

Delahoyde: In at least one vital case, cherished ignorance is more than such an insulating wall; it is literal architecture: Shakespeare's Birthplace, Shakespeare's Theatre, etc. Indeed, ignorance is an entire town – it has taken a village – actively maintained, and on its web site we are invited to “Become part of the Shakespeare story.” Unfortunately the only roles available are those of Shrine-Worshipper #43,000,001 and Heretic-Antagonist. The latter is a non-speaking part.

Dudley: This paper proposes that the project of decolonizing Shakespeare is incomplete and will likely remain so as long as it continues to focus exclusively on postcolonial readings of the texts themselves and on indigenized performances, rather than on examining the identity of their author, and the ways in which the practice of conventional Shakespeare biography has contributed to British imperial culture. Turning a postcolonial lens on contemporary Shakespeare scholarship itself, and specifically on the debate over the authorship of the plays and poems, may aid us in recognizing larger, potent and resistant cultural narratives underlying the mythology of the “Divine Will”...

McNeil: More importantly, however, instead of simply retelling or reworking the epigram, the poet has inserted himself into both sonnets: he has gone to the bath. The epigram has no first-person speaker; the sonnets do. This illustrates that Shakespeare has a personal connection to his sources, and that the adaptations he makes to his sources are intentional. It is personal experience that shapes the works, and sources are used as a tool in the shaping process. To suggest, as some critics have, that Shakespeare's works are not formed as much by personal experience as by imagination and skill strains credulity.

Waugaman: It has become surprisingly controversial in recent years to speculate about connections between the works and the life of Shakespeare. Theories of literary criticism during past decades (including New Criticism, New Historicism, and Postmodernism) have all undermined traditional interest in connecting a work with its author. There is sometimes a dangerously misleading false dichotomy that claims Shakespeare illustrates the creative potential of native genius, so that he did not need relevant life experiences to shape his literary works. Courageously, Norman Holland has continued to assert a legitimate role for psychoanalytic literary criticism, in the face of this growing opposition.

Whalen: John Dover Wilson wrote in *What Happens in Hamlet* that there are dozens of puzzles in the play that must be solved together “if *Hamlet* was an artistic unity at all.” It's safe to say the dramatist did not set out to write an enigmatic play full of puzzles. Knowing that the true author was not a commoner but a ranking nobleman in Queen Elizabeth's court, which was notoriously corrupt, may well provide the key to what happens in *Hamlet*.

Delahoyde: although he ultimately represented a profound qualitative leap in the importance of English literature, putting England on the map in terms of joining the artistic Renaissance at last, the Earl did not spring fully armed with lyrical talent from the head of Zeus, crying out iambic pentameters.³ We can, instead, detect in early suspected and attributed poems an evolution of Oxford towards “Shake-speare,” and we can see Oxford as a kind of culminating phenomenon in the context of native English lyric poetry: beginning with Chaucer; extending through Oxford's uncle Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey; and blossoming into not just de Vere's juvenilia in the Elizabethan anthologies but also in the lyricism of his more famous dramatic works in the Shakespeare canon.

Hughes: The anonymity of *Troublesome Raigne's* author, among the other Shakespeare “sources” performed by the Queen's Men, is conspicuous. Walsingham certainly was not penning the plays, as he had numerous other affairs of state to attend to and seems to have no record of artistic inclination. Rather, the playwright was in the employ of the government, but no record exists of payments to any person for the specific task of writing the works. However, Anderson points to correspondences throughout a six-day period in 1586 between Lord Burghley, Walsingham, and Edward de Vere, all alluding to an “unnamed proposal.”

Wainwright: Concordance between the narrative poem and the play, however, should not mask the contradictory intellectual relays that scholasticism would have established with the work of the sixteenth-century logician Pierre de la Ramée (1515–1572)—better known under the name, which he eventually adopted, of Peter Ramus—whose influence on both the logic and rhetoric of *Troilus and Cressida* is undoubted. That this play at once examines the basic structure of human logic, the multifarious impresses that personally articulate that foundation, and the rhetoric associated with that articulation, testifies to a university-educated playwright.

Gilbert: This discussion of the similarities between Shakespeare and Lyly may have landed us at the bottom of a hill with no bottom, or a bottomless fountain, or a bottomless bay or a bottomless dream — it could certainly go on and on. Though I have perhaps not answered the rhetorical question “Was Shakespeare a Euphuist?” it was not really my intention to do so. But I hope that I have indicated some of the implications that a comparison between Shakespeare's work and Lyly's work might have for future research.

Brief Chronicles: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Authorship Studies V (2014)

Brief Chronicles: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Authorship Studies V (2014)

