like Showerman and Whalen, Regnier brings to this topic not only a formidable record of his own scholarship<sup>17</sup> but a close reading of the relevant critical tradition. This includes two outstanding and underestimated articles by another lawyer, Tony Burton, whose work, although written from a nominally orthodox perspective, has for a decade implicitly challenged many of the presumptions on which this view is predicated. As an independent scholar, Burton was unimpeded by the epistemic constraints imposed by struggle for professional advancement in an intellectual context that still finds it expedient to substitute ridicule and ostracism for rational engagement of relevant factual and theoretical questions. Regnier finds that *Hamlet* “contains legal issues that parallel watershed events in Oxford’s life, particular events that concerned homicide and property law.”<sup>18</sup> Drawing also on Nina Green’s detailed study of the finances of the Oxford Earldom published in *Brief Chronicles I*,<sup>19</sup> he concludes that the dominant *Hamlet* theme of frustrated inheritance is foreshadowed in the decline of Oxford’s estate under the Machiavellian machinations of Robert Dudley, who in 1562 became legal supervisor of the Oxford estates on the death of the 16<sup>th</sup> Earl.

Regnier’s study of the legal subtext of *Hamlet* reminds us of the central role that legal analysis has always played in a fully informed and conscientious Shakespeare scholarship. To define Shakespearean studies as consisting of “Shakespeare – not law” is to indulge in an elementary error of binary either/or logic that not only mistakes the object of its own study but also parodies the authentic quest for knowledge. When joined to the proofs of the other divergent domains of knowledge embodied in the plays and documented by Showerman and Whalen, the legal erudition displayed in *Hamlet* cannot fail to strike the unprejudiced reader as a powerful contradiction of the orthodox paradigm of authorship. This most autobiographical of plays reveals an author conversant with abstruse legal principles that ultimately invoke the traditional conflict between law and equity.<sup>20</sup> The Stratfordians are half right. Shakespeare did not think like a lawyer. He thought like a judge, a brilliantly imaginative judge with a literary message about equity.

Together these first four essays present the orthodox biographical tradition

with a formidable challenge from circumstantial fact pattern. As exemplified in the substantive, but consistently ignored or unjustly deprecated scholarship of such writers as those represented here, authorship studies may lack the official approval of the academy, but it cannot fail an impartial test of either comprehensiveness or credibility. Those who suppose that Oxfordian scholarship is confined to a narrowly defined biographical register enabled by naïveté about the complex interrelatedness of experience and art will be disappointed. These writers bring credibility to their analyses because they have studied and contemplated their subjects with as much, or greater, passion and intellect as the best professional scholars in their respective fields of inquiry. And they have done so in an atmosphere free from the need to gain social approval by reaching preordained conclusions aimed at advancing themselves professionally by flattering peers who are still fooling themselves more effectively than anyone else could. These essays, then, highlight various dimensions of the “myriad minded” experience deposited in the plays, confirming what smart scholars have always known even if they are reluctant to admit it: the range and subtlety of this Renaissance author transcends the confines of the territorial borders that characterize the modern intellectual division of labor within academia. These scholars explore not just the intersection of the biological and biographical (Wainwright), but classical (Showerman), theatrical (Whalen), and legal (Regnier) aspects of the plays.

The evidence cited in both Showerman’s and Whalen’s articles suggests that the alchemical transformation of lived experience into great literature was facilitated by the author’s having had access to an exceptionally wide range of books. Abraham Lincoln and Fredrick Douglass, both omnivorous readers, were advantaged by reading both the Bible and Shakespeare, among many other books. The bard himself read not only the Bible and Seneca (among many other books), but also Aeschylus. Given the imprint of such untranslated sources as the *Oresteia*, as documented in Showerman’s essay, he was (notwithstanding Ben Jonson’s deliberately ambiguous gibe) conversant in Greek, as well as Latin, Italian, and French. His knowledge of Italian geography, as documented in Richard Roe’s recent *Shakespeare Guide to Italy* (see review this issue, 279-284), is matched by a versatile awareness of the forms and possibilities inherent in the popular *commedia dell Arte* – which, however, influential it may have been in 16<sup>th</sup> century Italy or even France, was virtually non-existent in Elizabeth’s England. The author, like his creation Jacques, seems to have been a traveler, indulging a literary melancholy “compounded of many simples, extracted from many objects, and indeed the sundry contemplation of my travels” (*AYLI* 4.1.15-16).

The fifth contribution to this volume, Robert Prechter’s “On the Authorship of *Avisa*,” concentrates a spotlight on one of the most intriguing and unresolved authorship enigmas of the 1590s. Prechter argues that *Willowbie His Avisa*, conventionally attributed by the pseudonymous editor “Hadrian Dorrell” to Henry Willobie, is a work by George Gascoigne, written sometime in the 1570s not long before Gascoigne’s death and reflecting an allegory of Elizabeth’s royal suitors from the perspective of that temporal horizon. Like his previous iconoclastic article on *Hundredth Sundrie Flowres* (1573),<sup>21</sup> Prechter breaks new ground in attributing to Gascoigne a work sometimes assigned to Matthew Roydon<sup>22</sup> or even to the Earl of

Oxford. We are pleased that Prechter's previous article has stimulated vigorous debate, printed in this issue (see "Kreiler and Prechter on *Hundredth Sundrie Flowres*," 294-314), and hope that his further contributions will continue to promote thoughtful methodological dialogue.

Our next essay, Bonner Miller Cutting's "She Will Not Be a Mother: Evaluating the Seymour Prince Tudor Hypothesis," seems destined to upset more than the average number of readers. For far too long, in my opinion, the so-called "Prince Tudor" debate has suffered from various forms of intolerance and irrational combativeness from nearly every side. Miller's article refreshingly cuts through a great deal of the emotional posturing to show that there is good historical reason to suspect that Princess Elizabeth Tudor may well have become pregnant – as wide rumor speculated – by the unscrupulous Admiral Seymour in spring 1548. Cutting asks a simple but provocative question to which there is but one obvious answer: if there was nothing to such rumors, why did the Princess remain sequestered in Anthony Denny's country manor of Cheshunt from May, when she left Queen Katherine's household, until December – a full seven months, during which time she missed several critical opportunities to "show" herself in public in order to quell the rumors of her pregnancy. In the course of establishing this possibility Cutting revisits some long-assumed interpretations of known historical events such as the famous "teasing" event during which the Katherine, the wife of Elizabeth's alleged molester, supposedly was having a romp with the princess by slicing off her dress in the garden. This received story, suggests Cutting, is a thinly veiled cover for a much more serious and scandalous reality. The "tease" was an *assault*:

Cutting off the clothes of a Princess was not an everyday occurrence in a royal household. It suggests that there was nothing playful about it. No one was "tickling" Elizabeth, either in the garden or during the reported visits to the Princess' bedchamber. The Queen wanted to know the truth: was Elizabeth pregnant?<sup>23</sup>

Having taken us this far, Cutting turns the tables on a great deal of loose thinking by applying the same critical interrogation she has directed against contradictory official documents to the "Seymour PT" theory, which would make the alleged child of the possibly pregnant Elizabeth into a changeling raised as the 17<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford. Arguing that "historical events can be easily conflated when viewed retrospectively," Cutting concludes that even if such a child was born, there are "compelling reasons to conclude that this child was *not* the 17<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford."<sup>24</sup>

In "Shakespeare's Antagonistic Disposition," Williams College Psychology Professor Andrew Crider revisits one of the most important documents in the orthodox biographical tradition, *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* (1592), to analyze its ambivalent portrayal of a figure who is often thought to be William Shakespeare. Taken in conjunction with his analysis of other documents such as those of the Wayte affair and Shakespeare's will, Crider suggests that the hero of the Stratfordian narrative seems characterized by an "antagonistic propensity...most reliably expressed in the facets of

low altruism and tough-mindedness”<sup>25</sup> and “that Shakespeare’s successful career as a businessman may have been influenced by dispositional conscientiousness, which the five-factor model opposes to undependability.”<sup>26</sup> Although Crider does not take up the issue, one can only wonder how the average literary genius – more likely than not a manic depressive – ranks on the five-factor axis of “dispositional conscientiousness” versus undependability.

The final essay in this volume, Richard Waugaman’s “*The Sternhold and Hopkins Whole Book of Psalms: Crucial Evidence for Edward de Vere’s Authorship of the Works of Shakespeare*,” is one toward which the editor must confess a partiality. Paradigm shifts are always driven in part by new methodologies. That the annotations of the Earl of Oxford’s Geneva Bible can point to new discoveries regarding Shakespeare’s use of the Bible has been a scandal for a decade, the implications of which orthodox Shakespeareans have devoted some effort to ignoring. Doing so has required studiously ignoring a series of articles in *Notes and Queries* and other academic publications, both by myself<sup>27</sup> and by Waugaman,<sup>28</sup> as well as in my 2001 University of Massachusetts PhD dissertation. In this article Waugaman takes up a new and revealing dimension of this question by suggesting that the Sternhold and Hopkins Psalms (WBP), a copy of which is bound and annotated with the de Vere Bible, left a far deeper and more pervasive imprint on Shakespeare than previously recognized. Waugaman reached this conclusion through a systematic study of the verbal traces left in the plays and poems of the 21 psalms – most especially 51, 25, 65, 63, and 103 – marked in the de Vere Bible. Waugaman concludes that “close examination....reveals the WBP to be a much richer source of Shakespearean sources than previously acknowledged”<sup>29</sup> and hypothesizes that “De Vere was so familiar with the [WBP] that some of its echoes in his works probably reflect the associative process that was integral to his creative genius.”<sup>30</sup> If so, one can only look forward to the day when further discoveries of this kind will serve to more fully reveal the author’s creative engagement with the many written sources that informed his extraordinarily rich imaginative life.

### Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Earl Showerman, "The Watershed," *Shakespeare Matters*, 10:3 (Summer 2011), 3.
- <sup>2</sup> Mark Twain, *Is Shakespeare Dead* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1909), 131.
- <sup>3</sup> As cited in Edwin Reed, *Noteworthy Opinions, Pro and Con: Bacon vrs. Shakespeare* (Boston: Coburn, 1905), 9.
- <sup>4</sup> James Shapiro, *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2010), 277.
- <sup>5</sup> Charlton Ogburn, 3. All references with only an author's name are to page numbers in the present volume.
- <sup>6</sup> Ogburn, 1.
- <sup>7</sup> William McFee, in J. Thomas Looney, "*Shakespeare*" Identified in *Edward de Vere, 17<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1948), xix.
- <sup>8</sup> Michael Wainwright, 15.
- <sup>9</sup> Wainwright, 13.
- <sup>10</sup> Wainwright, 30.
- <sup>11</sup> Wainwright, 30.
- <sup>12</sup> "Shakespeare's Many Much Ado's: *Alcestis*, Hercules and *Love's Labour's Wonne*," reprinted in *Shakespeare Criticism Vol. 141*, Gale, Cengage Learning, 2012. Originally published in *Brief Chronicles Vol.1* (2009); "*Timon of Athens*: Shakespeare's Sophoclean Tragedy," *The Oxfordian Vol XI* (2009); "Look down and see what Death is doing": Gods and Greeks in *The Winter's Tale*," *The Oxfordian Vol X* (2007); "*Orestes and Hamlet*: from Myth to Masterpiece," *The Oxfordian Vol. VII* (2004); "Mythopoesis of Resurrection: Hesiod to Shakespeare – *The Winter's Tale* and *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*," *Discovering Shakespeare: A Festschrift in Honour of Isabel Holden*, Concordia University (2009); "Shakespeare's Plutarchan Nomenclature: The Company of Noble Grecians," *Shakespeare Matters Vol.8:3* (2009); "Horestes and Hamlet," *Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter*, Vol.44 (2008).
- <sup>13</sup> Oxford's mother-in-law, Mildred Cooke, among the most educated women in England, owned Aeschylus, *Tragoediae VII* (in Greek). Paris, 1557. 4<sup>o</sup>. See Caroline Bowdon's "The Library of Mildred Cooke Cecil, Lady Burghley," *Library* 6:1 (March 2005), 26.
- <sup>14</sup> Cited in Showerman, 39.
- <sup>15</sup> Richard Whalen, 99.

- <sup>16</sup> Alan Nelson, *Monstrous Adversary: The Life of Edward de Vere, 17<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford* (Liverpool English Texts and Studies), 40 (2003).
- <sup>17</sup> “Could Shakespeare Think Like a Lawyer? How Inheritance Law Issues in *Hamlet* May Shed Light on the Authorship Question,” *University of Miami Law Review*, 57 (2003): 377–428; “Teaching Shakespeare and the Law,” *Shakespeare Matters* 6:1 (Fall 2006), 1, 11-13. Regnier also lectures on a regular basis on Shakespeare and the Law, and has taught a course on Shakespeare and the Law at the University of Miami School of Law.
- <sup>18</sup> Thomas Regnier, 109.
- <sup>19</sup> Nina Green, “The Fall of the House of Oxford,” *Brief Chronicles I*, 41-95.
- <sup>20</sup> Equity deals with legal contests that fall outside the traditional province of common law, seeking to reconcile contradictions so as to preserve the “spirit” of the law in cases in which the “letter” seems inapplicable.
- <sup>21</sup> Robert Prechter, *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres Revisited: Was Oxford Really Involved*,” *Brief Chronicles II*, 45-78.
- <sup>22</sup> See, for example, Arthur Acheson, *Mistress Davenant: The Dark Lady of Shakespeare’s Sonnets* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1913).
- <sup>23</sup> Bonner Cutting, 172.
- <sup>24</sup> Cutting, 182.
- <sup>25</sup> Andrew Crider, 209.
- <sup>26</sup> Crider, 210.
- <sup>27</sup> See, for example, Roger Stritmatter, “Shakespeare’s Ecclesiasticus 28.2-5: A Biblical Source for Ariel’s Doctrine of Mercy,” *Notes and Queries*, 254:1 (March 2009), 67-70; “The Source of Harry of Cornwall’s Theological Doctrine,” *Notes and Queries*, 246: 3 (September 2001), 280-82; “‘Old’ and ‘New’ Law in *Merchant of Venice*,” *Notes and Queries*, 245:1 (March 2000), 70-72; “By Providence Divine: Shakespeare’s Awareness of Some Geneva Marginal Notes of I Samuel,” *Notes and Queries* 245:1 (March 2000), 97-100; “A New Biblical Source for Shakespeare’s Concept of ‘All Seeing Heaven,’” *Notes and Queries* 244:2 (June 1999), 207-09; “The Heavenly Treasure of Sonnets 48 and 52,” *Notes and Queries*, 244:2 (June 1999), 226-28; “The Influence of a Genevan Note from Romans 7.19 on Shakespeare’s Sonnet 151.” *Notes and Queries* 242:4 (December 1997), 514-16.
- <sup>28</sup> Waugaman’s publications on the Bible as a Shakespearean source include, “The *Sternhold and Hopkins Whole Book of the Psalms* is a Major Source for the Works of Shakespeare,” *Notes and Queries* 56:4 (2009) 595-604; Psalm Echoes in Shakespeare’s *1 Henry VI*, *Richard II*, and *Edward III*,” *Notes and Queries* 57: 3 (2010), 359-64; “Maniculed Psalms in the de Vere Bible: A New Literary Source for Shakespeare,” *Brief Chronicles II* (2010), 109-120; *Titus Andronicus*, the Psalms,

and Edward de Vere's Bible, *The Oxfordian* (2011), 1-17; and "Shakespeare's Bible: A Personal Odyssey," *American Academy of Psychoanalysis Forum* 54:16-18, 2010.

<sup>29</sup> Richard Waugaman, 215.

<sup>30</sup>Waugman, 227.

