

Epistle Dedicatory:

A Local Habitation and a Name

Fool. Canst tell how an oyster makes his shell?

Lear. No.

Fool. Nor I neither; but I can tell why a snail has a house.

Lear. Why?

Fool. Why, to put 's head in; not to give it away to his daughters,
and leave his horns without a case.



o much has happened since our first issue last year. For starters, *Brief Chronicles* has a Wikipedia entry. It needs work, but we are pleased to be included in a reference source which, for all its obvious internal problems, has established itself as the online world's premiere reference site and omnipedia. No doubt as *Brief Chronicles* moves forward in publishing the best articles on the authorship question we can find, the *BC* Wiki entry will grow to reflect the journal's contributions to 21st century intellectual life. At the same time, the value of the first issue has been recognized by editors for the Gale Publishing Group, who invited one of our contributors, Dr. Earl Showerman, M.D., entrepreneur and President of the Shakespeare Fellowship, to contribute his essay on the Greek origins of *Much Ado About Nothing* to its forthcoming reference text, *Shakespeare Criticism* (Michael L. LeBlanc, general editor), due out next spring. Thanks to the hard work of our own Managing Editor Gary Goldstein, every article from *Brief Chronicles* is also now abstracted in the *MLA International Bibliography* and *World Shakespeare Bibliography* databases, the two most prestigious academic reference tools covering topics germane to our interdisciplinary focus on authorship studies.

Before arriving at an abbreviated synopsis of the contents of the present volume, it may be enlightening to consider the implications of Gale's decision to reprint Showerman's article on the Greek sources of *Much Ado*. Here is part of Showerman's unapologetic conclusion:

When one considers the acknowledged sources of *Much Ado*, it could be argued that this comedy is the most "Oxfordian" of all the plays for its connections to Edward de Vere's literary patronage. The works dedicated to him by John Lyly, Anthony Munday, and Thomas Watson have all been identified as primary sources for this comedy. That both *Much Ado* and *Winter's Tale* must now also be recognized as borrowing dramaturgy from a Greek tragicomedy also reinforces Oxford's authorship claim... [his] education and access to the Greek classics is well documented. For a number of years, the young Oxford lived in the home of Cambridge scholar and Greek orator, Sir Thomas Smith, who lectured in Greek from Homer, Aristotle, Euripides, and Aristophanes.¹

Gale Publishing has chosen to reprint *that* article, with *that* conclusion, in its spring 2011 issue of *Shakespeare Criticism*. Are we having fun yet?



Writing during the autumn days of 2009, your editors expressed the hopeful expectation that future issues of this journal might look forward to continuing to publish articles and reviews that live up to the exacting standards established in the inaugural issue, and to "continue publishing....cutting edge scholarship" in the tradition of "former insiders' who are now realizing, in the words of Supreme Court Justice Stevens, that the case against the traditional view of authorship has already been proven 'beyond a reasonable doubt.'"² It is therefore with no small gratification that we may report that this 2010 issue of *Brief Chronicles* confirms the breadth and depth of 21st century scholarship on the authorship question, supplying ten articles and five reviews which truly do live up to the promise of the first issue.

That first issue might reasonably be characterized not only by the range of topics surveyed in some detail, but by its willingness to engage literary and historical perplexities when and where they do exist, rather than pretending they don't and hoping they will go away, a habit which has too often and for too long typified ossified orthodox approaches to Shakespeare. We are therefore pleased to lead off the 2010 issue with a reprint of H. Trevor-Roper's classic, "What's In a Name," originally published in the 1962 English edition of *Réalités* — an essay which, without identifying an alternative author, thoughtfully probes some of the implausibilities of the orthodox doctrine.

Trevor-Roper considers the authorship question from the point of view of the professional historian. Departing from the perspective understood by all educated persons that “Of all the immortal geniuses of literature, none is personally so elusive as William Shakespeare,” Trevor-Roper, distinguished historian and Merton College Research Fellow, argues that we cannot find the real Shakespeare in the external historical documents of his age. These show us – in the Droeshout engraving to the 1623 First Folio, for example – only the “the blank face of a country oaf.”³ Instead, urges Trevor-Roper, we must turn to

the authentic deposit of his mind: at his copious, undisputed works. Surely, we say, we shall find him there. But what in fact do we find? In the end, the mystery is only deepened. A supreme dramatist, Shakespeare is always creating other characters, but never reveals his own.⁴

Whether one agrees with this final assessment or not is perhaps a matter of perspective. Those who admire the man, with Ben Jonson, “this side idolatry,” may be tempted to indulge in the occupational fantasy that in fact Shakespeare does reveal his character rather more fully in his own works than the historian in this case supposes. On the other hand, few can fail to appreciate the logic of Trevor-Roper’s continuing argument when he wonders how “this sensitive creature, this delicate, aristocratic character, so acutely aware of the pleasures and pains, the comedy and tragedy of life....survive[d] the rough-and-tumble of the Elizabethan age?” The answer, according to Trevor-Roper, is that

he did not survive it intact. At a certain point in his life his heightened sensitivity turned from awareness of the marvelous outward beauty of the world to perception of its remorseless and, in the end, meaningless cruelty....⁵

These perceptions mark the Merton College Historian as a remarkably astute reader of Shakespeare, one able to capture the leading inflections of an entire oeuvre with uncanny aptness. There is indeed a giant rift between the “delicate aristocratic character” of *As You Like It* and the cosmic terrors of *Lear*, or the sardonic, sometimes scatological satire of *Troilus and Cressida*, that is almost too large to comprehend. It is easier for us to imagine the disembodied bard of Bloom, coterminous with the phenomenology of modern existence, or the paper Mache cutout of the official cover, than one who had actually experienced a *human* life commensurate with the involuted turnings of *his own* art.

In the second essay of our issue, “Shakespeare’s Impossible Doublet,” John Rollett resumes the question of where to discover the “real” Shakespeare, by zeroing in on a longstanding but widely-ignored dimension of the Shakespearean question: the doubts, expressed by Trevor-Roper among many, over the *bona fides* of the 1623 First Folio’s introductory materials. Such doubts have a distinguished history. Sir George Greenwood, for example, writing in 1916, wondered how

any unprejudiced person, with a sense of humour, can look upon it without being tempted to irreverent laughter. Not only is it, as many have pointed out, and as is apparent even to the untrained eye, altogether out of drawing; not only is the head preternaturally large for the body; not only is it quaintly suggestive of an unduly deferred razor; but it looks at one with a peculiar expression of sheepish oafishness which is irresistibly comic.⁶

Focusing our attention on the design of the sitter's doublet, Rollett confirms in impressive detail never before published the anonymous 1911 observation that the garment

is so strangely illustrated that the right-hand side of the forepart is *obviously* the left-hand side of the backpart; and so gives a harlequin appearance to the figure, which it is not unnatural to assume was intentional, and done with express object and purpose.⁷

"Many people will be likely to conclude," hints Rollett, "that by printing a caricature of the man from Stratford-upon-Avon, the publishers were indicating that he was not the author of the works that bear his name."⁸

But if the Droeshout engraving is a droll jest, of the kind so popular in Shakespeare's day (have you ever seen the picture of "we three?"), a visual pun depicting a harlequin or court jester as the mask for a concealed author — who was that man? Nina Green, in the shortest article ever published in *Brief Chronicles*, provides a succinct and stunning answer. Following Ben Jonson's advice in the prefatory verses written to accompany the Droeshout engraving, Green looks "not on his picture, but his book."

Noticing that Shakespeare at least three times, in three different plays (*Titus Andronicus*, 4; *I Henry IV*, 2; *Merry Wives*, 4) creates characters who allude to *the same page and passage* in Lily's Latin Grammar, perhaps the most generally known book (excepting the Bible) in early modern England, Green proposes an intriguing rationale for the emphasis. Was the bard trying to tell us something, using Lily as a trusted *confidante*? If so, he had good precedent, from well known examples still discoverable in such alien lands as his own imagination. Perhaps he was following a clue from Ovid, imitating a motif which Leonard Barkan categorizes as "the first signal that Shakespeare knew his Ovid at first hand, and that he read *The Metamorphoses* with a deliberate and original purpose," a passage which will provide Barkan's own study with the natural "point of entry to the powerful relation between [the] two geniuses," Ovid and Shakespeare. The connecting link, says Barkan, is the myth of Philomela.⁹

In that Ovidian myth, the raped Philomela's tongue is cut out to prevent her from naming her assailant; the inventive victim instead weaves a tapestry to identify and accuse him. In so doing she supplies a model for the literary figure first

named by Ovid, in another passage¹⁰ of his *Metamorphoses*, of *intertextuality*. One might even suggest that if Elizabethans read comparatively — and we know that they did — it was because Ovid had taught the practice to his numerous medieval followers. In his comparative analysis of *Titus Andronicus* and the Philomela motif, Leonard Barkan — Bliss Snyder Professor of English and Art History at Northwestern University — notes that both stories involve “escalating efforts to stifle communication. The [Philomela] story attracts Shakespeare because it is centrally concerned with communication.”¹¹ Concluding that this Ovidian motif forms the deepest and most potent strata of Shakespeare’s absorption with Ovid, Barkan leads us directly to the center of our shared Shakespearean quandry:

Titus takes us back to the darkest side of Ovid’s poem...[but]....it is not lessons in perversity that Ovid offers Shakespeare – there are many other classical sources for that – but *a series of paradigms for the act of communication*. Many of the great figures of Ovid’s poem define themselves by their struggle to *invent new languages*....Narcissus, [like Philomela], must discover *a language of paradox that suits his situation*.... Shakespeare appears to be still struggling [in *Lucrece* and *Cymbeline*] with the problems of Philomela, the juxtaposition of mutilation and communication.¹²

Surely this is not the Shakespeare you studied in Jr. High: “Inventing new languages?” Appropriating “a series of paradigms for the act of communication” in order to “struggle with....the juxtaposition of mutilation and communication”? To accept these generalizations obliges us to reconsider the opacity of Shakespeare’s text: just as Shakespeare’s characters must follow Ovid’s exemplars to “define themselves by their struggle to invent new languages” and “discover a language of paradox that suits their situations,” is Shakespeare himself following the same template.

It is not difficult for an informed reader to conclude that, as one whose “arte” is “made tung-tide by authoritie” (66.9) and “like her” must “some-time hold my tongue” (102.13), Shakespeare is an acolyte in Philomela’s temple. She instructs him by example in the meta-cognitive strategies required by particular circumstance — just as anyone, possessing an unnatural abundance of sympathy and depth of human feeling in a hostile world, would do to survive. He communicates through silent gesture, a kind of “pointing” towards a commonly known source of public knowledge — the pedagogical manual from which he learned Latin. Under the revivifying influence of his literary magic, Lily’s book is filled with a new signifying presence, speaking what cannot be said *in propria persona*. It is the first grammar lesson for a post-Stratfordian epistemology: *Eduardus is my propre name*.

But if orthodox Shakespeareans “know” one thing about Edward de Vere, it’s that he died before several late Shakespeare plays — prominently *The Tempest*, *Winter’s Tale*, *Pericles*, *Henry VIII* and *King Lear*, to name only the most obvious suspects — were written.

Right? Not really.

Hanno Wember's essay on the eclipses of *King Lear* exposes the brittle, inconclusive, and ultimately implausible reasoning on which such beliefs are predicated, and it confirms that the traditional chronology of Shakespearean plays is a rickety construct held together by a tissue-thin layer of dubious assumptions and indefensible logic. Surveying all of the possibly relevant early modern eclipse data, Wember demonstrates that, of three possible pairs of solar/lunar eclipses which occurred between 1598 and 1605, by far the most plausible reference point for the play's preoccupation with "these late eclipses of the sun and moon" is that of the earliest date — not, as we have been told so often, the latest. If correct, Wember's argument establishes a *terminus ad quem* (date after which) a full seven years earlier than has conventionally been assumed by scholars who, without examining the data at first hand as Wember has done, have always insisted that the play alludes to events of 1605.

Bob Prechter's contribution to this issue of *Brief Chronicles* undertakes to cross-examine a longstanding "Oxfordian" tradition, which has attributed parts of the 1573 poetry "anthology," *Hundredth Sundries Flowres* — a book reissued with modification in 1575 under the revised title *The Posies of George Gascoigne* — to the 17th Earl of Oxford. Prechter opposes these interpretations on grounds deserving of considerable reflection by anyone with a serious interest in authorship studies. Whether it is really true that the entire body of the two works in question were only written by one man seems far less certain. But whatever the ultimate disposition of the case, Prechter's article will have made a great and material contribution to the ultimate answer.

In "Chapman's Hamlet and the Earl of Oxford," on the other hand, Robert Detobel explores in detail the startling implications of Chapman's explicit and extended reference to the 17th Earl of Oxford in 3.4 of his 1612 *Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*. In that scene, Chapman's invented ideal stoic, the fictional brother Clermont to the historical character of the play's title, apostrophizes the 17th Earl (who had been dead for eight years at the time of the play's publication) as one

Valiant, and learn'd, and liberal as the sun,
[who] spoke and writ sweetly, or of learned subjects,
Or of the discipline of public weals.

This panegyric, Detobel shows, is enmeshed in a complex skein of literary allusions to the most famous revenge tragedy of Chapman's day, *Hamlet*. It is readily discernible in Detobel's account that Chapman both affirms through his imitation, and criticizes through his endorsement of a truly dignified foil to the histrionic sissy Hamlet, in the genuine stoic Clermont, who sets a standard of the stoic ideal which Hamlet himself only achieves in the fourth act of Shakespeare's play, and only after a lot of whining which reveals his fundamental lack of fitness for the position of the stoic beau idyll. The juxtaposition of allusions to Shakespeare's play with those to

allusions to the Earl of Oxford, concludes Detobel, is unlikely to be an accident:

Let us suppose that Chapman wanted to transmit to his readers a knowledge of a specific relationship between Hamlet and the Earl of Oxford. As this had remained concealed, Chapman could only state it by indirect allusion. He established a connection between his play and *Hamlet* by picking up the episode on the Count d’Auvergne. This allowed him to put Clermont, conceived as an ideal Stoic, in phase with the Stoic Hamlet of Shakespeare’s play (V.2). The positioning could have served to communicate any one of three propositions: Whether Oxford wrote *Hamlet*, was the model for Hamlet, or *both* wrote the play *and* was the original of the title character, this scene III.4 was the ideal place to introduce him.¹³

The prolific psychoanalyst and literary scholar Richard Waugaman¹⁴ contributes two essays to our volume. The first recounts his experience returning to some of Shakespeare’s many Psalm allusions, after closely studying the marginal drawings (mostly, perhaps all, manicules) of the Sternhold and Hopkins which is bound with the Folger STC 2106 edition of Edward de Vere’s 1568-70 Geneva Bible.¹⁵ For the first time in this article, Waugaman “comes clean” on the methodology employed in his 2009 *Notes and Queries* article, admitting that he discovered the Shakespearean allusions to WBP by following the thread of evidence surviving in the de Vere Bible:

Each of the ten psalms I wrote about in my article was marked by de Vere. It was de Vere himself who “pointed me” to these psalms through his marginal manicules.

But I voluntarily “manacled” my impulse to tell the “manicule” part of my story in a mainstream journal. I decided the better part of valor in this case was discretion about my “source.” I remained “tongue-tied” by the authority of the Shakespeare establishment, afraid that the subversive implications of my discoveries for traditional authorship assumptions might lead to their suppression. I will probably never know if my fears were well-founded.¹⁶

Waugaman sardonically remarks that “given the many correlations between de Vere’s entire Bible and Shakespeare’s works, it is only a matter of time before someone tries to claim that Shakespeare of Stratford must have borrowed de Vere’s Bible and marked it up.” Indeed, such suggestions, while they have yet to our knowledge to appear *in print*, have already circulated widely in the oral legends of Shakespearean orthodoxy at least since the mid-1990s. “Nevertheless,” continues Waugaman,

I agree with Freud in believing that the small, quiet voice of reason will eventually prevail. Many major advances of science during past centuries have taken place only after furious resistance from partisans of prevailing but erroneous paradigms. We will soon reach a tipping point when young scholars of Elizabethan literature will realize they have a far brighter future if they have the courage to defy their elders and search for the truth about the authorship of Shakespeare's works.¹⁷

In the second and in some ways more daring of his two articles, Waugaman probes one of the most fascinating attribution enigmas of Elizabethan English literature: who wrote that anonymous 1589 *tour de force* of Elizabethan literary criticism, *The Arte of English Poesie*? Proceeding from the early demonstrable premise that the existing default attribution to George (or, as a failsafe, his brother Richard) Puttenham is without substantive justification, Waugaman asks the reader to consider the possibility that the work, which is dedicated to William Cecil and frequently addresses Queen Elizabeth I *directly*, is actually written by de Vere. Whether this theory can withstand critical scrutiny or whether, for example, the real concealed author of *The Arte* was the prominent recusant intellectual Lord John Lumley, as BM Ward supposed, or, as some have suggested, Thomas Sackville, Baron Buckhurst (1536-1608), a leading literary aristocrat who, after co-authoring the tragedy *Gorboduc* (1561) with Thomas Norton, seems to have disappeared from the stage of Elizabethan literature, the editors cannot say. But whatever the ultimate solution to the enigma, Waugaman highlights many characteristics of the work which have profound implications for the future of authorship studies.

Summarizing Marcy North's critical work on early modern pseudonymity, Waugaman discovers that

concealment is a central theme in the *Arte*. Its advice about proper courtly conduct only seems explicit — [North] demonstrates that there is another level of "mystification" of "intricate social codes" beneath the surface. Referring to the author's anagram on Queen Elizabeth's name, she says the author "suggests that identity functions like natural talent. Even when disguised or altered, an important name will shine through the veil to call attention to itself. Puttenham's anagrams verge on the supernatural," in that the author implies that divine providence helped him create his anagram. North concludes that the message is that

"The noblest form of identity announces itself without the aid of a patron or friend... Puttenham's name games ...demonstrate how poets might have hoped their identities would emanate from their work even when their names were not attached."¹⁸

Further developing these themes, and demonstrating an intriguing *prima*

facie case for de Vere's authorship, based on stylistic and cognitive parallels, Waugaman argues that North, like her other orthodox colleagues, is reluctant to consider alternative theories of *The Arte's* authorship because of the destabilizing implications of such an admission for a scholarly establishment which is devoted at its core, for whatever private reasons having little to do with the actualities of the case, to the Stratfordian "just-so" story:

It would be of enormous interest if the same person wrote both *The Arte* and the works of Shakespeare. We are depriving ourselves of significant opportunities for scholarly advances in our understanding of the works of Shakespeare by clinging to insubstantial if widely accepted evidence for the legendary author. This evidence erodes considerably if we take seriously the studies of North, Mullan and others on literary anonymity. We will then have to acknowledge that the case for the traditional author of Shakespeare's works is based largely on the questionable assumption that all contemporary references to this name were indisputably references to the (front) man from Stratford rather than to a pseudonym.¹⁹

Another distinguished psychoanalytic critic, Heward Wilkinson, explores the authorship subtexts of *King Lear*. In his essay, revised from a chapter originally published in his 2009 book, *The Muse as Therapist: A New Poetic Paradigm for Psychotherapy*, Wilkinson focuses our attention to the twin problems of "Cordelia's silence" and "Edgar's secrecy." He shows in particular how the latter Shakespearean alteration of the received Leir legend — the enlarging of Edgar's character to form the play's epistemic center and radiant point — becomes an intelligible expression of the author's alienation from his own literary kingdom:

In Edgar, Shakespeare has *dramatised disguising itself*, in an uncanny double take, in which case *King Lear* is also dramatising the agony and shame of the authorial concealment as such – which is so often expressed in the *Sonnets*, e.g., 72 ("My name be buried where my body is").²⁰

Rounding out the issue is the second of our "debunking" essays, Christopher Paul's fastidious re-examination of the 17th Earl of Oxford's "Office" – mentioned prominently in his July 7, 1594 letter to Lord Burghley, in which he complains of being "in mine office greatly hindered." This has often been interpreted as a reference to a secret office of theatrical propaganda, which B.M. Ward and others hypothesized Oxford was paid "publicke means which publicke manners breeds" to undertake, under the *sub rosa* terms of a mysterious crown annuity (1586-1604) of a thousand pounds. While such an office may have existed (for one thing, the grant still requires explanation – not the fig leaves applied by recent orthodox critics), it does not appear to be the object of Oxford's letter.

On the contrary, Paul suggests, drawing on original transcriptions of

numerous previously unavailable documents, the “office” in question here was more likely to have been the Lord Great Chamberlainship of England. The “sundrie abuses” of which Oxford complained in another context seem to have been the attempts of his former steward Roger Harlackenden to profit from control over Oxford’s extensive but poorly managed properties, at the expense of his ostensible employer and his heirs.

It ought not to require any special emphasis that *Brief Chronicles* is not an ape to mock a dogma by imitating it, but an intellectual forum for the exchange of sometimes controversial ideas. Both the reasoning and the conclusions of our contributors — which are unlikely to ever be entirely in one harmonious accord — in the first instance belong to *them*, and not to the Shakespeare Fellowship, the editorial board, or even the editors, of the publication. Ultimately, moreover, the fate of any author’s ideas, as the Earl of Oxford recognized four centuries before the emergence of “reader response” criticism, lies with the skill of his readers.

As he himself wrote, in his 1573 preface to Bartholomew Clerke’s translation of *Cardanus Comforte*:

The labouring man that tills the fertile soil,
And reaps the harvest fruit, hath not indeed
The gain, but pain; and if for all his toil
He gets the straw, the lord will have the seed.



So he that takes the pain to pen the book,
Reaps not the gifts of goodly golden Muse,
But those gain that, who on the work shall look
And from the sour the sweet by skill doth choose.
For he that beats the bush the bird not gets,
But who sits still and holdeth fast the nets.

— From the General Editor



~Endnotes~

- ¹ Earl Showerman, "Shakespeare's Many Much Ado's: Alcestis, Hercules, and Love's Labours Wonne," *Brief Chronicles I* (2009), 137.
- ² "From the Editors," *Brief Chronicles I* (2009), 6.
- ³ Hugh Trevor-Roper, "What's In a Name," *Brief Chronicles II* (2010), 3.
- ⁴ Trevor-Roper, 3.
- ⁵ Trevor-Roper, 6.
- ⁶ George Greenwood, *Is There a Shakespeare Problem*. London: John Lane at the Bodley Head, 1916, 395.
- ⁷ John Rollett, "Shakespeare's Impossible Doublet: The Droeshout Engraving Anatomized," *Brief Chronicles II* (2010), 11.
- ⁸ Rollett, *Brief Chronicles II* (2010), 21.
- ⁹ Leonard Barkan, 247. See Barkan's extended analysis, in one of the most inspired humane essays ever written on Shakespeare, *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis & the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), in the chapter, "Shakespeare & the Metamorphoses of Art and Life," 243-288. All quotations to Barkan are to this particular chapter of *The Gods Made Flesh*, which is recommended in its entirety to all Shakespeareans.
- ¹⁰ Ovid, *Meta*. VI: 127-28.
- ¹¹ Barkan, 245.
- ¹² Barkan, 247, 249, emphasis mine.
- ¹³ Robert Detobel, "Chapman's Hamlet and the Earl of Oxford," *Brief Chronicles II* (2010), 104.
- ¹⁴ Waugaman has recently published a closely related article in *Notes and Queries*, has reviewed both Mark Anderson's "*Shakespeare*" *By Another Name* (2007), and James Shapiro's *Contested Will* for the *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* (forthcoming), not to mention published on more general Shakespearean topics for *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* and other established psychoanalytical journals.
- ¹⁵ See Roger Stritmatter, *The Marginal Annotations of Edward de Vere's Geneva Bible*, a University of Massachusetts PhD dissertation submitted to the Department of Comparative Literature, The University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 2001.
- ¹⁶ Richard M. Waugaman, "What's in a Manicule? The de Vere Psalms as a New Shakespearean Source," 111.
- ¹⁷ Waugaman, "Manicule," *Brief Chronicles II* (2010), 117.
- ¹⁸ Richard M. Waugaman, "*The Arte of English Poesie*: The Case for Edward de Vere's Authorship," *Brief Chronicles II* (2010), 127.
- ¹⁹ Waugaman, "Arte," 136.
- ²⁰ Heward Wilkinson, "Cordelia's Silence and Edgar's Secrecy," *Brief Chronicles II* (2010), 165.

