

A'Maur's Labour's Lost

Shakespeare's Damnation

The *Damnatio Memoriae* of 'Shakespeare'

by Michael Stepniewski, mikestepniewski@gmail.com

	Contents	1
	<i>Shakespeare's Damnation — Why would his identity be suppressed?</i>	3
	<i>A short description of this 'Sincere' book.</i>	4
Part I	<i>BEROWNE Chases the Heir — Himself</i>	5
	<i>Or, How A' Maur's Labour May be Lost</i>	
	– Discussion of Key Rhetorical Features of the Plays of 'Shakespeare'	5
	– Historical Preface	9
	– A Threefold Presentation — Three Levels of Understanding	11
	– Of Love's Labour's Lost — Characters	14
	– Format — Exposition of Wordplay	16
	– BEROWNE ruminates on his overturned state.	16
	– Comments on Reference Language	20
	– Reconstruction at the Biographical 3rd Level — Once More	25
	– Counsel — "To the great Variety of Readers" (Heminges & Condell)	26
	– Damn'd Shakespeare, again ...	27
Part II	<i>In which the Artist names his fathers</i>	
	HOLOFERNES as Ram / Mar ; NATHANIEL as O'Vis / 'O Vere'	28
	– The Purbblind Heir — Amor, a' Maur	29
	– Methodical Wordplay and Sound Play	31
	– Format, 'Once More'	35
	– Examination of Wordplay, Love's Labour's Lost V.1 42-55	36
	– Reconstruction at the Biographical 3rd Level — Once More	44
Part III	How a PRINCESS killed a Déor;	
	<i>Or — How to distinguish Lord Oxenford from Lady Jane Grey.</i>	46
	Article 1: "Haud credo" or ~ Old Grey Doe? ~ (LLL IV.2 1-21)	47
	" 'twas a Prickett that the Princess killed." (LLL IV.2 47)	
	– Articles: The dividing of longer scenes into coherent sections.	47
	– NATHANIEL — A Vere-us Vir , ~ as it vVere ~	47
	– HOLOFERNES — A Judas (~ Tudahs ~) Maccabeus, or Iscariot?	49
	– DULL — A dull-witted Constable: Henry Grey, Robert Dudley, or Oxford?	52
	– Old Grey Doe — Queen Jane, Approximately	55
	Article 2: 'Simplicity; thou monster Ignorance,' (LLL IV.2 22-33).	58
	"how deformèd dost thou look" (LLL IV.2 23)	
	– "Tudor Simplicity!". To each his own apt language.	59
	– Who knew of Oxford's birth?	62
	~ Many can Ferre the Ram that A'Mor not the heir ~	64
	Article 3: "Dictynna? nay Dictisima!" (LLL IV.2 34-47)	65

~ <i>The Moon? nay, Say-More! A title to Phœbe, to Luna ...</i> ~	64
~ <i>You two are ~ Freeman ~ , nothing left to lose</i> ~	64
~ <i>“The Thallusian-Collusion holds in the con-Vere’scion”</i> ~	68
Article 4: “forms, figures, shapes ... revolutions.” (LLL IV.2 48-79)	71
~ <i>nourished in the womb of Primater.</i> ~	
~ <i>“Epitaph on the death of the Déore”</i> ~	72
~ <i>Annulling Squirrel Tails</i> ~	72
~ <i>An a’Mor-ous Pricket Déore</i> ~	74
~ <i>Of One Sore I an hundred Make</i> ~	77
~ <i>Kings and Things, conceptions, arrests, sentences, con-Vere’scions</i> ~	80
~ <i>Their daughters succeed Vere’y Mawr-ly under you</i> ~	82
Article 5: “Master Person, quasi Pierce One?” (LLL IV.2 80-100)	83
~ <i>Master Person, almost One Transfigured?</i> ~	
~ <i>If One should be transfigured, which is the One?</i> ~	86
~ <i>Woman-child, who does not wound you, does not succeed you.</i> ~	92
Article 6: BEROWNE’s Aversio. (LLL IV.2 101-143)	93
~ <i>By way of Succession ... meaning hath Miscarried.</i> ~ (IV.2 136-43)	
~ <i>Let me heir a Spear, a Moor, a Vere</i> ~	95
~ <i>Of myself say Vere, I’ll prove a child of Liz</i> ~	97
~ <i>You discover not the a’Vere-scion.</i> ~ <i>Aversio, ‘Apostraphus’</i> ~	102
~ <i>Why indeed ‘the Nose’, but for smelling out the Faire Flower ...</i> ~	104
Article 7: “I do fear colourable colours.” (LLL V.1 144-160)	110
~ <i>St Maur suspects misrepresentation of character.</i> ~	
~ <i>I dine today at the father’s of a Maur’s Orphan of mine.</i> ~	113
~ <i>Veres to be Vere-y rough, neither innate of Mures or Tudor heirs</i> ~	114
~ <i>The Maur’s R’ at t’heir fair’all hunt, and we Maur to Or re-creation</i> ~	116
~ <i>Once More</i>	116
Part IV <i>The Taming of the Shrew Induction 2</i>	121
~ <i>And Mare-mour Grey-man, and L’ord Somerset,</i> ~ <i>And Sum-More Maur surnames—and Veres, as these</i> ~	122
Conclusion	128
~ <i>As You Like It III. 3 10-14 ~ a Mawr-Tudor in a concealed birth, ‘Vere-ily’ ...</i> ~	132
~ <i>Dedication to Lucrece What I have Tu-do(r) is yours ...</i>	134
Postscript: Titus Andronicus: A Disastrous Love’s Labour’s Won	141
~ <i>Historical basis for Dramatis Personae in Titus Andronicus</i>	142
Bibliography	149
~ <i>I am that I am — I am not what I am.</i> ~	

In this book I attempt to follow a natural argument, based on the authority of sources that are reasonably well-accepted by all parties to the subject of Shakespeare Studies. Perhaps we can understand the Man in a sense that is compatible with his time, and in agreement with his counsel to Readers. Words are used as defined in dictionaries, particularly as he would have known them—from Latin, French, Italian, or other literary vernaculars. Rhetorical devices are applied as they have been for many hundreds of years. The parenthetical and digressive nature of my analysis is inherent in the **double** nature of **Twin** subjects.

Condemning Shakespeare

This essay examines statements by and about the Artist concerning the meaning of his work. At times these statements may be taken literally, at other times, the reader must catch a facetious twist, yet they are all intended to be a guide towards understanding, taking the Writer's "dull" [*Latin obscurus*: 'dark, unintelligible'] "witness" [*(L) testimonium*: 'proof, attestation'] of his "name", and from them producing interpretations that should "astonish" us—so says John Milton ('*An Epitaph on the ... Poet, VV. SHAKESPEARE*', Second Folio, 1632):

	<i>Deare Sonne of Memory, great Heire of Fame,</i>	
6	<i>What needst thou such dull witness of thy name?</i>	<i>Deare, wp (E) deór, d'Or</i>
	<i>Thou in our wonder and astonishment</i>	<i>Memory, wp ~ Same-More ~</i>
8	<i>Hast built thy selfe a livelong Monument:</i>	<i>Fame, wp Report: Two-door, Tudor</i>
		<i>a'stonish-, wp a'Marmor'eus — Sea-mour'ious</i>

What needst thou such dull witness of thy name? Here lies an extra-legal tail of Attainder and Damnation. **Attainder** by Process, as determined by an Act of Parliament—the loss of life, title, estate, and heritability, in respect of treason—was, in former times, an irregular solution to the problem of political opposition. Following the death of King Henry VIII, conflict arose between Edward and Thomas Seymour, maternal uncles of boy king Edward VI (*reigned 1547-53*). Edward Seymour, 'Lord Protector Somerset', governed England as Regent during Edward VI's minority. Admiral Thomas Seymour, his popular brother, asserted a degree of political power as one of England's 'Great Officers of State'—Lord High Admiral of the Navy. Further, he was created 1st Baron Sudeley. His prestige was greatly enhanced when he married Henry's last Queen, the extraordinarily wealthy Katherine Parr, and thereby took charge of Princess Elizabeth Tudor and Lady Jane Grey within his household.

As the brothers jealous disagreement escalated, thirty-three Articles of Attainder were leveled against Admiral Thomas, the most dangerous of which was his courtship and (it seems) secret marriage to Princess Elizabeth Tudor (Maclean, *p.72.3*). Without trial, the Bill of Attainder passed in Parliament, and Seymour lost his head—"Cap a Pe", "top to toe", "head to foot" (*Hamlet I. 2 200, 228, 229*). Due process of law was not observed as Attainder also meant all civil rights of the accused were suspended. Thus his execution was, in effect, an extra-judicial murder—an act of Regent Somerset's 'Royal Will'—and pure political expediency.

Edward Tudor-Seymour, the writer we call 'Shakespeare', suffered for the attainder of his father, Admiral Thomas Seymour. A *de facto* 'condemnation of memories', in Latin *Damnatio Memoriae*, was passed upon his small child without legal justification. 'Shakespeare' believed coercion was involved. Cunning lawyers manipulated young Elizabeth, the child's mother, convincing her they were protectors, but contrariwise, used their service to plunder the English Treasury throughout her forty-five year reign. The Judgement on 'Child Oxford' meant erasure or execration of his name. Both abuses were exacted, causing his true identity to be lost, and a false identity to be ever after slandered. The Attainder of Admiral Seymour brought the condemnation of his Son, our Writer; and in that stain upon *Caelum*-Sey'mure lay a stain upon *Orbis*-Two-d'Or; and in the stain of Tudor-Seymour (*i.e.* Earth and Heaven), lay a stain on the Writer's Son, Henry Browne-Seymour—so-called Wriothesley ('Southampton'):

Sonnet 33 — Thirty-three — the wounds (Articles, *L. insimulatio*: 'accusation, especially false, to bear false witness') charged to Thomas Seymour in his Bill of Attainder:

	<i>Even so my Sun one early morn did shine</i>	
10	<i>With all-triumphant splendor on my brow;</i>	<i>Sunne, son, i.e. Henry Browne-Wriothesley</i>
	<i>But, out alack, he was but one hour mine,</i>	<i>Region Cloud, i.e. ~ obscure Regency ~</i>
12	<i>The Region Cloud hath masked him from me now.</i>	<i>mask, (L) personam induo: 'assume a mask'</i>
	<i>Yet him for this, my love no whit disdaineth;</i>	
14	<i>Suns of the World may stain, when Heaven's sun staineth.</i>	<i>stain, < (L) tingere: 'tinge, dye'</i>
	<i>world, (L) orbis: anagram Bis-Or = Two-d'Or</i>	<i>heaven, (L) caelum, wp Sea-mul, Sey-mure</i>

**“Sincerity, is completely absent in all Shakespeare’s works ...
he is not in earnest, but that *he is playing with words.*”**

—Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910)

All of ‘Shakespeare’ is sincere. One could hardly devise purer expressions of ‘Existential Crises’. The conviction in his purpose, his earnesty, is felt if rarely defined. He unlocks his heart, not only with a ‘Sonnet Key’ but in his Plays and Narrative Poems too.

It is also true he plays with words. Tropic language creeps into every passage of Shakespeare’s Works, at times into nearly every word. That is how we are to read him: ~ **Marry, how? Tropically!** ~

There is a play within each of his plays—not so clearly as we find in *Hamlet*, but rather more like *The Taming of the Shrew*, where we may lose sight of the fact that the play itself is the play within a play. Nonetheless, they all serve a similar purpose, and we can call them, any and all of them:

“The Mouse-trap” : Marry how? Tropically.” (*Hamlet* III.2 233) mouse, (L) *muris*, wp *Simor*

Tropes alter the meanings of words. The dictionary yields literal definitions, and secondary, transferred or tropic definitions; these extended meanings are usually some form of ‘metaphor’. It is the secondary idea or meaning—the playful metaphor—that may ‘trap the *Muris*’: the Mouse, the QUEEN, Elizabeth I *Regina*.

The Semantic Range of a word may be quite diverse. Part I of this essay demonstrates a method of exploring the multiple definitions available to the word [eg. “pitch”]. There is a good number of epithets and metonyms that recur throughout the Canon, noted in our previous book, *Shakespeare’s Will*, that are signposts along the way. They confirm the subject at hand. If these do not present themselves, the Writer repeats a significant word for emphasis; careful examination of that word will reveal a precise and often unexpected meaning making sense of even the most confusing or ambiguous passage. ‘Shakespeare’ has used this device among others, to tell of his biographic tail, or entail, while also retelling some oft-told tale. His ‘tail’ is the loss of his name and inheritance. The loss of his mother’s labour, by which he came into the world is, tropically speaking, *A’ Maur’s Labour’s Lost*.

Part II makes a connection between the clever HOLOFERNES and the even more clever MOTH. As it turns out, they share the same surname. It is also the Artist’s name — and it is not ‘Shakespeare’. This is discovered again and again by unwinding his “mortal coil”, as in the riddles of HOLOFERNES.

Part III reveals how a father may be unable to see his child through maturity, and how others—Godfathers for example—can be appointed to fill the void. It may seem implausible, yet MOTH is orphan to HOLOFERNES; MOTH is the Pedant’s pupil—his (*Latin*) *pupillus*: ‘an orphan’. Several prominent leaders of England acted the part of father to young ‘Shakespeare’. The Artist’s natural genius made them look like ideal parents. Perhaps they were. As we discover MOTH’s father, his mother too, can be recognized. Whether because he was a Ward of State or otherwise, Queen Elizabeth took a keen interest in the boy.

The final short essays give additional examples of the rhetorical techniques used by the Writer to emphasize or reinforce the idea of a Labour Lost. The power of allusion to hint at hidden paths towards political secrets can be found in Classical Myth. In particular the Artist’s adherence to the Titanic myth of Heaven and Earth—*Caelus* and *Terra*—and their ‘Son of the Brine’, their Sea’s Son, *Muria*, *Oceanus*.

Proof of Shakespeare’s identity was designed into his texts using what he calls a “double tongue”. He equivocates within the established semantical range of words—he puns; he uses common rhetorical figures of repetition, amplification, and allusion, to name a historical yet unrecorded English ‘Hamlet’ — A Fool. ‘Shakespeare’ has created thousands of linguistic proofs to identify himself. In *double-entendre* lies the heart of the matter. ‘Shakespeare’ is the “news from England”, ~ the *Res / Rex* from England ~. Of “th’ occurrents, More and Less, “the rest is silence” (*Hamlet* V. 2 337-41) ~ *Le reste est sa lance* ~ ; ~ What remains is the Spear ~. There is Method—(L) *ratio*: ‘a reckoning, account’—in his Rat’s Tale. *Rattus! Ratus!* Surely, it is the madness of *Morio!*

(L) *ratio*: ‘the reasonable cause’ (L) *ratus*: ‘certainly, surely’ (L) *rattus*: ‘a rat’ (L) *morio*: ‘an errant fool’

Shakespeare's Damnation — *Damnatio Memoriae*

Part I: BEROWNE Chases the Heir, or *How A' Maur's Labour May be Lost*

"EVERY AGE creates its own Shakespeare." (Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All*, 2004; p.3)

"EVERY AGE creates its own Shakespeare." Why should that be so? Every age doesn't create its own Chaucer, or Jonson, or Wordsworth. The answer lies in the unorthodox rhetorical construction of his work and the reason for it. The Artist has an earth-shaking secret, yet is unable to tell it directly—he is "tongue-tied by Authority". He gives us abundant counsel on the techniques he uses in composition, but commenters have largely ignored the information. They have not applied his 'method' to find the 'great matter' hidden within. Instead students are often advised to consider 'Shakespeare' in light of modern literary theory.

"What is often described as the timelessness of Shakespeare, the transcendent qualities for which his plays have been praised around the world and across the centuries, is perhaps better understood as an uncanny timeliness, a capacity to speak directly to circumstances the playwright could not have anticipated or foreseen." (*ibidem*: 'the same place')

'Shakespeare' is indeed transcendent. He devised a particular allegorical form—identical with HAMLET's 'Method', as I will explain—that often leaves his meaning indeterminate. This indeterminacy allows that which we call transcendency. We may find many indications of the artist's surpassing excellence without feeling we understand him. While attending performances of his plays, or reading, we strain to fathom his depth. Finally, sense is resolved according to one's inclination. Though we may *believe* the playwright speaks "directly to circumstances he could not have anticipated or foreseen", I suggest he was in fact no generalist. He had deeply personal and *dangerous* reasons for writing what he did—every word of it—and his rhetorical scheme holds the key to his purpose. He has often sacrificed meaning that is immediately accessible in exchange for his life ... a fair trade. We are free to find his voice relevant on contemporary matters, but I think you may be interested in his proper purpose. It helps when faced with the sort of enigma that follows, in which he will 'Well prove' two names:

BEROWNE *Love's Labor's Lost* IV.3 1-10 (First Folio, 1623)

<p>The King he is hunting the Deare, 2 I am coursing my selfe. They have pitcht a Toyle, I am toying in a pytch, 4 pitch that defiles; defile, a foul word: Well, set thee downe sorrow; for so they say the foole said, and so say I, 6 and I the <u>foole</u>: Well proved wit. By the Lord this Love is as mad as <i>Ajax</i>, it kills mee, I a <u>sheepe</u>: 8 Well proved againe a my side. I will not love; if I do, hang me: yfaith I will not. O but her eye: 10 by this light, but for her eye, I would not love her; yes, for her <u>two eyes</u>.</p>	<p>fool, (<i>Latin</i>) <i>morio</i>—<i>Maur EO</i> Ajax = <i>de Vere</i>, 'a bellowing Ox' (<i>Illiad</i> 13.284) sheep, (<i>L</i>) <i>Ovis</i> — <i>O:Vir</i>, '<i>O</i>': <i>Vere</i> well proved, <i>wp</i> (<i>L</i>) <i>feri vel</i> ~ to do' or ~ hang, (<i>Fr</i>) <i>suspend</i>, <i>sus + pendre</i> eye, (<i>L</i>) <i>oculus</i>, (<i>L</i>) gemma: 'a bud, eye, or gem of a plant'</p>
---	--

This is strange, ambiguous, language. It is noemic language that demands to be understood. We may find ourselves at the end of a passage wondering what it was about. We are not necessarily dull-witted—rather, we may have the expectation of sincere meaning. *Noema* is 'a borrowing from Greek', and comes from the study of rhetoric. *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines **noema**: 'A figure of speech, whereby something stated obscurely is nevertheless intended to be understood or worked out'. As we strive to comprehend cryptic verses, we interpret in some manner. One is not expected to imagine meaning out of thin air, but to discover meaning by understanding the word—by knowing in which sense a word is used. The Power of the State made it so.

When 'Shakespeare' states he is "tongue-tied by Authority", does he not suggest his words are already deemed harmful to 'Authority'? I wonder if we can assume it likely the Poet has taken trouble to avoid the appearance of offense—that any criticism of Authority will remain hidden, or may be plausibly

denied? Hence, arcane verses give warning to readers that some effort will be needed in deciphering them, just as POLONIUS suggests (*Hamlet II.2 204*):

“Though this be madness, yet there is method in’t.”

Michael Delahoyde comments: *Loves’ Labour’s Lost* is “a satire on excesses of language”, but it must be added that all the works of ‘Shakespeare’ are saturated with rhetorical figures. Though the Artist does produce apparent satire, his intent is rarely to comment on the behaviors of society. His highest purpose is to inform us indirectly of specific political irregularities that concern himself, the Crown, and Britain. With his double tongue he reveals names in each verse, every passage—names State Authority will not allow. Fortunately for us the artist has given the solution to his uncounted riddles. It will usually be some play on his name ... **“Every word doth almost tell my name,”** (*Sonnet 76*). (E) tell, or fel, fell (?)

The Artist’s earth-shaking secret is his name.

‘Shakespeare’ is the mode of writing practiced by Edward Oxenford (1548-1604) in the last twelve years of his life, though elements of the system can be detected in his work from as early as the 1560’s. Within the Canon our poet circumvented his ‘tongue-tied’ condition (see *Sonnets 66, 80, 85, 140*) by his own method of **equivocation**. He tried to secure meaning through the ages by a process—**“If we have wit to read”**—that attempts to specify a particular sense that is otherwise mysterious. The intended sense is that which is most likely to be understood if his **counsel** is followed. All discussion of rhetorical figures by the Author, or by any of his characters, is counsel to the reader and applies to all his writings. He refers many words, by etymological wordplay, to the ‘eternal’ Latin language or its relative, French, as a means of semantic reinforcement from Classical Rhetoric. The enigmatic rules of his work include: **repetition**, especially of a consistent set of **epithets** and **metonyms** appropriate to historic persons; **Polysemy**, *i.e.* the multiple meanings of words; **double entendre** and stealthy **sleights of context**; and grammatical ambiguity or **amphiboly**. It has been demonstrated that many rhetorical devices used by ‘Shakespeare’ have been bent to the recording of his name and life (see *Shakespeare’s Will ... in what he hath left us; 2018*).

Oxford’s plays and poems are allegorical biography—“a kind of history” (*The Taming of the Shrew, Ind. 2 13*). In this way ‘Shakespeare’ “was not of an age, but for all time!”: (*Fr*) *tout’heure*. (*Ben Jonson; “To the memory of my beloved, The AUTHOR” 1.43*). We can learn a great deal about the Author from his contemporaries, but I believe he was absolutely committed to the preservation of his story, and *his* works, especially *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, are still the best source of that information.

The Winter of ‘Or Dis-content Made Gloria’s St Maur

Winter, (Fr) hyver, wordplay surname E.Vere

It is necessary to describe Shakespeare’s Invention, including his ‘knacks’, as George Puttenham called them in *The Art of English Poesy (1589, A Critical Edition, ed. Frank Wigham, Wayne Rebhorn, p.105)*. Speaking of rhyme and alliteration among the ancients, he calls such figures ‘knacks’—knack: *n.2* ‘a device, artifice; an ingenious method of doing something’. (*OED*).

The posterity taking pleasure in this manner of symphony had leisure, as it seems, to devise many other knacks in their versifying that the ancient and civil poets had not used before, whereof one was to make every word of a verse to begin with the same letter, as did Hugobald the Monk, who made a large poem to the honor of Carolus Calvus, every word beginning with C, which was the first letter of the king’s name, thus:

Carmina clarisonae Calvus cantate camenae. (*Hucbald de Saint-Amand, Ecloga de laudibus calviti*)

~ Clear-sounding Muses, sing your songs about the bald. ~ *Carolus Calvus, Charles II ‘the Bald’ (France)*

In a similar vein, Oxford/Shakespeare’s “Invention” and “Method” contrive to make his names, especially his true names, the stuff of which his verse is made: **Vere-Tudor-More**. John Milton, in his encomium to Shakespeare from the *Second Folio (1632)* commented that the Artist had literally built for himself a Monument. Truly, it is much as Saint-Amand did for Charles II of France. ‘Shakespeare’, wearing the mask of GRATIANO, states something true of almost every word he wrote:

“All that is spoke, is marr’d.” (GRATIANO, *Othello V.2 358*)

~ **All that is Sey’d, is Maur’d.** ~ **Gratiano** < (*L*) *gratia*: ‘favor’ received or shown.

George Puttenham wrote the following, “Of figures and figurative speeches”, that could hardly be more apt if it were specifically written of Shakespeare’s Invention (*The Art of English Poesy*; 3.7, p.238):

“As figures be the instruments of ornament in every language, so be they also in a sort abuses, or rather trespasses, in speech, because they pass the ordinary limits of common utterance, and be occupied of purpose to deceive the ear and also the mind, drawing it from plainness and simplicity to a certain doubleness, whereby our talk is the more guileful and abusing. For what else is your *metaphor* but an inversion of sense by transport; your *allegory* by a duplicity of meaning or dissimulation under covert and dark intendments; one while speaking obscurely and in riddle called *enigma* ...

This passage describes “foreign and colored (disguised) talk”, and just as rhetorical figures were developed with purpose, Oxford has used them to allow alternate, more witty, meaning. It is ‘Absolute Language’; the writer has been very specific in his choice of words without giving obvious signs towards understanding the sense. He allows State Censors to mistake context. It is only by processing all the information he and his wordy characters provide that we may find his true subject.

As Puttenham describes it, words may have “a certain doubleness”, may be “more guileful”, dissimulating, obscure, enigmatic. Shakespeare’s words are meant to be ‘read, and read again’ so one can take note of the devices and consider whether they point to emphasis or amplification; whether by analogy or lack of clear sense they suggest substitutions; do they logically argue towards a particular understanding of a word or syllable. Most importantly, by discovering the word wit in each phrase or sentence, we may infer the indirect path he has chosen to reveal state secrets.

My questions here, concerning the works of ‘Shakespeare’: Just how biographical are they? Does the writer speak of himself when characters, male and female, mull events and heartfelt matters? Is it safe to conflate opinions expressed by characters who mask for the writer, Edward Tudor-Seymour, with the true opinions of the writer. Conversely, do those of characters who mask for his *alter ego*, Edward ‘de Vere’, express opinions contrary to the writer’s and the State’s interests. I find the central concern of ‘Shakespeare’ is always Lancaster *versus* York—Crown Tudor *versus* Tudor-Grey-Dudley—Red Rose *versus* White Rose. For England, this was *the* dynastic political conflict of that age. So it is very useful to understand his method of self-identification, and thereby know what sentiments truly belong to the Artist, and what sentiments are those of ‘de Vere’, his ‘other self’, who is in servitude to ‘York’. Oxford tells us:

O, know sweet love, I always write of you
And you and love are still my argument; (*Sonnet 76. 9-10*)

Take it as you will, but to better understand the poet, I suggest you assume this to be a matter-of-fact statement. ‘Shakespeare’ writes of some particular one—both a Maur and amour—and that “sweet love” is for his Name. He has ‘self love’; his works are meditations on the self—pure (*Latin*) ***sui amoris***.

For as the Sun is daily new and old,
So is my love still telling what is told. (*Sonnet 76. 13-14*)

But “Why?” In ***Sonnet 76***, the ‘Key Sonnet’ (76 / 152), the writer asks the key question—thrice. ***Why? Why? Why?*** *Why do I write the way I do? Why so unwavering? Why do I always write of myself?* They are rhetorical questions and concern the great outpouring of art of which Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ is Master. And he generously answers them himself: So we may find the ‘*bi-valva*’: the ‘Two-door’, that lurks in the deep: (English) sea, (*Welsh*) môr. So we may discover how every word doth indeed almost tell his authentic ***Tudor-St Maur*** name. “This Star of England” (*Henry V Epilogue 6*), this ***Astrum*** / ***St Maur*** may be staged as KING HENRY V, but within allegory, HENRY V is drawn from the Author, “showing their birth and where they did proceed.” HAMLET may be staged as a Prince of Denmark, but the character study is one hundred percent Oxford of *Dano-Marc*. Again, in hundreds of enigmas to be found in ‘Shakespeare’, solutions will always concern Oxford. He doesn’t riddle without insinuating playful answers nearby. **Once More, the riddle of his name—in Some Manner—is the answer. HAMLET is ‘Morio’** (‘a fool’).

The great ‘Shakespeare’ Canon is meant to ‘set the record straight’. Great abuses of power against the writer and England’s Queen Elizabeth are described repeatedly to be certain they are not lost

to history. Edward Oxenford was suspected by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester (the supposed 'lover' of his mother), and William Cecil, Lord Burghley (the writer's father-in-law), of undermining their security and turning public opinion against them. Each colluder had an extensive network of informers. Thus Oxford contrived to appear the frivolous wastrel—an early prototype for the 'Scarlet Pimpernel'—disguising his presence behind scores of allonyms and pseudonyms. From that vantage he wrote of parallel matters, producing what appeared to some only innocent entertainments. The works often restated existing texts, seeming to be vague 'translations' that, if investigated, would acquit him of stealthy truth-telling. Our writer also maintained the option of appearing 'Mad'. He might present himself as did the character of BRUTUS, found in *The Rape of Lucrece* (ll.1807-41), who avoided Prince TARQUIN's wrath by acting the Fool.

I present here another way to approach 'Shakespeare'. Rather than reading *about* his Art to learn of its significance, we have a method of reading his Art directly. The idea is to separate the student from the diviners and seers—the supposed holders of the Poet's secrets. By understanding his word wit, you'll truly discover his matter as he sees it. This is an essay about crafty patterns occurring in Oxford's work. Polysemy—the various meanings of a word—allows a change of context, such that his words match what we know of his life, amplifying known history with detail he includes in the development of analogous characters. By positing the writer is himself a changeling: 'a child whose identity was altered at birth', we detect a Mour—a St Maur son of a Tudor-St Maur marriage. He has made himself the Fool / Morio / (*Old Danish*) *Amlæthi* hero of each of his plays. In an outburst at *Hamlet* III.1 147-49, HAMLET tells OPHELIA:

“I say we will have no more Marriages. Those that more = Maur, *surname* St Maur
are married already, all but one shall live, the rest
shall keep as they are. To a Nunnery, go.” nunnery: (L) *mon-asterium*, for the ~ *monacha* ~

I suggest HAMLET masks for Oxford, and OPHELIA for Princess Elizabeth. Simply by using a lower case m instead of a capital, the writer has mystified his Maur/more subject. The one that shall die is, no doubt, the writer's father, Thomas St Maur. The Princess is free to go as a Nun, (*Latin*) *monacha*, with wordplay on Monarch. It is not impossible to produce an allegory by subtle variations on a changeling or 'Vere-iation'.

Thus, Oxford might be “a lovely boy stolen of an Indian king” (*A Midsummer Nights Dream* II. 1 22) —an “Indian boy”, (*L*) *Indicus*—playing on (*L*) *indictus*: 'not said, unsaid' ~ **un-Sey'd** ~ . He may be the 'unspoken, unheard of' successor to Elizabeth Tudor, as well as TITANIA. Princely status would certainly explain the Queen's toleration of Oxford's sometimes outrageous behavior. Together, as mother and son, they might give the impression of being lovers, especially in conference behind closed doors. But behind closed doors, Oxford had a far more serious matter to discuss with mother — see *Hamlet* III. 4.

Royal Succession is the More serious matter of all 'Shakespeare':

Who's there? (*Hamlet* I.1 1 – BARNARDO)
~ **Who's t' Heir?** ~

[God]'s blood, but you'll not hear me! (*Othello* I.1 4 – [SANT]IAGO)
~ **Dei'S blood, but you'll not Heir me!** ~ (*Latin*) *deorum*: *wp* (E) *déor* — *Tu-deor*

And again, Royal Succession is the Matter (*Hamlet* V.2 379-81; FORTINBRAS):

“Bear Hamlet like a Soldier to the Stage,
380 For he was likely, had he been put on, likely, (L) *veri similis*, *wp* *surname* ~ Vere-like ~
To have prov'd most royally:” most, (L) *multus*, comparative **plus**: 'more'

Nicholas Royle wrote of the 'strangeness' of Shakespeare, and particularly of his “turn of words” (*How to Read Shakespeare*, 2005, p.4). In what 'strange' sense are we to understand the Writer's use of “put on”? Take a careful look at an English to Latin Dictionary. The English 'put' is a general verb — *Cassell's* shows sixty discrete Latin words that define 'put' more specifically. Among these you'll find (*Latin*) *induere*, *induo*: 'to put on, assume'; and particularly (*L*) *sumere*: 'to assume':

380 ~ **For he was Vere similis, had he been in Do-St Maur,**
To have prov'd More, royally: ~ *surname* **Do-St Maur**: Tudor St Maur (Seymour)

Biographical Preface — Part A: Too much information? **Part B:** Take careful note.

Part A ‘Shakespeare’ wished to justify the measures needed to keep the English Crown on the heads of Henry VIII (Crown Tudor) monarchs. The throne must not fall to the (*L*) *Graii* (‘Greeks’), the Greys, typified by the ruthless ambition of that “Son of York”, King Richard III. Like the Greeks of Homer’s *Iliad*, the Greys with their Dudley accomplices aimed to plunder England as Greek fighters had taken Troy. The person of Edward Tudor-Seymour/‘Shakespeare’, presents himself as a *Mure* (‘wall’), defending the ‘Trojans’ of Britain, and holds back an alien invasion by the issue of Margaret Tudor (1489-1541), Queen of Scots, and Mary Tudor (1496-1533), once Queen of France. The line of Mary Tudor had been sullied as her daughter Frances (1517-59) by Charles Brandon (1484-1545), 1st Duke of Suffolk, married Henry Grey (1517-54), 3rd Marquess of Dorset. Frances and Henry Grey became the ambitious parents of Lady Jane Grey who briefly displaced the line of Crown Tudors in 1553. Oxford, falsely named ‘de Vere’—was ‘an ever devouring cankerworm’, (*Fr*) *ver rongeur*, in the rose of Tudor’; he must not allow himself to be crowned under that name. As such, he would be like Jane Grey, under obligation to the ‘Greeks’ and controlled by Yorkist raptors; he would become further enmeshed in a violent struggle, and apt to lose his ‘cap’ (*head*).

Consider the story of the St Maurs/Seymours and their place in the ‘second’ Wars of the Roses — a war of strategic engagements and secret marriages, and unjustified beheadings among members of the Plantagenet family. It is by a “More marriage” that Princess Elizabeth became the enigmatic “Dark Lady”, (*Latin*) ~ *matrona morulus* ~, of the *Sonnets*.

Item: The bloodline of Tudor had a ‘thorn’ or two along the way, as did the Plantagenet line. In *Part 1, Henry VI, II.4*, an argument occurs between SOMERSET and RICHARD PLANTAGENET regarding the honor of their births. The allusion is apt; both lines—Lancaster and York—were corrupted. Lancaster-Beaufort, including SOMERSET, was the legitimized brood of **John of Gaunt** (1340-99), by his mistress Katherine Swynford (1350-1403); Gaunt was the 3rd son of King Edward III. **Richard Plantagenet** (1411-1460), was son of Richard of Conisbrough (1385-1415), 3rd Earl of Cambridge and wife Anne de Mortimer (1388-1411). *Cambridge* was the 2nd son of Edmund of Langley (1341-1402) and his wife Isabella of Castile (1355-93), the illegitimate daughter of King Peter of Castile and his mistress, María de Padilla. Edmund was the 4th son of Edward III. Hence, both Gaunt and Plantagenet had a thorny difficulty—an ‘Error’ of descent. The discussion is a proxy for one current during the Elizabethan period among competing claims of the Grey-Dudley Tudors and the Crown Tudors. The differences in the claims are subtle and left unresolved, but the Artist’s loyalty is to the ‘Strong fixed House of Lancaster’ (1 *Henry VI II. 5 102*) and he sides with SOMERSET/Beaufort, even if his ‘true’ (*vere*) and ‘right’ (*legitimus*) birth is false.

Another ‘difficulty’ was the birth of Edmund Tudor (1430-56), child of dowager queen Catherine of Valois (1401-37) and Owen Tudor (1400-61). Queen Catherine had been having an affair with Edmund Beaufort (1406-55), 2nd Duke of Somerset, following the death of her husband King Henry V. Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (1390-1447), guardian of young Henry VI, urged a parliamentary statute governing the custody and remarriage of widowed queens for fear Queen Catherine might produce spurious children to compete with the royal line of Lancaster/Beaufort. To avoid penalties of the statute, it appears a secret marriage was arranged between Owen Tudor and Queen Catherine to hide her affair with Beaufort, but leaves the possibility that Catherine’s pregnancy was by Beaufort and not Tudor. This means the parents of Henry VII (1457-1509), might both have been Beaufort—Edmund and Margaret—and *that* line justified the ‘Tudor’ claim to the Crown. This information sets the stage for the **Wars of the Roses ‘Continued’** (1485-1603):

Part B In early October, 1549, King Edward VI was taken to Windsor Castle by his uncle, Lord Protector **Edward Seymour** (1500-52). Seymour was the king’s eldest maternal uncle and had been appointed by Henry VIII to the ruling council (~ Regency ~) for the duration of the young king’s minority. The Protector, created 1st Duke of Somerset in 1547, became unpopular for a number of reasons, and upon sensing his imminent fall from power, removed to Windsor with his most valuable possession—the person of the king. Though Seymour had been given Royal Authority, he still needed the signature of Edward VI to rule. From Windsor, young Edward VI wrote: “Methinks I am in prison.” It might have appeared so, but subsequent events suggest it was also for protection from Grey Family ‘Raptors’, particularly the Dudleys.

Item: The Protector's brother, Lord Admiral **Thomas Seymour**, attempted to counter the near absolute power and prestige of Protector **Somerset**, by marrying king Henry VIII's last Queen, Katherine Parr, and thereby assuming control of the person of Princess Elizabeth Tudor. Elizabeth had been left in the care of Parr by the dying king Henry, and lived in the homes of Seymour and Parr from February 1547 until June 1548. Likewise, Admiral Thomas managed a degree of control over Lady Jane Grey by convincing Henry Grey (1517-54), *3rd Marquess of Dorset*, that he could arrange the marriage of the boy king, Edward VI, to Dorset's eldest daughter, Lady Jane. Jane also joined the household of Seymour and Parr.

Item: In 1553, as Edward VI lay dying of tuberculosis, a tumor, or perhaps poison, the Lord President of the Privy Council, John Dudley—created *Duke of Northumberland* in 1551—persuaded or deceived king **Edward VI (Seymour-Tudor)** into altering the 'Device for the Succession', thereby making Lady Jane first in line to succeed when King Edward expired. Northumberland also saw Jane Grey married to his son Guildford, making Guildford *de facto* king should Jane accede. This would have side-lined Princesses Mary and Elizabeth Tudor.

Item: Another **Edward Seymour** (1539-1621), *1st Earl of Hertford*, and eldest son of Protector Somerset, secretly married (*m. 1560*) Lady Katherine Grey (1540-68), Lady Jane's younger sister. When Queen Elizabeth learned of their marriage, she confined 'Hertford' in the Tower of London, and wife Katherine was placed under house arrest. Lady Katherine attempted to escape to France, was captured and placed in the Tower; she died there in 1568. Nonetheless, Lady Katherine bore Seymour two sons (1561 & '63).

Item: Another **Edward Seymour** (1561-1612), *Lord Beauchamp*, was the elder son of the above union. By virtue of Henry VIII's Third Succession Act (1543), Seymour became the senior claimant to the throne in 1603 (when Queen Elizabeth died), but was passed over by Robert Cecil in favor of king James VI of Scotland. This Lord Beauchamp married Honora Rogers in 1582. Their eldest son, **William Seymour** (1588-1660), secretly married Lady Arbela Stuart (1575-1615), only child of Charles Stuart, *1st Earl of Lennox*, and together they presented a strong claim to the English throne should king James VI (Scotland) & I (England) fall from power at some point. Arbela was placed in the Tower for safe keeping, but for years sued for release. Finally she went on a hunger strike and died in prison. After her death, William Seymour gradually worked his way back into favor.

Item: There is yet another Seymour—**Edward Tudor-Seymour**—known by the title he acknowledged in life—Edward Oxenford. We know his story and name because each work by 'William Shakespeare' records them in "ev'ry line, each verse", just as Leonard Digges wrote in his (*L*) *explicatio* printed at the beginning of the *First Folio*. It seems the obvious reason for Oxford's disappearance is the judgement of attainder against his father, Admiral Thomas Seymour (*see above*); but he was struck by a heavier blow—*Damnatio Memoriae*. This 'condemnation of memory', or erasure from the historic record, fell on the true Tudor-Seymour identity of Oxford. This may be thought a means of shielding Princess Elizabeth Tudor from a mortal scandal, but has a more profound effect on our reading of Shakespeare's words. Like his cousin, Lord Hertford (*above*), Oxford produced illegitimate children and did time in the Tower of London.

Item: And another Seymour ... Henry 'Wriothesley' (1573-1624), *3rd Earl of Southampton*, is almost certainly the first "boy son" of Edward Tudor-Seymour. Properly, he might have been named Henry Browne-Seymour. 'Shakespeare' diffusely *wills his Tudor blood* to Wriothesley in his dedication to *The Rape of Lucrece*. Further, PRINCE HAL alludes to him as the "Browne Bastard" of FRANCIS (a Frank-Verus 'drawer'—like an Ox, *see Part I, Henry IV II.4 71*), who masks for Edward 'de Vere', *17th Earl of Oxford*. This can only stand if both HAL/Oxford-Seymour and FRANCIS/Oxford 'de Vere' claim some part in the child's parentage; yet such a confused line of descent is easily explained if PUCK/Cecil has misidentified a *Mour*.

'Wriothesley' fell to a temptation by Robert Devereux (1565-1601), *2nd Earl of Essex*, and allied himself with the Grey-Dudley faction (*c. 1596*), in a move that gave the coercive powers formerly held by Dudley, to Devereux. Thus, Essex could claim possession of the 'person' of an Heir (Southampton) to Queen Elizabeth I. This would explain the aim of the Essex Rebellion (1601)—to place Southampton on the throne. It would also explain the beheading of Essex, who had over-stepped his strength, but not Oxford's son Southampton, who had been an impressionable Fool, yet carried forward Crown Tudor blood.

As you can see, the 'possession' of British princes, male and female, has been a means to political power. It began with Lord Protector Somerset's (Ed. Seymour) jealous control of Edward VI.

Katherine Parr and Thomas Seymour briefly managed a similar control of Elizabeth Tudor and Jane Grey. The Regency power of Lord President John Dudley assumed ‘possession’ of both young ladies after the fall of Edward Seymour, ‘Somerset’, in late 1549; but with such power came the ‘kiss of death’. IAGO (*Othello*. 1.1 8) refers to this point in Shakespeare’s characteristic manner—in enigmatic allegory:

“Three great ones of the City ... off-capped” [to The Moor] “capped”/(L) *caput*: ‘head’

Edward Seymour, Thomas Seymour, and John Dudley, were the great Ones who knelt to the headsman. And who is ‘The Moor’ for whom they lose their heads? He is ‘The Son’, Edward St Maur/Seymour, our “**beloved, The AUTHOR**”. This is history—“a kind of history”. Oxford has written the History Plays to tell the story of his family, but also describe episodes that mirror his own life. He must achieve this end discreetly; and this is why it is hard to understand ‘Shakespeare’ in the way he hoped to be understood.

As postscript to these histories: The present King Charles III traces his descent from the line of Edward Seymour, Lord Somerset (1500-52). Diana Spencer, Princess of Wales, descended from Edward Tudor-Seymour by two blood lines according to Paul Streitz (*Oxford... p.282*). Prince William, now heir apparent to the throne, can thus claim some ‘Shakespeare’ from both parents. It All came out in the wash.

A Threefold Presentation: A Tale, “a Kind of History”, and an Authentic Biography

There are three essential levels by which each play by ‘Shakespeare’ may be read. The **first level** presents an apparent fiction. Meaning emerges from each story as one sees it—according to relationships we each understand from life. They may speak to us of moral distinctions. Shakespeare’s plays are often understood as ‘cautionary tales’. In the case of *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, the writer might warn against artificiality in rhetoric—of the Euphuists, for example.

A **second level** links the fiction to historical individuals. As such, the plays might appear to be allegories or *Romans à clef* (‘Novels with key’), revealing the lives of important individuals living in the time of Edward Oxenford. William Farina mentions that the King of Navarre’s followers, BEROWNE, LONGAVILLE, and DUMAIN, have names similar to historical figures. The character of BEROWNE, is likely modeled on *Baron de Biron*—Armand de Gontaut (1524-92); Biron was a page to Queen Marguerite of Navarre in youth, and later named a “Marshal of France” for exceptional service to the Crown. Catholic King Charles IX (1550-74; reign. 1560-74) attempted to place Biron as royal governor of the Huguenot city of La Rochelle in 1572. When the population refused to have him, French forces began a massive siege, and England gave some support to La Rochelle. Both LONGAVILLE, taken from Léonor d’Orléans, *Duke of Longueville* (1540-73), and DUMAIN, from Charles of Lorraine, *Duc de Mayenne* (1554-1611), were military commanders of the siege. Hence, their common thread is they served together as leaders of (Catholic) French Government forces early in the French Wars of Religion (1562-98). The last significant suitor for Queen Elizabeth’s hand in marriage, François, later *Duke of Anjou and Alençon* (1555-84) also served against La Rochelle < (MFr) *roche*: ‘montagne, colline’; (Fr) *roche*: ‘rock’, cf. (L) *marmor*.

It appears the characters of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* bring to the stage a tribute to a group of French nobles known to Elizabeth I, who were themselves irresolute in support of either Catholics or Protestants. They joined to defeat a non-conformist or ‘secessionist’ faction. Foremost, they were patriots rather than religious ideologues—‘Politique’ like Oxford—conceiving strong and liberal monarchy as a remedy for the loss of a single central religious authority. This we may guess from the artist’s “truant disposition”, the ~ wandering inclination ~ (see *Hamlet* 1.2 169; HORATIO speaking) he brings “in faith” from Martin Luther’s Wittenberg, birthplace of the Reformation. We have more direct evidence of his ~ straying condition ~ by weak arguments for religious faith in a short discourse called “*Euphues and Atheos*” (*Lyly, Vol.1, 291-305*). Students of ‘Shakespeare’ will find in John Lyly’s EUPHUES, a mouthpiece for Oxford in his prime.

FERDINAND—*Fer de Nantes*, or ‘Sword of Nantes’—masks Henri III of Navarre (1553-1610; reign. 1572-1610), and later, King Henri IV of France (r. 1589-1610). This is the man called ‘Good King Henry’ by the French. He was raised Huguenot/Calvinist by his mother, and joined the French Protestant forces in 1572. Upon the death of Henri III (France), the throne was contested; Henri of Navarre was rejected by many for his faith, but famously converted to Catholicism in 1593 to remove a principal objection against him. The allusion to ‘Nantes’ in the character name FERDINAND refers to the Edict of Nantes (1598) by which an allowance for certain rights was granted by Henri IV to the French Huguenots/Protestants.

Eva Turner Clark (1871-1947) was a proponent of this ‘second level’ of analysis in her book: *Hidden Allusions in Shakespeare’s Plays* (1931). No doubt, Oxford intended some allusions to well known individuals, but you will often note he does not record historical relationships forthrightly. His scheme is to use them as ‘cover’; they may protect him from accusations of revealing State secrets about himself and the Queen. He might plausibly deny an ulterior motive by presenting topical subjects and current figures, as he does in this example with a familiar cast of harmless ‘Navarrese students’. The *Variorum* of Horace Furness, 1904, places topical ‘second level’ allusions to historical events of 1589-98, but clues within the work suggest events from earlier in the lifetime of Queen Elizabeth I—the death of Henry VIII in 1547 for instance. The “little Achademe” mentioned by FERDINAND (LLL I.1 13) is probably *Academie de Poésie et de Musique* (1570-76), or *Acadamie du Palais* (1576-85).

A **third level** is similar to the second, except instead of accommodating his works to analogues from history or popular fiction, the writer reconciles words and action to his name and life. He assumes the good or bad character of others as facets of one or the other of his two principal identities: Seymour or ‘de Vere’. He distinguishes between good (*bonum, merces*) behaviors natural to him, and bad (*malus, masculus, vir*) behaviors that are forced by a false identity. Technically, what lies between the permitted second, and forbidden third level, is the substitution of *transitive wordplay*—apparent only in translation from French or Latin—for the well recognized wordplay in English. Because the device exists purely by implicit associations rather than explicit, it is the basis for **equivocation**. In this mode, dangerous political information may best be hidden and most safely revealed. In *transitive wordplay* lies the “aggressive meaning” mentioned by M. M. Mahood (*Shakespeare’s Wordplay*, p.37.2, 1957):

“It more commonly happens that the aggressive meaning of a word is the blade that strikes home, while the attacker shields himself behind its innocuous meaning.”

Each selection presented in this essay focuses on the biographical **third level**, presenting detail that is **complementary** to important ideas found nearby. Examples are everywhere; here is a riddling etymology that sounds almost like gibberish:

MOTH *Love’s Labour’s Lost* III.1 7-9

7-8 Master, will you win your love with a French braule?

ARMADO

9 How meanest thou, brauling in French?

MOTH

complete: *1a* ‘having all parts or members’

10 No my complete master ...

— both de Vere and Seymour.

This is intended wordplay on a French figure dance, a brawl, or *braule*: *2a* ‘A kind of French dance resembling a cotillon.’ But the Artist, reverting to his childhood—his ‘inner MOTH/MOTE’—hints at a more personal matter. The ‘love’/*amour* ARMADO hopes to ‘win’, is precisely the **Love** whose **Labour** is **Lost**. The French noun *murmure*, means ‘a murmur, whisper, muttering, prattle, bickering, brawling’. Hence, in this case, the French for brawl is (*Fr*) *murmure*, with wordplay on *Mer-mure*—Sea-mour. The answer will be **complementary**: *1b* ‘of two (or more) things: mutually complementing or completing each other’s deficiencies’, ‘completing, perfecting’. MOTH has discovered a balance of syllabic elements in **Mur-Mur**:

MOTH *LLL* III.1 20-23

20 These are complements, these are humours, these betray **these**, (*Fr*) *ces, wp say, Sey, St.*
nice wenchs that would be betrayed without these, and **nice**, (*Fr*) *bonne, biens*: ‘goods’
 22 make them men of note: do you note? men that most are **note**, (*Fr*) *marques*, = Marcius
affected to these?

That did not make much sense to me, and it should not have made much sense to you. Now, if we make a rough literal translation into French, we might get something like:

20 *Ces sont des compléments, ces sont de s’humeurs, se révèlent
 bonnes Souillons que seraient révèlent sans eux, et*

22 *en font des Vires (re)marque: Tu fais re-marquer? De Vires qui sont les plus affecté par ceux-ci.*

But the autobiographical element surfaces when we search for transitive puns—cross-language puns. You can examine dictionaries to find French analogues for the words to see if the results look anything like the Artist's name. 'SHAKESPEARE' anyone? No? But it *is* built of Vere—Tudor—St Maur, or of apt epithets. Let's clarify these puns as adnomination: (*Latin*) *adnominatio*: ~ toward the name ~ .

20 ~ *Sea's-son are Measures, Sey's-son de St. Maur, they re-Veal good Boar-Pigs that would be re-Vealed without the Sea and*

22 *infants-de Vere re-Marc'd: Tu-do r' Marc'd? De Veres which are Maur-liked, Parr the Sea. ~*

liked: 'affected', (*Fr*) *aimer*: 'to love, to like', < (*L*) *amor*.

(E) **measure**: 3a 'due proportion, symmetry, balance'; *anagram* Seamure

My understanding is that this is a discussion relevant to DON ARMADO and MOTH. What pertains to one, pertains to the other—they represent the same individual but at different ages. MOTH attempts to convey information concerning the relationship between a member of the de Vere family and a member of the Seymour family. In the case of Oxford-Seymour, that which is called 'de Vere' is actually Seymour. Further, if the male person in question be a Seymour, should the mother also be 're-vealed' as Seymour? Even if she is Queen Elizabeth Tudor? This is a comedy of errors—of 'heir Ors'.

Again, 'third level' communication is achieved through a **Reference Language**. Unexpected meaning is discovered by the reader when a word is carefully considered in the language of Court in the country where a play is set. In *Love's Labour's Lost*, the Reference Language is French, but certain characters—HOLOFERNES and NATHANIEL in particular—choose meaning from analogues in Latin. The other plays are more consistent. Those set in Italy, Denmark, Austria, Greece, and Anatolia, playfully refer to Latin definitions and polysemy; those in France, Scotland, and England refer to French. Transitive puns are often signaled by repetition, though the technique is applied quite generally, and not restricted to any single rhetorical device. In the example above we note repetitions of these, (*Fr*) *ces*. This is a syllable of the writer's surname Sey or St.—and its complement is (*Fr*) *hu' Meur* (*humeur*), or marque, re'Marque, etc. which denotes the (*Latin*) *gens Marci[us]*. The heir of Tudor-Seymour is the 'Son of the Sea', or Sea'son; we may expect to find him without trouble, because the name has been so often revealed, in:

"ev'ry Line, each Verse" (*Preface to First Folio*, L. Digges.)

This is but one example of the steps needed to understand the writer's transitive wordplay. I suspect the Artist did not expect readers to translate large parts of his work. A small number of passages should allow the reader to catch the general drift of the whole. Yet we cannot discover his jests without researching the etymologies of English words throughout the Canon; this entails finding the etymons or analogues of English words in another language. It's a game. No, really! It is a delightful game.

It would be of little consequence to suggest Oxford had included so much personal history if he had not explicitly counseled readers of its presence. We find in the *Sonnets* the critical information we need. Here is rhetorical *non sequitur* that does indeed follow, if you have the time, inclination, and the 'Will' to follow. The writer insinuates seemingly superfluous material towards his existential purpose. The effect is to create a memorial of his 'not to be spoken' identity (*see B. Jonson, "To the Memory", l.22*)—a memorial not to be inscribed with his true name:

"The earth can yield me but a common grave" (*Sonnet 81 .7*) **common**: 'joint possession, shared'

And so, 'Shakespeare' has chosen his Art to carry his name forward:

"Thou art the grave where buried love doth live." (*Sonnet 31 .9*) **love**, (*L*) *amor*, *wp a' Mor*
~ *Thou Art! the in-terra'ment where buried a'Maur doth live.* ~ "Thou art", *wp ~ Tu tar ~*

But we should not expect an 'easy go of it'. Sharpen your wit, for it is (once More):

"... Art made tongue-tied by Authority," (*Sonnet 66 .9*)

Oxford relies on rhetorical ‘keys’ embedded in each play and poem that nearly continuously identify a character as a part of himself, and satisfies his statement in *Sonnet 76* that he always writes of ‘you’—a particular person—‘the Author’. Though it appears madness, “yet there is method in’t”— (L) *intueor*: ~ if you consider it more carefully ~ (see *Hamlet II. 2 204*):

IAGO (*Othello I.1 5-6*) — Set partly in Venice, the reference language is Latin.

5-6 (Original) “If ever I did dream of such a matter / Abhor me.

e.g.1 (Substitution 1) ~ *If E.Vere I Do To-dor tale a Mater / A Boar me.* ~

e.g.2 (Substitution 2) ~ *If E.Vere I Do Somn-Mare a tail / A Boar me.* ~

These transpositions rely on substitutions from Latin or French—generally, only one language per scene. Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ loves multiple meanings. Either by explicit or implicit wordplay, the words are ‘interlaced’ to define and subtly assure coherence. (English) **ever** is a standard substitution for the false name Edward de Vere. (E) **did**, (Latin) *facere*, (Italian) *fare*: ‘to do’. (E) **dream**, (L) *somnio*, an element of Sommer, Seymour, or St Maur ... otherwise you can try (L) *dormito*: *Il. Trop.* ‘to be dreaming’; it’s a partial anagram of Tudor, or To-dor. (E) **such**, (L) *tale*: ‘such, such like’, with play on (E) *tale*: 3 ‘That which one tells; the relation of a series of events’, or (E) *tail*: 3a ‘The limitation or destination of a freehold estate to a person and the heirs of his body’. (E) **matter** plays on (E) *mater* < (L) *mater*: ‘mother’, or (E) *matter*, (L) *res* might hint at (L) *rex*: ‘king’; otherwise (L) *aliquid*: ‘something (else)’, with wordplay on (E) a liquid, (L) *liquidus*, *liquidus moles*: ‘the sea’. (E) **abhor**: plays on (E) *boar*, (L) *verres*: ‘a male swine, a boar-pig’, punning on *surname de Vere*, or otherwise on (L) *aper*: ‘a wild boar’—a manifest, (L) *aperio*, danger to the writer’s true identity. ‘The Boar’ may gore his groin, such that he ‘dies’ without heir (*Venus and Adonis*). Oxford-Seymour study finds all the works of ‘Shakespeare’ are, in some sense, examinations of the self.

Of Love’s Labour’s Lost

Oxfordians, as usual, are already ‘ahead of the curve’. The play is both satire and biography. The subject is the writer, and within is a wealth of personal information about him. William Farina writes: “Oxfordians postulate that the origins of **Love’s Labor’s Lost** are to be found in the literary fad of Euphuism during the late 1570’s.” (*De Vere as Shakespeare*, p.49, 2006). This is generally accepted by fans of ‘Shakespeare’. It may well be based on “a lost, anonymous work titled *A Maske of Amasones and A Maske of Knightes*” played before a Court audience 11th January, 1579 (*Ibid.* p.49). “Oxfordian scholar Dr. Felicia Hardison Londré of the University of Missouri-Kansas City (possibly the world’s leading authority on this play) believes that the 1579 masque was a primitive version of *Love’s Labor’s Lost* ...”

The title, we will discover in the course of this essay, introduces the idea that MOTE, a page in the service of DON ADRIANO DE ARMADO—nay, who **is** the “**tender Juvenal**” to ARMADO’s “**tough signeur**” (1.2 7-18)—has parentage contested by pedant schoolteacher HOLOFERNES, and also SIR NATHANIEL. NATHANIEL is a curate: ‘a clergyman without benefice’, *i.e.* without ‘land grant in feudal tenure’. The matter of MOTE’s father and mother, though seemingly a subplot of the play, notes an historical revision of great importance to the Author. Is he Ed. Tudor-Seymour, created 17th Earl of Oxford, but truly the son of HOLOFERNES, the unfortunate beheaded Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour? Or is he Ed. de Vere, son of John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford, masked by the ‘landless’ NATHANIEL? At stake is whether we resolve the question of authorship, or whether we decide both the authorship question and solve the mystery of meaning in Shakespeare’s often impenetrable words. The second pursuit offers a far greater prize.

The present study shows the extent of Oxford’s effort to preserve complex identities that often decline into multiple characterizations of the same individual. These poly-vocal representations became the “be-all and the end-all” of his disguise, such that no single actor clearly masks for the suspect writer. It is only in combining several that we discover the ‘fearfully mad’ biography of Edward Tudor-Seymour. Revealing his true name will bring to justice the rapacious “Region Kites” (*Hamlet II.2 518*)—RegenCy-ta, (Old Eng.) *cyta*: ‘kite’)—Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and William Cecil, Baron Burghley.

At the aforementioned **third level** of understanding, Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ presents aspects of himself in several dramatic characters: The Counterparts will tell us something critical about a character!

FERDINAND, a mannerly wise, (*L*) *more*, if somewhat foolish, (*L*) *morio*, King of Navarre; according to BOYET, in *a Mour* with the Princess of France. FERDINAND is ‘Ne-Varre’—not Vere, but More. **BEROWNE**, Biron, ‘bi-rowne’, bis’or / (*L*) *orbis*, *wp* *Tudor*—Tudor-Seymour, his every word a jest! **DUMAIN**, ‘by the hand’, the writer’s literary *corpus*, similar to HORATIO: (*L*) *oratio*: ‘words’ (*Hamlet*). **LONGAVILLE**, ‘langue of Veal’, ~ *langue o’ veau* ~, *wp* ‘tongue of veal’ (*Oxford/deVere*); else Longauille, Long-a-will (~ Mor-more ~).

HOLOFERNES, by the name of a the famous Assyrian general beheaded by Judith of Israel, masks for Admiral Thomas Seymour, guardian of Princess Elizabeth Tudor. He insists that the part of a father must not be ‘colored’ (*6a* ‘portrayed in a false light’). His role in a ‘play within the play’ (*V.2*) ‘*The Nine Worthies*’, is as the national liberator Judas (Tudor’s) Maccabeus, but he is mocked as Judas Iscariot, the betrayer of Christ (*LLL V. 2 590-623*).

NATHANIEL, an honest man: “Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile!” (*John 1:47*); “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.” In ‘*The Nine Worthies*’ (*LLL V.2 557-74*) he plays Alexander the Great, conqueror of the World (*Or-bis*: Two-d’Or); he inadvertently undermines both the Grey and Crown Tudors; alas, he is “o’erparted” (*V.2 579*)—*Or*-parted, having lost lands and revenue to Leicester.

DON ADRIANO DE ARMADO, ~ Sir Hadrian ‘Armed’ ~, ‘the Mure’/Wall, Tudor-St Maur—defender of England from foreign invasion.

MOTH, (*French*) *mote*, *motte*: ‘the ball (clod) of earth that adheres about the root of a [family] tree’, (English) *mote*, *wordplay* as the (*French*) *terre*, *wp* *Tu-d’RR* (earth) that clings to his roots or origin; he is a young ADRIANO DE ARMADO, before ARMADO donned the mask of a frivolous Courtier.

COSTARD, a small vessel — (English) *costard n.2* ‘a small sort of a barrel’; (E) *costrel*, (*Middle French*) *costerel*: ‘a small vessel for storing wine, ale, water, etc.’ (*OED*), (E) *costret*: ‘a small vessel for carrying liquids’. The name CLOWN is derived from (*Fr*) *rustre*, *wp*, *anagram* — ~ Tu[t]’errs ~ . COSTARD plays ‘the Fool’ at times, but at other times reveals it’s an act, as does HAMLET.

DULL, a slow-witted constable—a composite of Henry Grey (Duke of Suffolk) and Robert Dudley (Earl of Leicester) ... the name dull is visual play on (Mid Eng) *dulle* — *dudley*. Leicester was born to John Dudley (1504-1553), son of Edmund Dudley (c. 1462-1510) and Elizabeth Grey (1480-1525).

The Ladies of the Princess’ court are, likewise, elements of a whole idea or ‘unity’, and each is the thing needed to complete in marriage that which is lacking in her prospective Mate (from Navarre’s court). This idea was introduced at *Love’s Labour’s Lost III.1 20-23* by MOTH.

PRINCESS OF FRANCE, based on Princess Elizabeth Tudor; she might, of course, marry the King of Navarre or an historical analogue — some French/Spanish Lord. Or she may admit that she has been married, and had a son (Oxford). Marrying again would only diminish her power.

ROSALINE, the ‘Line of the Rose’, *surname* Beaufort, must ‘marry’ BEROWNE/Tudor. Figuratively speaking, is she a partner to BEROWNE? a Crown-Tudor complement of Lady Jane Grey?

Perhaps a Mary Browne-Seymour spouse? Ay, marry, a Rose-Line Berowne Tudor-Seymour?

KATHERINE, ‘purity’, (*Fr*) *pureté*, *wp* *pur été*: ‘pure Summer’ — may marry DUMAIN and purify the writer’s art, making it (*L*) *merus*: ‘unmixed’. At second level = Katherine Grey-Seymour (?)

MARIA, (*Fr*) *mer*, (*L*) *mare*: ‘the sea-*môr*’, must marry ~ Tongue of Veal ~ to complete or simplify Oxford (*V.2 243-52*). At second level = Mary Grey-Keyes (?), youngest sister to Lady Jane Grey.

— **This raises the question** whether Lady Jane, Lady Katherine, and Lady Mary Grey, are to be thought the natural complements to the ‘Mus-co’Wits’, *wordplay* (*L*) *musca*-wits, who attend the King of Navarre; should Crown Tudors intermarry Grey-Tudors, as prescribed by Th. Seymour?

JAQUENETTA, (*L*) *jacio*: *I. B7* ‘to lie in ruins’, *II. B* ‘to be cast down’; (*L*) *jaceo*: *II. C* ‘to utter, mention, let fall (in conversation)’, ‘to throw out in speaking’, *II. A* ‘to cast’, *adulteria*: ‘to lay to one’s charge’ — She is a composite of Lady Elizabeth Tudor and Anne Vavasour (1562-1650), both involved in adulterous affairs with married/Marr’d, men.

Additional characters:

BOYET, secretary and advisor to Princess of France; represents a figure like William Cecil.

BOYET is not hesitant to put the young MOTE “out of his part” (*LLL V.2 337*). The name Boyet is likely derived from (*Mid.Fr*) *boye* = (*Fr*) *boureau*: ‘a tormenter’, ‘one who ill-uses, a mistreater’.

Format

Beside each line number below is the original wording (1) from the *First Folio* — the first printing of ‘Shakespeares’ collected works. I then show a set of definitions (2) inserted within brackets, following the bold-faced original text. They are the heart of the matter! These definitions are ‘proofs’ of the viability of a transposed reading of each sentence. They are not meant as translations, but as a basis from which to examine the polysemy and etymology associated with a word. Readers should review them to assure themselves I have selected reasonable and apt substitutions. Are the chosen definitions consistent with the writer’s known concerns, particularly those that direct us to his origin and inheritance, **in a manner suggesting the writer’s true names?** They should reveal the **Word Wit** so often mentioned by Oxford’s friends and contemporaries. All these definitions are found in standard dictionaries: the *Oxford English Dictionary* for the English language; *Cassell’s French Dictionary*, for the French Language; and *A Latin Dictionary*, Lewis & Short, for Latin (naturally). My purpose is to show that clever ‘sleights of context’, and nearly unremitting wordplay, allow us to understand the Artist’s words in other senses. A revised wording (3) is highlighted in **bold italic** print within ~ ~ symbols, indicating altered or clarified meaning obtained by substitution. The purpose of this transposition is not to settle our understanding once and for all, but to present the fact that, if the writer’s name is ‘Shakespeare’, he has missed his aim — every word does not almost tell his name. The names *he has hit* are Vere, as the lesser or false name (the ‘Leices’er’/ Leicester name), and Tudor-Maur as the *Mawr*-greater authentic name. I follow with additional comments on the writer’s biography and rhetorical scheme (4) behind an arrow (►). I believe my interpretations are in accordance with the recommendations Oxford provides towards understanding the many ambiguous, illogical, or otherwise unusual uses we find in his work. (see **Counsel**, *Shakespeare’s Will*).

A key point of my thesis is that the ability to find definitions that are both apt and witty, and suitable to the figurative (‘tropical’) biography proposed by the Author, would not be possible without careful design and execution. That is, the discovery of the writer’s story in “ev’ry Line, each Verse” is itself the manifestation of his intent. He ‘proves’ this within the text by teasing out precise definitions from various possibilities, and may note his success—“Well proved Wit” (eg. *LLL IV.3 6 & 8*). One-hundred and fourteen thousand lines of verse converge on the writer’s name and story. That’s a lot of evidence.

If you pursue **Oxford’s Invention** diligently, you will find in ‘Shakespeare’ a virtually complete survey of language, rhetoric and Logic. Sister Miriam Joseph documented this beautifully in her 1947 work, *Shakespeares Use of the Arts of Language*. The only significant subject she does not cover is the cohesive and emphatic device of Varronian or Etymological Wordplay. Likely she was not aware of its importance to Elizabethan writers. I will try to demonstrate how such wordplay can contribute to our understanding of the great Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ Canon.

This ‘Invention’ was hardly a development of the 16th century, but according to modern study of Classical literature, goes far back. A small revolution has occurred since the 1980’s in our recognition of this literary device. Martha Malamud has described it in Latin writers of ancient Rome, from Lucretius through Late Antiquity, and notes its relationship to the Atomic Theory of Democritus:

“Lucretius’ verse is a microcosmic model of the atomic universe. His language mirrors as closely as possible the laws he sees operating in the physical world—hence his fascination with puns, anagrammatic wordplays, alliteration, rhyme, and repetition not only of sounds and words, but of entire passages. Letters, syllables, words, phrases, and larger segments of verse are Lucretius’ building blocks, which he deliberately combines and recombines to imitate the ceaseless motion of atoms in the void. His verse is order imitating chaos; the random joinings of the atoms are mimicked by the poet’s significant combinations of letters and syllables.”

Malamud, Martha; *The Poetics of Transformation*, 1989.

I suspect Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ read Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura* with considerable interest.

Let’s take some examples of Shakespeare’s complex rhetoric apart to see if we can confirm whether his Counsel holds true. Does he tell his name with every word ‘Do’t’h’, (*L facere*, (*Fr faire*), and ‘Almost’, (*L fere*)? Is there a consistent allegorical theme — *Faire* Royal Succession perhaps? And together, do these both tell his origin and where he should Proceed? (from *Sonnet 76*).

Here we go (First line shows format) :

Examination of Wordplay: *Love's Labor's Lost* IV.3 1-18 (First Folio, 1623)

BEROWNE

► BEROWNE represents a facet of Oxford/'Shakespeare'. The name likely plays on his parentage: Tudor and Seymour. Bi-rowne = (L) *bis*: 'twice' + (L) *orum*: 'gold'—(L) *orbis*: 'the world, the circle of the world', (Fr) *orbe*: 'globe', *wordplay* Or-bis, ~ twice Or ~, hence Two-d'or, Tudor. He seeks to join ROSALINE in marriage. The 'Line of the Rose' is descent through a Maur, a'mour, *amour*. According to myth, the rose was dedicated by the goddess Venus—also an historical metonym for Elizabeth Tudor—to her son Amor. Though the false name 'de Vere' has apparently divorced Oxford from his true Seymour/St Maur name, still he seeks to unyoke from the line of the Ox, and be lawfully conjoined with his rightful *Venustas* family: 'The Rose'—Tudor-Seymour.

► The Furness *Variorum* of 1904 notes:

“While I have no atom of belief that SHAKESPEARE intended to ridicule Lyly, or to imitate him, there is yet one character, namely Berowne, who more nearly than any other approaches in his speech what we may suppose to be the Euphuism of the Court. Berowne's phrases are unmistakably, at times, Euphuistic.” — Oxford-Seymour Theory posits Oxford wrote 'Lyly'.

(1) The Original line from the *First Folio*. This source is arguable as there remain many questions regarding Oxford's intentions. We don't have manuscripts proofed by the Author. There are many inconsistencies in spelling and irregularities of grammar that have been resolved, especially by the *Cambridge Shakespeare* (1863-66) compositors, but apparently with little regard for the Wordplay that is the subject of this essay. Often apparent errors actually serve to reinforce the clever *double-entendre* hidden within.

1 (line) The King he is hunting the Deare,

(2) From Dictionaries. “Well Proved Wit” = 'Or' assayed *Musa*: ~ Or as'Sey'd More ~ Here are 'proofs' Oxford finds among a range of meanings available for words. The well-documented uses of Latin or French words provide a strong precedent for understanding English analogues similarly, and at times in ways beyond those commonly considered in English alone. Here we find the reason for Transitive Wordplay. Uncounted examples of wordplay and sound-play bind the Artist's Art to his Life, and fulfill his promise that every word doth almost tell his name, testifying to their *birth*, and where *they* did proceed.

~ **The King** [(French) *roi*, (Latin) *rex*, (Spanish) *rey*; in Shakespeare's allegories, a king may represent a (English) Queen, (Fr) *reine*, (L) *regina*, (Sp) *reina*; e.g. *King Lear* is an allegory of Queen Elizabeth's political dilemma: whom to trust? Her extortionist councillors, Robert Dudley and William Cecil? or her forbidden and unacknowledged son (our author, Oxford/'Shakespeare')?] **he is hunting** [(Fr) *chasse*: 'hunting', (Fr) *chasse à courre*: 'running hunt', 'often with hounds'.] **the Deare** [metonymy (Middle English) *déor*: 'deer', (ME) *déore*: 'dear', *adj.2 obsolete* 'hard, difficult', hence (L) *durus*: 'hard, rough', 3 *obsolete* 'dire' = (E) *dure*: *adjective* 'hard', *verb* 'to last, continue in existence'; *wp/wordplay* “the Deare” = Tudor.] ~ **Note: Bold-face** is the original text. *Abbreviation wp* = wordplay or soundplay.

(3) Revised meaning by *double entendre*: To reveal the wordplay that has allowed Oxford to build a 'St Maur y-pointing Pyramus' from the syllabic elements of his name, he and we must use our Wit. This step demonstrates the musings of a Tudor-Seymour mind.

— again, see *Shakespeare's Will*, Michael & Spencer Stepniewski, Oxford-Seymour.com pp.91-96, John Milton's Epitaph on Shakespeare from *Second Folio* of 1632.

~ *The King he is chasing th' Déor*, ~

~ *The King he is chasing Tudor, ~*

(4) Notes, historical and rhetorical:

► The Crown wants stability. It seeks orderly Succession and en-Dur'ing, en-Déor'ing, rule. In Part II of this essay, I'll try to fathom the wit of HOLOFERNES to find 'the Déor' (Deer, Dear, "deare")—the Tu-déor who *has been*, or the Two déor that *have been* killed, by a PRINCESS.

2 (line) I am coursing my selfe.

~ **I am coursing** [(E) coursing: 2 'The sport of chasing hares (heirs) or other game with greyhounds, by sight', (Fr) *chasse à courre*: < (Fr) *cours*: 'to run' (11-13th c.) *curs*, *cors*] **my self** [(Fr) *moi-même*]. ~

a ~ **I am chasing the heir—my self—with Grey-hounds, ~**

b ~ **I, with Grey-hounds, am chasing the heir — Myself. ~**

~ **I am searching for myself, the Heir, and Greys likewise search. ~**

Bio. ► Oxford's extraordinary choice of words is never casual. (E) course: ~ the hunting of hares with Greyhounds ~ cannot be more precise. This hunt matches the Crown Tudors (descended from Henry VIII, 1491-1547) against the Grey-Tudors (down from Mary Tudor, 1496-1533) in the political game of succession. The principals in this struggle are playfully double-named: **Crown Tudors** = ~ Two-deux ~; **Grey-Tudors** = (L) *canus-canis*: ~ grey dogs ~ ('cut throat dogs', if you like; **Seymours** = ~ *Môr-Mores* ~. The *Variorum* of 1904 suggests BEROWNE is to be understood not as hunting with the KING, but hunting for his own lost self—a' Mour lost to ROSALINE. (A *New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*, vol. XIV, "*Loves Labour's Lost*", Furnace, H. H.; 1904, p.160, notes on l.2)

3 They have pitcht a Toyle, I am toyling in a pytch,

~ **They** [i.e. the 'Grey hounds', i.e. the Grey-Suffolk Tudors, including the Dudleys.] **have pitcht** [(Fr) *abattre*: 'throw, overthrow'; alt. (E) pitch: v.2 4a 'to set plant, set up'] **a Toyle** [(E) toil, (Fr) *labour*, (E) labour: 'childbirth', this being the (E) labor of *Love's Labour's Lost*; alt. v.2 (MFr) *toile*: 'a hunting net', v.2 1a 'A net or nets forming an enclosed area into which quarry is driven'], **I am toyling** [(Fr) *toil*, (E) toil: *wp v. as n.*, v.1 'to cover, coat, seal with pitch; to mark or brand (a sheep, etc.) with pitch; to soil or stain with pitch'; alt. (MFr) *tueil*: 'conflict, fighting'] **in a pytch** [(Fr) *brai*: 'resin, rosin, pitch', 'coal tar'; (E) bray: v.3 'to pitch (a ship) with resin, pitch'; (Fr) *brai* is related to (E) bray, and (Scottish dialect) brae: 'slope', 'hillside'.], ~

a ~ **They have overthrown a Labour, I am labouring against black limitation, ~**

b ~ **They have set a net, I am fighting to bray with roi-sin, ~**

~ **They have overthrown a Labour; I am at hard labour in a bray, ~**

Rhetoric ► In 'Shakespeare', proofs of the writer's intentions abound in various forms of **reinforcement (emphasis)** and **polysemy**, combined with schemes of **argumentation**. Once again, the writer's name is the issue and the reason for his oblique and cloudy use of language. Here, in lines 3-4, is a logical sequence in which the word 'pitch', having multiple meanings, is 'proofed' for particular definitions in discrete uses. First, in line 3, we find (E) pitch as (Fr) *abattre*: 'to throw or put down', 'to overthrow', 'to cut or hew down'; pitch is then used in the sense (Fr) *taille*: 'cutting, fashion', with reference to (OFr) *taille*, and (E) tail: 3a *Law* 'the limitation of a freehold estate to a person and the heirs of his body, or some particular class of such heirs' (*OED*). Finally, in line 4, Oxford doubles up on the meaning of pitch as (Fr) *dégré*: 'grade, slope', with cloaked intimation of the writer's assigned name 'de Vere' by *degré*—by the Grey family of the Tudors, specifically Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. The Queen's Tudor-Maur labour is supplanted, pitched, and tailed, by a false de Vere labour ('giving birth'), and so the Crown Tudor monarchy is annihilated.

If there is agreement within all the divergent Shakespeare 'communities', it is that the Artist is a master of Wit. What we have not discovered is Wits reason. I believe the cause can be found by carefully discerning meaning, and in this we are fortunate that Oxford has shown or otherwise

suggested alternate definitions. The reader must consider how rhetorical figures may hide, yet still report, his subversive theme. Oxford's monumental purpose is tied to Succession of the Crown Tudors. He would not be stopped by the injunctions of Authority. He clearly felt he must ultimately 'catch the conscience of his Queen'—Do or Die, *Faire or Mort*, Tudo(r)-Maur.

Bio. ➤ *A' Maur's Labour* has been *Lost*. Oxford, as BEROWNE, toils to seal the ship of state without a treasonous brand—without the false conviction upon his own St Maur/Seymour name. By such means he may find his missing self. He implies that his mother was also a Seymour/*St Maur* or, in his own playful, trōpical language, 'a Moor'. If that is the case, and the writer is descended from a Maur father and a Maur mother, everything could be as it should be.

In order that she, and he, find their proper surname, the 'stain' of attainder must be explained away. The injustice of Thomas Seymour's attainder (death) must be reconciled in Parliament. Something similar had been achieved once before in the tail of the Earldom of Oxford by Edward Seymour, 'Duke of Somerset' (1548). The matter was reviewed by Parliament in 1552; Somerset was beheaded in January of that year, and John de Vere's estate was returned to him (see Green, Nina; *"The Fall of the House of Oxford"*, Brief Chronicles, Vol.1, 2009). The case for restoring Thomas Seymour's name so that his son, Edward Tudor-Seymour, might also be 'restored', became that son's preoccupation—perhaps obsession—by about 1568. However, as before, this would mean bringing coercive ministers, Dudley and Cecil to justice. The Anglican Church might judge the Princess Elizabeth innocent of conspiracy, but instead a victim of rape or youthful indiscretion. Details of this are the very things BEROWNE, and we, are forbid to know (*LLL 1.1 60*); this is his "barren task, too hard to keep", ~ Tu-dure to keep ~ (*l.1 47*). The Author labored much of his life to that end. His personal endeavor caused him: "to sleep but three hours in the night / And not be seen to wink of all the day" (*LLL 1.1 42-43*), lest he give away the secret of his mortal, nightly, toil.

Unfortunately, Oxford's solution met resistance. The only other thing he can suggest is to let the Queen take her own "pitch", and let her innocent babe—Oxford—suffer no more.

As you can see, the true meaning of Oxford/'Shakespeare' (O/S) cannot be fully understood without referring to the life of Edward (Oxford) Tudor-Seymour. And 'Edward de Vere'? It is a 'more such' name "which neVer were nor no man eVer saw".

(— See Part IV this essay, p.121, *The Taming of the Shrew*, Ind. 2 89-94)
(E) *shrew*, (*Fr*) *mégère*, (*Italian*) *megeera*, *wp* (E) **measure**, *anagram* *Seamure*.

4 pitch that defiles; defile, a foul word: Well, set thee

~ **pitch** [(*Fr*) *degré*, (E) pitch: *n.2 1a* 'The angle of inclination.., also a downward slope or drop'; in a parallel manner, (*Fr*) *dévers*: 'inclined'; *wordplay* (E) grey / (*Fr*) *gré*: 'will; liking, pleasure', (*Fr*) *degré*, *wp de*: 'down from, origin' + *surname* Grey plays on the Grey-Tudors as the manipulators of the writer's (and BEROWNE's) identity.] **that defiles** [(*Fr*) *déshonorer*: 'to disgrace, to bring shame', likely *wp* (*Fr*) *déflorer*: 'to deflower', ~ to remove the flower ~; (E) defile, de-, *prefix: 1a* 'down, down from', *Id* 'to subject to some indignity' + (E) file: *n.4* 'a worthless person (male or female), < (*Old Norse*) *fyla*: 'foulness' < *fíll*: 'foul', with *wordplay* on (E) fool, (*L*) *morio*.]; **defile, a foul word** [This is a semantical 'proof'; If you doubt your senses, here is evidence of the Artist's intentions; he is defining the subject circumspectly by defining words associated with his subject.]: **Well** [(*Fr*) *or*: 'but, now; well', *wp* (*Fr*) *or*: 'gold', the golden element in Tu-d'Or and Seym'our; there is extensive *wordplay* in 'Shakespeare' based on the (*L*) *vel* (pronounced as (E) well) as (E) *or*: *conjunction* 'coordinating sentence elements ...', heraldry 'gold or yellow in armorial blazoning], **set** [(*Fr*) *poser*: 'to pose', 'sit', 'to lie' (down), will play on (E) lie: 'make false statements', at 1.10] **thee** ~

a ~ *de Grey that de Flowers; de File, a foul word: Or, lie thee* ~

b ~ *degree that dishonors; de Foul, a Fool word; Or, lie thee* ~

Bio. ➤ (E) pitch is analogous to two French words associated with his false identity: *degré* and *dévers* —de Vere, aligns him with the Grey family, descending from Anchetil de Greye (1046-86).

Rhetoric ➤ Important *wordplay* emerges at *Love's Labour's Lost* V.2 120-21, in which (E) foul plays on (*Fr*) *foule*: 'crowd, throng, multitude', 'rush'. The (*Fr*) *foule* then, is a 'rush' of Russians, or *Moscovites* /

'*Mufcouites*' (*First Folio*) = (L) *musca*, (Fr) *mouche*, (It) *mosca*: 'fly' + wits, (L) *musae* ("as I guess"), indicating Maur-*Musae*: 'wit'. In this way the writer finds the Moscvites to be '*foules*', and it is not always a bad thing to be a fool, (L) *morio*. So says Oxford and Erasmus (see "*In Praise of Folly*").

5 downe sorrow; for so they say the foole said, and so say I,
 ~ **downe** [(Fr) *en bas*, à *bas*; *bas*; (Fr) à *terre*; "set thee down" secures or proves (by Alexandrian Wordplay) the writer's intention to denote the degradation of BEROWNE's position; we see we are on 'the right track'.] **sorrow** [(Fr) *douleur*: 'pain, anguish, grief', *wp?* (Fr) *doux*: 'sweet' as emblem of (Fr) *faire*: 'to do', *surname* Tudor, To-d'heur, Tudor + (Fr) *heur*: 'fortune, chance'; *alt. wp* (E) sore + O[xford]:]; **for** [(Fr) *car*] **so** [(Fr) *si*: 'so, so much'; (Fr) *ainsi*: 'thus, so, in this (or that) manner'] **they say** [(Fr) *mot*: 'saying'; (Fr) *dire*, *wp* (E) dear, deer] **the foole** [(Fr) *sot*] **said** [(Fr) *le mot*: 'the word'], **and so** [(Fr) *si*] **say** [(Fr) *mot*] **I**, ~

~ **base Do-l'heur; for See, they mot the Sot moe, and Si mot I**, ~

► '*Much Ado*' about *Si-mo(t)*—Seymour—and the mischance of sweet succession / *suite doux*.

6 and I the foole: Well proved wit. By the Lord this
 ~ **and I the foole** [(Fr) *sot*: 'fool']: **Well** [(Fr) *or*: 'but, now; well', *wp* (Fr) *or*: 'gold', the golden element in Tu-d'Or and Seym'our] **proved** [(Fr) *démontrer*: 'to demonstrate, prove'; (English) prove: 1 'to make a trial of; to try, test', with apt epithetical support from "well"/[(Fr) *or*: 'well', and "wit".] **wit** [(Fr) *esprit*: 'spirit', 'soul'; 'intellect, wit']. **By** [likely wordplay (Fr) *de*: 'the nobiliary particle, correctly used only after a Christian name or title'; *alt. wp* (English) *bi-*, *combining form*: 'twice, two'] **the Lord** [(Fr) *notre Seigneur*, *wp* (Fr) *dieu*, hence "By the Lord" = ~ Two-dieu, Tudor ~.] **this** ~

~ **and I the Sot: Or demonstrated spirit. Two-d'or! this** ~

~ **and I the Morio: Gold demonstrated spirit. Two-d'Or! this** ~

Rhetoric ► BEROWNE argues premises with himself, and is apparently satisfied his logic holds. The proof
Logic succeeds within his clever rhetoric, and all devices contrive to convey or bear his argument, (L)
Law *argumentum adferre*. (E) proof: *n. Logic* 'A sequence of steps by which a statement is derived from given statements' < (E) prove: 1 'to make a trial of; to try, test', *Law 8* 'to establish the validity of (a will)'. The Artist emphasizes 'proofs' of his identity by the examination of words; fair words are **Tudor** words; more words are **St Maur** words; boar words are **Vere** words; dog words are **Greys**.

Rhetoric ► What precedent do I have to apply the polysemy of French analogues to English words when considering the wordplay in 'Shakespeare'? Such cross language wordplay—'**transitive wordplay**'—was common in Classical Latin and Greek poetry according to recent scholarship (see Bibliography: Frederick Ahl, James J. O'Hara, Michael Paschalis, etc.). Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466-1536) used the trick in his popular essay "*In Praise of Folly*" (*Moriae Encomium*) addressed to his friend Sir Thomas More. Additionally, R. Warwick Bond commented on a related device in the *Complete Works of John Lyly, 1902, Vol. p.125, (4)*. Puns and a play on words:

'birds are trayned with a sweet call, but caught with a broad nette' (pun on 'caule' = net).

Euphues and His England, 'John Lyly', *Complete Works, ibid. Vol.2 p.155, l.23*.

The pun 'caule', < (Fr) *cale*, (ME) *cawle*, *caule*, etc.: 'net', does not appear in the text, but is clearly intended wordplay, and might be termed 'punning by word association'. Oxford-Seymour Theory calls it Transitive Wordplay. 'Shakespeare' himself counsels on the scheme (*Hamlet V. 2 110-11*):

Is't not possible to understand in another tongue? You will to't, sir, really.

~ **You Will Tu-t'uh, sir, Real-ly**. ~ (E) **will**, (L) *more* (E) **real**, (MFr) *real*: 'of a monarch'

Rhetoric In lines 5 & 6, note the effect of the **Reference Language** in 'Shakespeare'; its importance can be discerned everywhere in the plays found in the *First Folio*. If fully expressed in English, the artist's secret intent would have been exposed. Instead he refers to the language of Court used in

the land where the play is set. This allows Oxford/'Shakespeare' to locate his meaning within the range of definitions formally established (Dictionaries) for a word in a foreign vernacular. If a play is set where Latin would be commonly used in royal court, he may draw on the multiple definitions available for Latin analogues of the English word used. If set in France or England, he may draw on the several definitions found in dictionaries for French analogues of the English word chosen. I suspect there is also a good amount of Welsh wordplay hidden within, but Welsh speakers are needed to confirm this. Each word of each passage may be examined for potential meaning within an altered context in the local vernacular. For example—and this demonstrates but one avenue to play in double-entendre—he may use (E) land in a play set in France (*As You Like It* V. 4 187); a dictionary will reveal that (Fr) *lande* means (E) moor, heath:

e.g. JAQUES (speaking to OLIVER, wordplay O[xford] le Vere, who)

187 You to your land and love and great allies;

~ *Tu Tu-t'or a 'Moor and amour and more aliases; ~ great, (Welsh) mawr*

So this is Oxford's "tongue-tied" state—all is well and good—let's say, *Tout-or* and *Mar-chant*. Double entendre plays out in nearly every line of 'Shakespeare'. JAQUES speaks rationally. He wishes a general restoration: to each "convertite" according to his Will. The DUKE should return to his former "honor". ORLANDO = ~ Two-d'or ~, shall receive a'Moor (*amour*) according to his "*mérite*" (~ sea ~). OLIVER = ~ O-le'Vere ~ deserves what his heart desires—to be elevated to the full rank of 'More'. SILVIUS should get a more (Fr) 'Or'-worthy (Fr) *pension* (bed or pension); finally, TOUCHSTONE may return to (Fr) *chamaillerie*: 'quarreling', *wordplay* ~ St Maur-y ~. Each character here masks for Oxford in one form or another. ROSALIND: *i.e.* ~ Beauty's Rose ~ or ~ The Rose of a Maur (*amor*) ~ will have the *Épilogue*: she will ~ Say-More ~; we'll bid her Farewell, (Fr) *Faire or*: ~ Todo'r ~ (see: *As You Like It* V. 4 182-191).

7 Love is as mad as Ajax, it kills mee, I a sheepe:

~ **Love** [(Fr) *amour*, wp, surname a' Mour, the writer is a Maur—St Maur, though he is no saint—Seymour] **is as** [(Fr) *comme*: 'as, in such a way', *pron. çomme* or 'some'] **mad** [(Fr) *fou*, (L) *morio*; I suspect there is unattested use of (L) *morio* in France; the word is found in (English) *moria*.] **as** [(as before)] **Ajax** ["a bellowing ox" (*Illiad* 13.284), "a mongrel, beef-witted lord" (*Troilus & Cressida* II.1 12) *allusion*, Classical Myth: Ajax and Odysseus contended for the armor of Achilles; Athena, a supporter of the Greek Achilles granted the prize to Odysseus; this angered Ajax who then wrought havoc among a herd of sheep and cattle nearby, thinking they were Achaean soldiers.], **it kills** [(Fr) *tuer*: 'to kill, slay'; *likely wordplay* 'two-heirs', makes two heirs (of me), or 'two heirs moi(r).] **mee** [(Fr) *moi*], **I a sheepe** [(Fr) *mouton*, (Fr) *chamois*: (L) *Rupicapra*: 'a goat-antelope native to..Europe' (Wiki), *homonym* St Mau(r)]; ~
~ **'Mour is so Mad as Ajax; it tu-d'heirs moi, I a St Mois** : ~
~ a' *Maur is so moria as Ajax; it tu'heirs More, I a St More* : ~

Rhetoric ➤ **Love** is a **metonym** used consistently by the artist to indicate his proper surname. He names his family circumspectly—himself, his father, and his mother—as (*Latin*) *amor*, or (*French*) *amour*. '*Amour*' or **Love** always names a Mour, a (St) Maur. In classical myth, *Venus*, 'the goddess of Love' is **Love**; her child *Cupid* / *Amor* is also **Love**. Thus, when Oxford /'Shakespeare' speaks of *Venus*, he refers to his mother, a' Maur / **Love**, altered at times in English to Sey'mour—born of sea-foam. He figures himself as the "little love god", *Amor*, in *Sonnets* 153 & 154.

At *Love's Labour's Lost* 1.2 13, ARMADO speaks to MOTH of "congruent **epitheton**"—an apt or accordant **epithet**: 'an adjective indicating some quality or attribute which the speaker or writer regards as characteristic of the person or thing described' (*OED*). Metonyms and epithets perform similar functions; they both denote something the writer chooses not to name properly, but by consistent use, or by clear association, they come to signify that thing. Oxford's metonyms and epithets go a step further and are clearly related etymologically to their true names. This is called **Alexandrian Wordplay**, Varronian Wordplay, or etymological wordplay.

Oxford here alludes to Ajax, a famous warrior from Classical Myth. **Allusion** is a common rhetorical figure referring to notable associations that indirectly complete a characterization. In ‘Shakespeare’ they also speak directly of the author’s biography. As a Greek personation of his Trojan self, ‘de Vere’/Ajax was in the enemy camp, and envious of honors embodied in Achilles armour (ar’mour). Ajax, under the influence of goddess Athena, lapsed into a fit of ‘madness’/‘made-ness’ — (L) *fūror, fūrōr*, or *morio*—and killed sheep and cattle (see [theoi.com/Olympios/Athena Myths, The Madness of Ajax](http://theoi.com/Olympios/Athena_Myths_The_Madness_of_Ajax)). You can expect the allusion to agree with Oxford’s history of self-annihilation and personation on several levels. Ajax is “a bellowing Ox” (*Illiad* 13. 284), and will therefore mask for Oxford’s ‘de Vere’ *alter ego* ; Oxford’s THERSITES, calls him a “mongrel, beef-witted lord”! (*Troilus and Cressida* II. 1 12; see Trapp, Richard L.; *Ajax in the Illiad, The Classical Journal, Vol. 56, No. 6 March 1961*). Get it?

The subject of Allusion is raised by HOLOFERNES at LLL IV. 2 41 & 43:

- HOLO. 41 Th’ allusion holds in the exchange.
 DULL 42 ... the collusion holds in the exchange. (DULL notes a **hidden political truth**.)
 HOLO. 43 I say th’allusion holds in the exchange. wp **th’allus-ion** < (L) *thalamus*: ‘room / moor’

Bio. ➤ Throughout ‘Shakespeare’, we find the writer takes the side of the Trojans against the Greeks. This is because he assumes, in part, the role of *Brutus*, a descendent of mythic *Aeneas* of Troy. *Brutus*, according to English myth, left a city *Aeneas* founded, *Alba Longa* (near Rome), and sailed to Gaul (France and Belgium), and then further west, to found the ‘Brutish’/British nation. Hence, the ancient Greeks denote enemies of Troy, and by extension, Rome (*anagram* More) and Britain.

By coincidence, the harriers of the Crown Tudors—the Grey-Suffolk Tudors—were served by a group of Greek language and Law specialists from Cambridge University, including Sir Thomas Smith, John Cheke, William Cecil and Roger Ascham. These ‘Greeks’ undertook the task of prosecuting Oxford’s father, Admiral Thomas Seymour, and dealing with the problem of Princess Elizabeth’s child, making him “Tremble and depart” (*A YLI* V. 1 55), ~ Shake and Dis’spear’ ~ . The Artist was ever more wary of them. As the Greek warrior *Ajax* killed sheep while crazed with envy, so have the Greek Lawyers assisted the ‘Greek’ Tudors in killing the Ram (Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour) and his child MOTE/MOTH. This is more fully explained in the second chapter of this work, covering *Love’s Labour’s Lost* V.1 42-55, (see *Part II of this essay, p.28*).

8 Well proved againe a my side. I will not love;
 ~ **Well** [(Fr) *or*: ‘gold’; (L) *orum, aurum*: ‘gold’; *alt.* ‘but, now, well; (Fr) *bien*: ‘good’, *biens*: ‘goods, chattels; fruits, productions’] **proved** [(Fr) *démontrer*: ‘shown, demonstrated’, also (Fr) *éprouver*: ‘to test’, (Fr) *vérifier*: ‘to verify’] **again** [(Fr) *encore*: ‘once more’] **a** [(E) *prep.* ‘variant of’] **my side** [(Fr) *de mon côté* (?)]. **I will** [(Fr) *volonté, désir*: ‘desire’, likely wp de + sire; wp? (E) will, the will, (L) *mos, mores*: ‘custom, manners, mores:’, (Fr) *mœurs*: ‘ways, manners and customs’] **not love** [(Fr) *aimer*]: ~
 ~ *d’Or verified once more, for my part. I de-Sire not a Maur;* ~

9 if I do, hang me: yfaith I will not. O but her eye:
 ~ **if** [(Fr) *si*: ‘if, supposing’] **I do** [(Fr) *faire*: ‘to do, to make, to be’], **hang** [(Fr) *suspendre, pendre*: *playing with* (Latin) *sus*: ‘pig’ or (Fr) *verre*: ‘boar’, as emblem of the de Vere family; similarly (Fr) *truie*: ‘sow’, wp (E) true = (Fr) *vrai, vérité*] **me: yfaith** [(Fr) *en vérité*: ‘in truth’, wp (Fr) *verrat*, (L) *verre*: ‘boar’, wp (Fr) *verrat-é*] **I will** [(Fr) *volonté*: ‘will’, according to ones desire.] **not. O** [wp, *synecdoche* (rhetorical figure: ‘a whole for a part or a part for a whole) O = Oxford], **but** [(Fr) *mais, sauf que*: ‘save, except that’] **her eye** [(Fr) *œil*: ‘eye’, ‘bud, bourgeon’, (E) *bourgeon*: I ‘a young shoot of a plant’, as in (Fr) *bourgeon*: ‘bud, shoot’]: ~

~ *If I Do, sus-pend me: in Verrat-é I Maur not. O but her bourgeon:* ~

~ *If I be Tu-Do(r), Verr-aly hang me, in Verrat-é I Maur not. O, her only bud:* ~

~ *If Tudor, hang me as a swine: In Boarish-ness, I Maur not. O, except I be her child:* ~

- Bio.* ➤ Lines 9-10 tell us the threat our writer faces if he should insist on the name Tudor-St Maur — he will be hanged (be-headed or poisoned). He had better accept being reduced to ‘de Vere’.
- Rhetoric* To be debased is to have the estimation of your worth lowered—to be ‘lightened’, as in line 10. In Shakespeare’s crammed lexicon, (E) ever usually, if not always, signifies ‘E. Vere’, derived from (*Middle Low German*) *ever*, and (*Middle Dutch*) *ever*: ‘a wild boar’, in turn descended from (*Classical Latin*) *aper*: ‘a wild boar’. This is the significance of the ‘loving castration’ and death of the author (by loss of blood) as seen in *Venus and Adonis*. By antithesis, (E) ever is frequently set against (E) never, in which the particle (E) *ne* = denotes ‘a simple negative’. Never names the state-of-being that is *not* ‘boar-ish’, and so, *not* a ‘bor-ent’ (see *Sonnet 116* and *Othello I.1 4-6*).

10 by this light, but for her eye, I would not love her;
 ~ **by** [(Fr) *par*, possible wordplay Parr, naming Queen Katherine Parr as an architect of princess Elizabeth’s security.] **this light** [(Fr) *légèreté*: ‘lightness’], **but** [(Fr) *sauf que*: ‘except for’] **for** [(Fr) *vers*: ‘towards, to’, ‘for’] **her eye** [(Fr) *œil*: ‘eye, bud, bourgeon’, hence ‘child’], **I would not love** [(Fr) *aimer*, *wp* (Fr) *amour*] **her** [(Fr) *elle, lui*; *wp?* (Fr) *heir*]; ~
 ~ **By this lightness, except for her bourgeon, I would not a’ Maur her;** ~
 ~ *Parr this lightness, except Vere her child, I would not a’ Maur her;* ~
 ~ *By this lightness, except I be her child, I would not make a’ Maur of her;* ~

- Bio.* ➤ Oxford reveals he would not insist on naming his mother ‘a Maur’ (amour) if it did not bear so heavily on himself—“but for her eye”—for he is that “eye” (‘bourgeon, offspring’), well, he is “two eyes”. Though he insists (*ll.12-14*) he is truly Tudor-Maur, yet he is falsely Vere. The works of Oxford/Shakespeare are heavily biased to these two antithetical names. A similar idea is found in Classical Myth in the related figures of Amor and Cupido; Amor may be thought to represent an abstract devotion to another person, while Cupido suggests desire or lust for another. Oxford as Tudor-St Maur signifies a purer, ‘good’ amor. These are the protagonists of ‘Shakespeare’, including HAMLET, CORIOLANUS, EDGAR and CORDELIA, BRUTUS, OTHELLO, POSTHUMOUS LEONATUS, ORLANDO, VINCENTIO, ANTONIO, BENEDICK, VIOLA, RICHMOND, PRINCE HAL.
 ‘De Vere’ as Cupido is mixed with baser drives and often ‘bad’/*malus* emotions, usually envy and vengeance — LAERTES, AUFIDIUS, EDMUND, CASSIUS, IAGO, IACHIMO, OLIVER, ANGELO, SHYLOCK, DON JOHN, MALVOLIO, RICHARD III, HOTSPUR, ‘and on and on’. From *1 Henry IV ll.4 150-271* we may understand these antithetical identities are not the last of the Artist’s ‘rogues in buckram suits’—bound as books. We may well look elsewhere in Elizabethan Literature and find examples by ‘other’ authors duplicating many elements of ‘Shakespeare’. And some of those ‘other’ artists may eventually prove to be Oxford by various allonyms and pseudonyms. We may find, as testified by FALSTAFF (*ll.4 154 & 156*) there were “a hundred” such ‘capons’ (*wp* ~ retaining their heads ~), solely to protect PRINCE HAL.

11 yes, for her two eyes. Well, I doe nothing in the world but lye
 ~ **yes, for** [(Fr) *car*] **her two** [(Fr) *deux*, *wp* (E) *Do*—*To do*, Tudor.] **eyes** [(Fr) *yeux, les yeux*: ‘eyes, buds, bourgeons’, offspring, *wp* youths (?); (Fr) ~ *two d’œils* ~ , (Fr) ~ *two d’o* ~]. **Well** [(Fr) *or*: ‘but, now; well’, *wp* (Fr) *or*: ‘gold’, the golden element in Tu-d’Or and Seym’our.], **I doe** [(Fr) *faire*: ‘to do’] **nothing** [(Fr) *néant*: *wp* (E) *no more* — (E) *ne*: ‘a simple negative’ + (E) *ant* = *obsolete* (E) *maur*, (Middle English) *mor, mour*: *I* ‘various small insects..of the family *Formicidae*’; (E) *ant*, (Fr) *fourmi*, *wp*, *anagram fimour* (with ‘long s’)] **in the world** [(Fr) *du tout*, wordplay ~ *tout’du* ~ , hence ‘nothing Tudor’] **but** [(Fr) *sauf que*: ‘except, save that’] **lye** [(Fr) *chômer*: ‘to cease work, to be doing nothing’, agriculture ‘to lie fallow’, *wp*, *pun* Sommer, St Maur.] ~
 ~ **Yes, for her Deux buds. Or, I fare nor Maur in Tudor save St Maur,** ~
 ~ *Yes, for her Tudor buds. Or, I fare nor Maur in Tudor save St Maur,* ~
 ~ *Yes, for her Tu-d’œils. Or, I fare nor Maur in Tudor, save for St Maur,* ~

- Wordplay on (E) *lie* (*OED*):

verb 1 ‘Of persons or animals: to be in a prostrate or recumbent position’.

verb 2 ‘To tell a lie; to utter a falsehood; to speak falsely’.

Rhetoric The truth of names is shown when etymology identifies something fundamental in the nature or situation of the thing named. The writer plays with this idea throughout ‘Shakespeare’. We find his principal surnames, St. Maur or Seymour, and Tudor, have roots in (*Latin*) mora: ‘to delay’, and (*L*) tardo: ‘I delay’. Oxford marks this idea repeatedly in *Troilus and Cressida* (1.1 15-26): “Still have I tarried”. The Writer ‘lies’ or abides in (*L*) versor: ‘to be, to be situated’ (de Vere). However, that is not his true form, but his ‘still’ or inactive form. If Oxford was as productive under various pseudonyms and allonyms as it appears, he was anything but ‘still’—(*L*) immotus: ‘motionless’—yet he may still complain he “lacks advancement” (*Hamlet* III. 2 333). Otherwise, he might be (*L*) sessilis (*wp Cecil*’s: i.e. ~ held by Cecils ~), (*E*) sessile: 2 ‘Of certain animals: Sedentary, fixed to one spot’. That he lies is a lie. In the present wordplay on (*E*) lie, we find a restatement of HAMLET’s famous soliloquy: “To be or not to be” — ‘Sum or’ not ‘Versor’.

12 and lye in my throate. By heaven, I doe love, and it hath

~ **and lye** [(*Fr*) mentir] **in my throate** [(*Fr*) gorge, (*E*) gorge: 2 ‘the internal throat’, 3 falconry ‘the crop of a hawk. Hence in opprobrious rhetorical use, the ‘maw’ — (*E*) maw: 1 ‘the crop of a bird’, 3a ‘the throat or gullet’, (*E*) maw (Mew): *n.3* ‘the Common Gull, (*E*) Grey Gull, *Larus canus*’, ‘a ravenous sea-bird’, maw punning on more]. **By** [(*Fr*) par: ‘by, through; for, for the sake of’] **heaven** [(*Fr*) ciel, (*Latin*) caelum: wordplay A frequent metonym for Sea-mure; *alt.* (*Fr*) céleste; *wp par cieux*, (*Fr*) partiaux: ‘biased, unfair’, likely wordplay (*Fr*) ce leste: ‘this quick’, *epithet* Leicester, Robert Dudley.], **I doe** [(*Fr*) faire: ‘to do’, *wp Tudor*] **love** [(*Fr*) aimer, amour], **and it hath** [(*Fr*) avoir, faire] ~

~ **and tell untruths in my Maw. Two-dieux, I Do a’Mour, and it hath** ~

~ **and tell lies in my Maw. Two-dieux, I Doe-Maur, and it hath** ~

► BEROWNE swears, (*Fr*) faire serment (‘to do-St Maur’) “By heaven” (~ Two Dieu ~).

13 taught me to Rime, and to be mallicholie : and here is

~ **taught** [(*Fr*) instruire: ‘instruct, teach, tutor’, *wp Tudor*] **me to Rime** [(*Fr*) rimer: ‘to rhyme; to write verses’, (*Fr*) versifier: ‘to versify, to write verse’, (*Fr*) faire rimer, *wp*, *anagram* (*E*) mire; *alt.* likely including obsolete definitions (*E*) rime: *v.1* ‘to count, reckon, enumerate’, and perhaps *v.2* ‘to make clear, vacant for someone’(!)], **and to be** [(*Fr*) être: ‘to be’] **mallicholie** [*wp melan/mal*: ‘black’ + *choler*: ‘one of the four cardinal humours, identified as bile’; ‘black-humored’, *wp* Maurish, ‘moorish’, St Maurish]: **and here** [(*Mid. Fr*) ici, alors: *wp* (*E*) ~ all’Ors ~ : *tout d’ors*, Tudors] **is** ~

~ **Tutored me to Versi-fy, and to be Male-[h]umored: and Tudor is** ~

~ **Tudor’d me to Do Veres, and to be Vir a’Maur-ed: and to d’Or is** ~

14 part of my Rime, and here my mallicholie. Well, she

~ **part** [(*Fr*) partie; portion: ‘a part’, *wp* (*Fr*) porte: ‘doorway, door’, *wp d’or*, the golden element of Tudor and Seymour + tion, *wp* scion] **of my Rime** [(*Fr*) rimer: ‘to rhyme; write verses’, (*Fr*) versifier: ‘to versify, to write verse’], **and here** [(*Mid. Fr*) ici, alors: *wp* (*E*) ~ all’Ors ~ : *tout d’ors*, Tudors] **my mallicholie** [*wp*, (*Fr*) mal: ‘evil, wrong’, (*Fr*) malice: ‘desire to do evil; ill-will’ + (*Fr*) colère: ‘one of the four cardinal humours, identified as bile’; ‘black-humored’, *wp* Maurish, ‘moorish’, St Maurish]. **Well** [(*Fr*) or: ‘but, now, well’], **she** ~

~ **Port’ scion of my Verse, and Tu-d’Or is my male-choler. Or, she** ~

~ **port’ion of my Verse, and All-Or is my Vere a’Maur. Or, she** ~

► The “part of my Rime”—the ~ *Port’ scion of my Verse* ~ —is a reversion or transfer of some part of the writer’s humour (that which is *Tout de / Tudor*) to another (Male / Vir / Vere). This is his “mallicholie” (melancholy).

15 hath one o' my Sonnets already, the Clowne bore it,
 ~ **hath** [(Fr) avoir: 'to have, to possess; to obtain'] **one** [(Fr) un/une, seul: 'only, sole, mere'] **o'**
my sonnets [wp (Fr) seulement = wp (Fr) ~ seul o' mon ~ 'one of my'] **already** [(Fr) déjà: 'already, before,
 previously'], **the Clowne** [(Fr) rustre: 'boor', wp (E) boar, emblem of de Vere family surname, referring to
 COSTARD.] **bore** [(Fr) porter: 'to bear, carry, to port'] **it**, ~
 ~ ***hath already the sole son Elizabeth Tudor, the Boor boar'd it, ~***

16 the Foole sent it, and the Lady hath it : sweet Clowne,
 ~ **the Fool** [(Fr) sot: 'fool', (Latin) morio: 'an arrant fool'] **sent** [(Fr) envoyer: 'to send, to
 forward', 'to dispatch, emit'] **it, and the Lady** [(Fr) dame: '(married) lady', (E) dame: n.1 I 'a female
 ruler', 8 'a mother', 9 chess 'The queen at chess] **hath** [(Fr) avoir: 'to have, to possess; to obtain'] **it:**
sweet [(Fr) doux, wp (E) verb to do, (Fr) faire; alt. wp (E) sweet, (Fr) suite: 'succeeding, following'] **Clown**
 [(Fr) rustre: 'boor', wp (E) boar, emblem of de Vere family surname.], ~
 ~ ***the Sot dispatched it, and the Dame possesses it: suite Boar, ~***
 ~ ***the More dispatched it, the Queen possesses it: suite Boar, ~***

17 sweeter Foole, sweetest Lady. By the world, I would not care
 ~ **sweeter** [(Fr) plus doux: 'more sweet'] **Foole** [(Fr) sot: 'fool', (Latin) morio: 'an arrant fool'],
sweetest [(Fr) le plus doux: 'the most sweet', 'the most Do'] **Lady** [(Fr) Dame]. **By** [wp (Fr) bi: 'two']
the world [(Fr) monde; l'univers; orbe: 'globe, a spherical representation of the earth'], **I would not care**
 [(Fr) soin, wp (E) swine] ~
 ~ ***More suite Sot, the More succeeding Queen. Tu-d'Or, I would not care ~***
 ~ ***More succeeding Sot, most succeeding Queen. Two-d'Or, I would not swine ~***

18 a pin, if the other three were in. Here comes one with a paper,
 ~ **a pin** [(Fr) cheville: 'pin, peg, tree nail', wp (Fr) cheveu: 'a hair', wp ~ an heir ~] **if** [(Fr) si] **the**
other [(Fr) autre: 'other', (Fr) autrui: 'others, other people'] **three** [(Fr) trois, likely identifying the three
 as of (Fr) Troie: 'Troy', i.e. not (Fr) Grec: 'Greek', wp (Fr) gris: 'Grey', hence (Fr) Troyen: 'Trojan', the
 founders of Rome (anagram More), and Britain.] **were** [wp, plural past (E) to be; alt. (E) were: 'man', I 'a
 male person, a man'] **in** [(Fr) en: 'in, to', (E) -en, suffix: 'belonging to a place', 'following a founder',
 added to: Troie + en = Troyen: (E) Trojan]. **Here** [(Fr) alors] **comes** [wp (Fr) comme: 'as; like, almost,
 nearly'; alt. (Fr) venir; arriver: wp R-E.Ver (?)] **one** [(Fr) un, une, wp (Fr) principe: 'beginning, source,
 basis', 'the very first', hence (E) Prince] **with** [(Fr) avec, à] **a paper** [(Fr) papier, feuille de papier; (Fr)
 mémoire: 'report, statement of account'], ~
 ~ ***an heir, if the other men were Trojan. Tout'dor accedes with a Same-mor, ~***
 ~ ***an heir, if the other men were Troyen. Tudors accede with a Same-mor, ~***

19 God give him grace to grone.
 ~ **God** [(Fr) Dieu, wp (E) do, as an element of Tudor.] **give** [(Fr) donner, dō] **him grace** [(Fr)
 grâce: 'mercy', anagram Cy-mer, Sey-mer] **to grone** [(Fr) gémir: wp (Fr) géminé: Botany 'to
 geminate', 'double', i.e. ~ to double his meaning ~; alt. (Fr) bêler: 'to groan', wp (Fr) bélier:
 'Ram'; (Fr) murmure, (L) murmur, (E) groan: I 'a low vocal murmur', hence the doubling of
 more, Mure, môr, Moor, Maur, as in Sea-mor; alt. (Fr) grogne: 'to grumble, grouse', ~ to be
 discontent ~ with wordplay on 'loss of content']. ~
 ~ ***Dieu-Do[r] him Mer-Sey to Murmur. ~***
 ~ ***Two-dō him Mer'Sea-fully, to geminate. ~***
 ~ ***Two-d'Or him Mer'Sea-fully to Ram. ~***
 ~ ***Tutor him not Seymour to double (his meaning). ~***

By whatever means, the Writer always tells elements of his biography. A more complete reckoning of his story is *Hamlet*, but each play by ‘Shakespeare’ tells another element, if we take care to understand his *gémîné* — his doubling: Ram-Mar, Re-port, Mor-More, Two-d’Or, Same-More. I believe my efforts reveal some of Oxford’s underlying wordplay, but the freedom with which it is to be put together is uncertain. In nearly all cases I have maintained the original grammar. A full vernacular translation in which every word almost tells the writer’s true names is evident if he is ‘aVerse’ to a Vere’s identity and his desired name is Tudor-Maur. However, the result does not read like conventional prose or poetry.

Once More:

1 ~ *The King he is chasing th’ Dure,*
 2 *I am chasing the heir—my self—with Grey-hounds,*
 3 *They have overthrown a Labour, I am labouring against a Black Stain—*
 4 *de Grey that de Flowers; de File, a foul word: Or, lie thee*
 5 *base Do-l’or; for See, they mot the Sot moe, and Si mot I,*
 6 *and I the Sot: Or demonstrated spirit. Two-d’or! this*
 7 *’Mour is so Mad as Ajax; it tu-d’heirs moi, I a St Mois:*
 8 *d’Or Vere-fied (once more), for my part. I de-Sire not a Maur;*
 9 *If I Do, sus-pend me: in Verrat-é I Maur not. ‘O’ but her bourgeon:*
 10 *Parr this lightness, except that it Vere her child, I would not a’ Maur her;*
 11 *Yes, for her Doe youths. Or, I fare nor Maur in Tudor save St Maur,*
 12 *and tell untruths in my Maw. Two-dieux, I Do a’Mour, and it hath*
 13 *Tutored me to Versi-fy, and to be Male-humored: and Tudor is*
 14 *Port’ scion of my Verse, and Tu-d’Or is my mal-humour. Or, she*
 15 *obtained, the sole son Elizabeth Tudor, the Boar ported it,*
 16 *the Sot dispatched it, and the Dame possesses it: suite Boar, more suite*
 17 *Sot, the More succeeding Queen. Tu-d’Or, I would not swine*
 18 *an heir, if the other men were Trojan. Tout’dor accedes with a Same-mor,*
 19 *Dieu Do[r] him Mer-Sey to Murmur. ~*

[Counsel]

To the great Variety of Readers (Preface to First Folio):

And there we hope, to your **divers** capacities, you will find enough, both to draw,
 and hold you: for his **wit** can **no more** lie hid, then it could be lost.

Read him, therefore; and **again**, and **again**: And if then you do not
Like him, surely you are in some **Manifest** danger, not to understand him.

To the great Variety of ‘Shakespeare’ Readers:

And there we hope, to your **diVers** capacities, you will find enough, both to draw,
 and hold you: for his Musa can ‘**no Maur**’ lie hid — then it could be lost.

Read him, for t’heir; and **once more**, and **once more**: And if then you do not
A’Mare him, surely you are in some **Aper-ent** danger, not to understand him.

Clarified at Shakespeare’s request out of Heminges and Condell, Preface to *First Folio*.

(Latin) **amare**, amo: ‘to like, to love’ (Latin) **aperire**, aperio: ‘to uncover, reveal’

(Latin) **apertum**: ‘clear, plain, manifest’ wordplay (Latin) **aper**, **verres**: ‘boar’

Damn'd Shakespeare

It appears there was an effort to restore Shakespeare's identity at the time the *First Folio* was printed. The process, begun by the Writer as the central purpose of his life, was reintroduced with the above counsel in 1623. It has been suggested the publishing of 'Shakespeare' may have been intended to lend support to the pro-Catholic nobility of England, important supporters of the 'Spanish Match'.

Here is equivocation. It is the first counsel of the *First Folio* towards understanding 'Shakespeare'. Heminges and Condell repeat themselves for emphasis, first in equivocal English, then once more with transitive punning from Latin. Transitive puns make their point when words are considered in translation. *What is contained in this counsel that bears repeating?* Simply that: If you miss his 'More' / Maur—if you do not (L) amare him properly—then the meaning of the whole will be lost, and the great Author must henceforth live out his 'boar'-ish life.

"Divers", a Middle English form of (E) diverse: *la* 'different in character or quality; not the same', plays on one of the names denoting Edward Oxenford: the surname 'de Vere'. No matter where you look in the works of 'Shakespeare', you'll find the writer turning away from the name 'de Vere' itself, or from epithets denoting attributes associated with 'de Vere'. This is the defining article in Oxford's argument. The Artist hopes we will become as he is, *a'Mare More* — averse to things swinish and beastly:

Venus and Adonis ll. 589-92 note: **wp** = wordplay "(quoth she)" *i.e.* ~ Sey'd VENUS ~
 'The **boar**' (quoth she) whereat a sudden pale, (Latin) **aper, verres**: 'boar'
 590 Like lawn being spread upon the blushing rose, (E) **lawn**, (L) *gramen*: 'grass' = 'Grey-men'
 Usurps her cheek; she trembles at his tale, **cheek**, (L) *gena, wp geno*: 'offspring'
 592 And on his neck her yoking arms she throws: (E) **yoke**, (L) *jugum servile*: ~ 'enslaving' ~

Now turn the words over in your mind, and Once More, and Once More ...

"And againe, and againe" — but with (L) *Animus*: I 'breath of life, soul'. Sing it with Soul, with (E) Air — (L) *aer*: 'air', *wp* (E) *Heir, II A2* 'memory' (*wp* Same-mor'y).

~ **The Boar!** (quoth she) whereat a Sutton Hoar, surname **Sutton**: Dudley **Hoar**: Grey-white
 590 **Like Grey men being spread upon the Red Rose,** **Red Rose**: House of Lancaster
Usurps her Clan; she Shakes at his entail, **entail**: 'limitation of inheritance'
 592 **And on his neck an enslaving yoke she throws:** ~ **enslaving**: '*servitude afficer*', surname Vere

As allegory, we may understand that Elizabeth Tudor now fears for her son, Edward Tudor-St Maur. She sees a Dudley-Grey 'killing frost' has fallen upon the Crown Tudors because of her affair with Thomas St Maur. Her error severs her child's descent from the House of Lancaster, and ends the royal Crown-Tudor line. Edward's inheritance will be legally limited to the Earldom of Oxford. The name 'de Vere' will force him to submit as a (Latin) *Verna*: 'a slave born in his master's house'; *i.e.* 'Vere' is converted to 'Grey-man', to act in the interests of his Dudley and Cecil masters. Oxford, voiced by MARCELLUS, wants us to know:

90 Something is rotten in the State of Denmark. (*Hamlet* I.4 90)

~ **Something** [(L) *aliquid*, ~ a liquid ~, (L) *liquidus moles*: 'the sea', ~ Sea-More ~ (with r as acceptable substitution for l in Latin.) **is rotten** [(E) rotten, rotted, (L) *putridus*: 'corrupt, decayed', *wp* (Latin) *rotat-*, *rotatus*: 'turned round', *i.e.* (L) *verso*: 'to turn, twist'] **in the State** [(L) *status*: II. *Trop.* 'state, condition, situation, circumstances'] **of Denmark** [*proper name* Den + mark, *wp* (L) *dano, do*: 'to give' + mark; (L) *Marcii*, '*Marcia gens*', 'nomen (clan) of Coriolanus' and Saints Crispin and Crispian, twin brothers martyred — evoking the brothers 'Gemini' (as a Constellation): *Castor and Pollux*, or Tudor-St Maur (surname Marci) and 'de Vere' (surname Verres)]. ~

~ **A Sea-More is rotat- in the Estate of Tudor-St Maur.** ~

~ **Some Rex is re-Vere'sed in the Condition of Tudor-St. Maur.** ~

~ **Some Mater is twisted-about in the Condition of Tudor-St Maur.** ~

Part II — In which the Artist names his fathers.

HOLOFERNES as Ram / Mar NATHANIEL as O'Vis / 'O Vere'

Note: The 'Yorkist' Grey and Dudley families had put Lady Jane Grey on the throne upon the death of Edward VI in 1553. They would come to have reason to hate John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford, because he supported Princess Mary Tudor instead of Lady Jane, and threw his powerful private militia behind Mary in the ensuing struggle. John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, the architect of the Grey-Dudley Plot for the Succession, was beheaded. Thus Dudley's son Robert, Earl of Leicester, in retaliation, sought the death of John de Vere. Because Edward Tudor-Seymour ('Shakespeare') was given the false name 'Oxford' in infancy, and because that name yoked the Ox and his Earldom to Grey-Dudley overlords, our Writer, the 17th Earl, slaved long to undermine his oppressors. In *Macbeth*, John de Vere is figured as the Thane of Cawdor ('Cow-d'or') whose title is granted to MACBETH.

Our "Gentle Shakespeare", or more correctly, the *Mollis Aer, wp Simorr Aer*—the 'Seymour heir' behind the mask—is likely the most significant individual to have gone completely missing from the history of Britain. His is a tale of Metamorphosis. Certainly you may find much of his life recorded in biographies of Edward 'de Vere', 17th Earl of Oxford, but not the most important bits. Anyway, he would not appreciate our using the Vere name. To call him 'de Vere' is to miss the *Aversio*—the "*Apostrophas*", HOLOFERNES calls it—that can be found in all works of the 'Shakespeare' Canon. Instead, he asks to remember a richer bloodline: that of Edward Tudor-Seymour—the sole grandchild of King Henry VIII, and only nephew of King Edward VI. 'History' teaches us the children of King Henry had no children, but 'Shakespeare' clearly believes he is such a one. This presents a problem: How can the Tudor heir prove himself without proving his mother a' Maur. (*a-*, *prefix4*: 'away', 'off', 'from', 'of', wordplay (*E*) *amour*: 'love')

'Prince' Edward, the Man who wrote 'Shakespeare', was proud of this name. It was peerless, and it properly belonged to him. The name 'de Vere' is not verifiable. 'De Vere' is an alien name, a creation: 'an appointment to a position of status', made by leaders of the King's Privy Council, probably in the Summer of 1548. 'De Vere' is a name that haunts the Artist—and he must "grunt and sweat" (*Hamlet III.1 77*), 'sus-pended' under a weary, 'vVere-y', life. If it is not discovered in good time, it will annihilate the true Edward Tudor-Seymour as surely as *Adonis* was snuffed by a Boar (see *Venus and Adonis*).

Oxford was the Elizabethan 'fall guy' for the Seymour Affair between Princess Elizabeth Tudor and Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour, Baron Sudeley. He might have been the most welcome of children, if only he had not proved so wary and head-strong; and if only the most powerful Privy Councillors advising King Edward VI had not already marked his unsanctioned birth as an Opportunity to seize control of the State and it's Treasury (see *The Rape of Lucrece II.874-1023*). His father compounded with his mother "under the Dragon's Tail" (*King Lear I.2 129*) that is, under the limitation of Tudor inheritance by Lord Protector Somerset in late 1547, and his "Nativity was under *Ursa Major*" (*Lear I.2 130*)—the Presidency of Northumberland from 1550-53. The unusually long gestation—two and a half years—is accounted for by the division of our one Author into two individuals: EDGAR and EDMUND (as in *King Lear*), if you will, or St. Maur and 'de Vere'; the two are ~ E.Ver the Seym ~ (see *Sonnet 76*).

The works of Shakespeare are allegories. If you can fathom the names of each of his characters, you will fairly easily discover their historical 16th century identities. Look to the model of *Hamlet I.1*, in which three men are identified as guards of the royal palace and family: MARCELLUS = (*L*) *Marci*, Sea-Mar (*Edward Seymour, Lord Protector Somerset*), BARNARDO = 'The Bear' (*John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, later Duke of Northumberland*), and FRANCISCO = de Vere, 'Frank, True' (*16th Earl of Oxford, Shakespeare's "godfather"*). We note the men involved and may discover the dates to which the writer refers—*May 1548 to January 1552*. Those are the years these three labored together—hardly selflessly—to help a young Princess in trouble. If 'Shakespeare' may be understood, Protector Somerset set aside his desire to appropriate for himself the lands of the Earldom of Oxford, and instead prepared a plausible name for a child soon to arrive from the union of Somerset's brother, Admiral Thomas Seymour, and the younger daughter of King Henry VIII. Each of these guards would eventually die to possess 'the person' of the Monarch.

A similar group is noted by IAGO (*Othello* 1.1): “Three great ones of the city ... **Off-capped** to [the Moor]...”. The Moor is St Maur, the writer. “Off-capped” grimly jests they were beheaded, as HORATIO reveals of HAMLET’s father: “cap-à-pie”! “Top to toe?” questions HAMLET. Yes, “head to foot” the guards affirm (*Hamlet* 1.2 200-228). We can guess the three headless “great ones” are the writer’s father, Thomas Seymour (*Baron Sudeley, d. March 20, 1549*), his uncle, Edward Seymour (*Duke of Somerset, d. Jan. 22, 1552*), and John Dudley (*Duke of Northumberland, d. Aug. 22, 1553*). These powerful Crown servants hoped to leverage a royal heir to their personal advantage. It should be a stunning surprise, in Part III of this essay, to learn how the beheading of Lady Jane Grey—an ‘Old Grey Doe’—is confused with the disappearance of Edward Tudor-Seymour (*O/S*).

The same “Great Ones” are given more prominence in *Love’s Labor’s Lost*.

So this is a tale of ‘possession’, of control of the Crown: whether by regency, by marriage to royals, or under lucrative franchises and awards made to ‘benign’ Privy Council members. The monarch, and the heirs of monarchs, were Britain’s most valuable commodity — and what a Commodity was the Tudor-Seymour child! The story of *Hamlet* is an allegory of England’s lost Tudor Prince: a “**somn**-thing [**M**]ore than fantasy?” (*Hamlet* 1.1 54). This essay will introduce examples of the secret communications practiced by ‘Shakespeare’, who was otherwise “tongue-tied by Authority”. His intention was to assert his claim indirectly. With power, I suggest, he hoped to liberalize religious toleration under fair rule, to avoid the contention between power-hungry Privy Councillors and Parliamentarians, and move England towards more harmonious relationships with other European nations.

Having found his integrity annihilated by the Grey-Dudley faction, Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ contrived to behave as two or more individuals. He was a generous patron to a great community of Elizabethan artists, and gave evidence of a liberal mind, yet was thought a ‘devil’ by the “Great Ones” who used his altered identity to coerce wealth, favor, and titles from the Crown. Oxford’s biography, unfortunately, is known better by records derived from his Burghley and Leicester enemies. The readiness of his friends and associates to fall under the hand of the Dudleys or Cecils—the controlling forces of the police state behind the Queen—meant he could not be certain that a trusted friend hadn’t been ‘turned’ to gathering intelligence against himself. This is how Oxford tells his secret at *Venus and Adonis* 11.673-708:

680	And when thou hast on foot the <u>purblind</u> hare, Mark the <u>poor</u> wretch, to overshoot his troubles, How he outruns the wind, and with what care	purblind : ‘A hare’ (<i>wp</i> heir); ‘mostly blind’; <i>Amor</i> . poor : (<i>L</i>) <i>miser</i> / ~ Si-mer ~ wretch : (<i>L</i>) <i>homo miser</i> / ~ Vir—Si-mer ~
682	He cranks and crosses with a thousand doubles . The many <u>musits</u> through the <u>which</u> he goes	musit : ‘a gap in a hedge..hares may pass’ which , <i>wp</i> witch: (<i>L</i>) <i>veneficus</i> : ‘poisoner, sorcerer’
684	Are like a labyrinth to amaze his foes.	

Venus and Adonis 11.679-84

► Purblind (679) is an epithet for *Cupid/Amor*, son of *Venus*. It is also an older name for the Hare. This is truly “congruent epitheton”; ARMADO applies it to MOTH (*Love’s Labour’s Lost* 1.2 13).

Musit (683), or muset: ‘A gap in a hedge or fence through which hares, rabbits, or other animals may pass; (also) the lair or form of a hare’, with clear wordplay hare/heir. I suspect which is intended wordplay on ‘witch’ indicating a magical agency of Metamorphosis by the hand of Elizabeth, probably under the influence of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester.

“The many musits through the which he goes” were the Artist’s *noms de plume* and plays on the root of (E) musit as the same root of ‘mouse’, (*L*) *mus* and *muris*. They are informants within artificial identities, such as ROSENCRANTZ and GULDENSTERN (*Hamlet*), i.e. ‘Rose Crown’ and ‘Golden Star’ — names assumed by Oxford as allonyms or pseudonyms to disguise his presence. The many names scattered his voice, making it seem that the ‘Prince’ had many supporters, and that his story was uttered from every tongue. It was through the mouthpieces of Arthur Golding, George Peele (peal/salmon/St Maur), John Lyly, Robert Greene, and many others, that his story was first told (see *Oxford’s Voices*, by Robert Prechter, 2021, for further suggestions). Unfortunately, the many false names also separate the man from his work, and thereby both his identity and purpose are lost; he is, in effect, killed. So it appears.

Though it seems complex, nonetheless we have the Author's words on the matter. Rather than dismissing his most soulful purpose, we should accommodate his counsel and learn of his process; the truth lies there. Dare I repeat: 'Shakespeare', Tudor and a'Mour, always wrote of his own life:

O, know, sweet love, I always write of you, **sweet love**, (*L sui amoris*: 'self love', i.e. the Writer.
And you and love are still my argument; (*Sonnet 76. 9-10*)

The present analysis is based on an extensive study of Shakespeare's language (see oxford-seymour.com). The study attempts to discover if a systematic cipher, based in polysemy and the humble pun, might explain why so much of his work seems obscure. Has he, in fact, hidden politically sensitive information, his name for example, in "ev'ry Line, each Verse" as L. Digges suggests (*TO THE MEMORIE of the deceased Author Maister W. SHAKESPEARE, First Folio, Preface*)? Has he 'built himself a livelong monument' — an ~ *Astrum monstrare* ~ / *St Maur* ypointing Pyramid— as John Milton tells us (*2nd Folio*)? Such a (*Latin*) *pyramis*—*wordplay* pier'amiss—would be the (*L*) *Mole* / *pier* / More who has gone missing. We have endeavored to prove that HAMLET's Method, and OTHELLO's Process, are ~ All One, Ever the Same ~ (*Sonnet 76*), and essential to the writer's biography.

As a technical exercise in linguistics and a game of circumvention, 'Shakespeare' has constructed his works from words that hint at his names—apparently defying some injunction against revealing himself. I suggest he made a vow to his mother, Elizabeth I, to protect her from scandal which might jeopardize the Monarchy. He tells us this is his Method, and we have done much to show how he achieved it. The game has sturdy foundations in the Alexandrian (etymological) 'play'—wordplay and soundplay—used by some of the greatest poets since the Roman Republic. If you are not yet acquainted with this type of wordplay, read at least the Introduction to Frederick Ahl's *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*, 1985, pp.17-63.

THE PEDANT/HOLOFERNES of Shakespeare's *Love's Labor's Lost*, is often dismissed for his displays of learning and seemingly pointless *Amplificatio*, i.e. 'enlargement': 'devices used to expand a simple statement'. Maybe he is a 'fool', (*L morio*—that fixture in all of 'Shakespeare'. Nonetheless, according to the Bard's conceit, he speaks truth. All we have to do is find the truth. Perhaps because the young PAGE/MOTH pokes fun at HOLOFERNES' urge to pun and amplify, readers and commenters have followed suit, judging the Author disdainful of such lightness. And yet, the Writer played with words in the manner of 'The Pedant' in each work. I suggest that with self-effacing characterization, HOLOFERNES represents an origin—the parent—of Shakespeare's "rare talent" with language. This talent is used to good purpose—to positively identify himself and his father, albeit in an indirect way. "The play's the Thing", HAMLET tells us, in a voice borrowed, once more, directly from the author: In the play of words one finds the Matter ... and the Matter is the writer's *Mater*. His mother, the Queen, has allowed Dudleys and Cecils to coerce the Crown into acting in *their* personal interests above those of State. Descending from his mother's hidden 'stain', and his father's Attainder, the story of 'Shakespeare' is a fine mystery. It is also a mystery that's been fully solved by the riddling writer, if we can discover his 'Mad Method'.

Below is an enigmatic fragment from *Love's Labor's Lost* V.1 42-56. In truth, nearly every passage in 'Shakespeare' includes riddling wordplay (*Enigma, Noema*), but his Method should help you to solve the riddle. As we read the Poet, an important key is to refer his words to those of the language used at Court for the country in which the play or poem is set—hence **Latin** for those set in Italy or Greece (also Denmark & Austria), **French** for those set in France or England. This is because Oxford (*O/S*) evidently restricts wordplay to the established meanings of words—to the definition or definitions found in Latin dictionaries, or as understood from classical texts. He attempts to 'eternalize' English words as analogues of Latin words. No comprehensive English Dictionary existed at the time of 'Shakespeare'. He relied on the well-recorded polysemy in Latin, and the Latin derived French, to establish a reliable source for defining and thus deciphering, words. It is Oxford's way towards enriching and formalizing our lexicon, and of side-stepping Authority. This process was an important facet of a purposed Renaissance reform of English, Italian, French, and Spanish vernaculars. If our language did not have a word necessary to the writer, a suitable appropriation was made from another that did.

Methodical Wordplay

*To draw no envy (Shakespeare) on thy name,
 Am I thus ample to thy Booke and Fame;* (E) **book**, (Fr) *livre*, wp, surname *le Vere*
While I confesse thy writings to be such, (E) **fame**, (Fr) *fame*: ‘report’, wp ~ two-door ~
*As neither **Man**, nor **Muse**, can praise too much.*

— Ben Jonson, “To the memory of my beloved, The AUTHOR, MR. WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE”

Consider this pun as a fairly complex mental process; it moves from idea to idea, subject to subject — in the present instance: Man to Muse ... Vere to Maur. When the transitive step is taken—to pun across languages—it is even more complex:

“**Man** (nor) **Muse**”

(Fr wordplay) *Mâle* (nor) *Muse* (anagram also)

(Latin wordplay) *mas*, *vir* (nor) *Musa*

(Latin wordplay) *Vir* (nor) (L) *Muris*, *Mus*

(E) Man (nor) (wordplay) (E) Muse or Mouse

(surnames) **Vere** (nor) **Maur**

My argument relies on Oxford’s ingenious tautologies—his exhaustive redundancies—in which “every word doth almost tell his name”. The preservation of the Artist’s name is the central issue of his life. For every case, for each line and verse, Shakespeare’s words allow the writer to be identified falsely as ‘Man’, (Latin) *vir* / surname Vere — or truly as ‘Muse’, (L) *musa*: ‘muse’, wordplay (L) *muris*: ‘wall’ / *muris*: ‘mouse’ (eg. *Mure*, surname *Maur*, *Moor*, *More*, in which ‘a medial or final *r* is represented by an *s*’ — Lewis & Short, p.1520); and in many instances he further associates himself with *Amor*, or *Aeneas*, sons of goddess *Venus* (Elizabeth Tudor), or otherwise with the god *Mars* (Thomas Seymour, see *Venus and Adonis*, ll. 91-102). Because he’s insistent on this point—because Jonson and Milton tell us this is the meaning of the Poet’s ‘monstrous’ *Corpus*—we believe he can hardly be mistaken. Do you see how this scheme might work? ... that his name is buried wherever his book/*corpus* may be found?

Sonnet 72

O, lest your true love may seem false in this, **love**: (Latin) *amor*, wordplay ~ a’ Maur ~
 10 That you for love speak well of me untrue, **well**, (L) wp *vel*: ‘or’, wp (Fr) *or*; (L) *Orum*: ‘gold’
 My name be buried where my body is, **body**, (Latin) *corpus*: metonym ‘a book’
 12 And live no more to shame nor me nor you; **live**: (L) *vivere*: ‘to live’, wordplay ~ de Vere ~
no more: ‘without *More*’; surname St *Maur*, Seymour, as source of shame. **nor—nor**: ~ not Two-d’Or ~

Wordplay is difficult to document, especially when it is pervasive and cryptic. It requires a great deal of explanation, which can be dizzying. Oxford/‘Shakespeare’, in a monumental effort to confound censors, hardly makes it simple to prove his meaning; he has contrived a system that must not be used to testify against himself. Nevertheless, his intentions bleed through wordy fortifications. A good number of dedicated researchers have come to the conclusion Oxford was in some way asserting a royal claim, without discovering the Method behind his compositions. The entire Process rests on the ancient study of *Rhetoric*. Once a foundation of education, it is now something of a lost art.

Wordplay complicates the process of interpretation. Heaven help the translator of ‘Shakespeare’ into a foreign tongue. Some misguided fellow, Dr. Rudolf Genée, made a new German translation of *Love’s Labor’s Lost* in 1887 (Variorum, 1904):

“By excluding much of the play on words, and by judicious omissions of that which no longer appealed to a modern German audience, he reduced it to a Comedy of three acts.”

Three very short acts, I should think. Without wordplay, *Love’s Labor’s Lost* has only the most tenuous hold on entertainment, even if we are advised that a crux of history lies hidden within. But then we must return to the wordplay. The student should not shy away from obvious difficulties, for the rewards of

expression and understanding, and the cultivation of Wit is much greater than the effort. There is simply no point in approaching ‘Shakespeare’ unless you keep wordplay in mind. *Love’s Labour’s Lost* in particular, but also large portions of his other plays, have little purpose unless you discover the secretive *Thesaurus*—the wordy Treasury. Hidden context and meaning is the ‘reason for being’ of Oxford’s Art, and likely the source of his fascination with Ovid:

“Soundplay and wordplay do not simply occur in [Ovid’s] *Metamorphoses*: they are the basis of its structure.”

— Dr. Frederick Ahl, Professor of Classics at Cornell University, “*Metaformations*”, 1985, p.10)

Alexandrian Wordplay, described by Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 BC) in the extant books of his *De Lingua Latina*, forms the basis of structure in ‘Shakespeare’ as well as Ovid. In this brief essay, I’ll attempt to show what all of Shakespeare’s verses are made of, and by their stealthy materials, what they intend. I suggest students should consider their first perceptions, plus a range of alternate contexts and definitions, before we feel certain of the writer’s intentions. Take note of discussions or even mentions of rhetorical devices. The Author has a superb memory; he raises a subject for the benefit of the reader; he reiterates for emphasis. Foremost, assume the key lines of **Sonnet 76** are central to the Canon and give necessary Counsel. The words have been composed with great precision; it is Counsel to the Reader:

Sonnet 76. 5-8

Why write I still all one, ever the same,
 6 And keep invention in a noted weed,
 That every word doth almost tell my name,
 8 Showing their birth, and where they did proceed?

Sonnet 76. 5-8 with commentary.

5 Why write I still all one, ever the same,
 ~ **Why** [(L) *cur*: ‘why (should)’] **write** [(L) *describere*: II ‘to describe in writing’, II B Trop. ‘represent, delineate’] **I** [(Latin) usually expressed in declension, but for emphasis *ego, ego ipse*: ‘I myself’.] **still** [(L) *rursum*: ‘once more’, *wordplay* ~ once Maur ~ ; *alt. (L) immotus*: ‘unshaken, steadfast’ — in general, all uses of (French) *encore*, with *wordplay* indicating ~ at heart ~ .] **all** [(L) *totus, wordplay* Tudo(h)s, Tudors] **one** [(L) *primus, princeps*: II ‘The first man, first person’, IIE ‘a ruler, sovereign’, Prince.], **ever** [*wp surname* E.Vere, (L) *semper*: ‘always’; a sly jest on the motto of Queen Elizabeth I—(L) *Semper eadem!* = ‘Always the Same’, and an indication of the Queen’s marriage (*de facto* ?) to Thomas Seymour.] **the same** [*wp* Seym, first syllable of Seymour], ~

~ **Why should I describe myself once Maur, Tudor, Prince, E.Vere the Seym,** ~

- The string of adjectives/adverbs in line 5, “still all one, ever the same”, may also function as nouns. They are like epithets for the Writer, substituting attributes for the name itself, or wordplay upon the name. Each word identifies a facet of one of the Artist’s names—there are several:
 - **still**: of the father’s side = (L) *rursum* — Sumurr, St Maur, Seymour, and steadfastly So.
 - **all**: of the mother’s side = (L) *totus*, (French) *tout, toute*: ‘all, the whole of’—(E) all one: *tout un*.
 - **one**: either appended to (L) *totus*, as in French = ‘all one’, or indicating ‘first’, or both—Tudor.
 - **ever**: indicates E.Vere, the name assigned to our writer shortly after birth—ere he was “two days old at Sea[môr]” (*Hamlet IV.6 16*). The creation of this identity, as noted earlier, protected Princess Elizabeth from taint—and possible Attainder—from the Seymour Affair by the same Authority that prosecuted Thomas Seymour.
 - **the same**: ‘the Seym’; by *timesis*, the first fraction of the Artist’s proper surname St Maur, Seymour, playing on Queen Elizabeth’s motto (L) *Semper Eadem*: ‘Always the Same’. In *Hamlet*, CLAUDIUS calls GERTRUDE “his mouse”, hinting she corresponds to a *Muris, Mus, Musso*. She has been quiet as a Mouse respecting some certain thing—her ‘marriage’ to Thomas Seymour—I should think. (L) *mus* was a term of endearment in Classical Latin. Elizabeth had been a *Mus*, *Muris*, a Sey-Maur, but is now possessed by a ‘Cloud Cap’tor’ figured as CLAUDIUS.

6 And keep invention in a noted weed,

~ **And keep** [(L) *durare*: ‘to inure, to endure’, marking the (E) dure heart of ~ Tu-dure ~, II 2 ‘to be patient, wait, persevere’] **invention** [(L) *inventio*: I ‘an inventing’, concerning, II ‘the faculty of Invention’: “the finding and elaboration of rhetorical arguments.” Richard A. Lanham—likely referring to foreign developments within the ‘Devises for the Succession’ of monarchs.] **in a noted** [(L) *noto, notare*: I ‘to mark, to designate with a mark’, II C ‘to mark or brand with infamy’; *alt.* (L) *animadversio*: I. ‘self-inspection’, and II. ‘censure, reproach’] **weed** [(L) II *Transferred herba, herba inutilis*: ‘weeds, useless plants’, indicating an undesirable *Planta genista*: ‘the Broom plant’ < (Old E) bróm: ‘thorny plant’—Plantagenet; a distinction is intended between useful Brooms and the thorny species.], ~

~ **And en’Dure Devices in a Branded Plantagenet**, ~

► Line 6 raises the subject of Invention. The conversation probably turns on a coup d’etat, by which a change of the writer’s name from Tudor-Seymour to ‘de Vere’, effectively overthrows the Crown Tudor monarchy. Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ figures the tale in *Hamlet*: a LAERTES type stooge doing the bidding of a CLAUDIUS type master may be elected to supplant the legitimate heir. Such a ‘branded’ servant, doing Brandon-Dudley service—a (L) *verna*, or ‘slave service’—might be despatched with a dagger at some time in the future, once his true bloodline had been tied to the murderer’s family. His own perfidy might then become the instrument of his death.

The difference between Broom species is shown in *The First Part of Henry the Sixth II.4*, in which ‘good’, Lancastrian (Red Rose) Plantagenets are represented by SOMERSET, identified with brothers John (1404-44) and Edmund (1406-55) Beaufort. The inferior Yorkist (White Rose) Plantagenets appear in the character of RICHARD PLANTAGENET (1411-60), later Duke of York. Interestingly, Edmund Beaufort is thought to have had an affair with Catherine of Valois, wife of King Henry V, after the death of Henry. Their son, called Edmund ‘Tudor’, was likely a changeling in the manner of our favorite author, Edward Tudor-Seymour. Hence, the descent of King Henry VII would be Beaufort on both sides. There is a vague allusion to this event at *Henry VI II. 4 68-9, Part 1*, in which RICHARD PLANTAGENET slyly insults SOMERSET:

68 “Hath not thy rose a canker, Somerset?” **canker**, cankerworm: (Fr) *ver* — Vere (!)

This is an example of Oxford’s progression from Second Level composition to Third Level (p.11). The writer uses historical individuals to set the stage and create a precedent for his own situation. Oxford/‘Shakespeare, miscalled ‘Vere’, is the “canker”, (Fr) *ver rongeur*: ‘ever-gnawing worm’. Note that RICHARD PLANTAGENET calls SOMERSET “**tongue-tied**”, 1 *Henry VI II. 4 25* ...

► Perhaps the greatest ambiguity in ‘Shakespeare’ is whether he was a ‘bastard’. Considering the subject of the Sonnets, the phrase “noted weed” (l.6), probably plays on Oxford’s ‘brand’. His blood may have been royal, but the marriage of his parents wasn’t formally recognized. The scheme as devised by the Dudley-Cecil alliance seems ridiculous today; its success depended on a deep insecurity within the Artist. A more confident individual—someone like Thomas Seymour, for example—would likely have retreated to Continental Europe and returned with sufficient force to take down the usurping pair of Cecil and Dudley. It is the (L) *animadversio*: I ‘self-inspection’, and II. ‘censure, reproach’, that appears to hold him back.

With this in mind, we should review the verb ‘keep’. Referencing Latin once more, we consider (L) *durare*: ‘to preserve’, and find in Tudor—‘to-dur’—the idea of preserving Tu-dure in the writer’s several names. This can be doubled with (L) *tueor*: II ‘to guard, preserve’ the names in a ‘defense’ of *Tue-[d]or*. Every word has its place. Such abstruse games are hard to spot at first, but with experience you’ll find a word qualified by those around them. That’s the power of etymological or Varronian Wordplay—to help you “understand the word”. (see Michael Paschalis, *Virgil’s Aeneid, Semantic Relations and Proper Names*, 1997.)

Again, the Romans had used similar ‘play’ to secure coherency in poetry by placing

qualifying words near an ambiguous term, thereby pointing to a particular definition of that term. The ‘Alexandrian Technique’ is useful in reinforcing meaning when indeterminacy arises—when essential ideas, necessary to be fathomed, are not fully stated for political reasons.

► Rhetorical Invention is the discovery of an ‘argument’—a means of persuasion—to be used by the speaker. But I believe Oxford/Shakespeare also intends the word ‘Invention’ to describe an original contrivance towards composing a witty, ‘double-tongued’ argument. It is his special adaptation—his method of presenting otherwise ambiguous information.

7 That every word doth almost tell my name,

~ **That every** [wp E. Vere, the false surname of Edward Tudor-Seymour; wp (L) *totus*: ‘all, the whole, entire, total’; alt. (L) *omnis*, anagram Si-mon, Semel, Sey-mour.] **word** [(L) *verbum*: ‘a word, words, language’; alt. (L) *muttum*: wp ‘mutterance’, < utterance, ‘a mutter’, likely by Oxford, from play *Misogonus*, 1577.] **doth** [< (E) do, to do, wp th’Do—Tudor] **almost** [(L) *ferre*: ‘more or less, about’, (E) fairly: 9 ‘almost, practically’] **tell** [(L) *referre*: II Trop. ‘to bear, carry’, II B3 ‘to convey a report, announce, relate, repeat, recount, to mention’] **my name** [(L) *nomen*, *cognomen*: ‘a name, surname’, possible pun on (L) *nomen*: ‘name’ and (L) *Nemo*: ‘no man, no one’, ~ No Vir, No Vere ~], ~

~ **That All mutterances T’Do(r) fairly repeat my surname,** ~

~ **That E.Vere word Do’th fairly Bear my name,** ~

~ **That E.Vere word Do’th fairly refer to my No-Man,** ~

► Possible allusions to the given name ‘William’ are very rare, so it is easily shown that the *praenomen*, or first name, is of little significance. Allusions to the surname ‘Shakespeare’ are also extremely rare. References to ‘de Vere’ are common, but only with aversion. Wordplay on ‘Tudor-Seymour’ are the materials and mortar of ‘The Works of Shakespeare’.

8 Showing their birth, and where they did proceed?

~ **Showing** [(L) *(de)monstrare*, *commonstrare*: ‘to show, point out something fully, or distinctly’] **their** [(L) *suus*: ‘belonging to themselves’, (L) *eorum*: (if reflexive) wp < de’or: playing on the ‘golden’ birth of Tu-de’Or; additional wordplay indicating the birth of their—t’heir.] **birth** [(L) *ortus*: ‘birth’, ‘a beginning, origin’], **and where** [wp Latin pronunciation of surname Vere.] **they** [‘Often not rendered in Latin’; “they” indicates plurality; the name must be compound, or denote multiple bloodlines.] **did** [*past indicative* (E) do, (L) *facere*, (Italian) *fare*: ‘to do’, wp To-do(r)] **proceed** [(L) *procedo*, *procedere*: ‘to go forth’, II E ‘to result, succeed’]? ~

~ **De Mor’strating Or-birth, and vVere they Do Succeed?** ~

~ **Showing Tu-d’Or birth, and vVere they Do succeed?** ~

In line 7, the writer restates the names of line 5:

- **That every**: as in l.5, the adjective every represents *surname* E.Vere + -y, *suffix*: ‘having qualities of’.
- **word**, (French) *mot*: ‘word’; (Latin) *muttum* < *muttire*: ‘to mutter, murmur’; (L) *mussito* < *mussare*: ‘to say in a low tone’, ‘to mutter, murmur’; (Fr) *mot* is pronounced as (E) moe (more).
- **doth**, (It) *fare*: “the name of action” (*Hamlet* III.1 88), (E) do, 3rd per. sing. doth, anagram t’doh / Tudor.
- **almost**, (L) *ferre*: ‘almost, nearly’, *homonym* (Fr) *faire*, (Italian) *fare*: *metonym* ‘to do’ / Tudu[h], Tudor.
- **tell**, (L) *referre*: II. 3d Trop. ‘to report, notify’, *wordplay* re: ‘twice’ + (It) *fare*, (E) do = two-do / Tudu[h].
- **my name**: (L) *nomen*: ‘gentile name’, ‘name of family, race, or clan’, distinct from (L) *praenomen*.

Simplified:

- Sonnet* 76.5 ~ **Why write I: Mure, Tuda[h], Prince, E.Vere, the Seym,** ~
 6 ~ **And to Dure Discovery in a censured Plant,** ~
 7 ~ **That E.Vere, Mure, To-do[h]—Fair-ly Re-ports my name,** ~
 8 ~ **Showing t’Heir’s birth, and vVere Ty-do[h]s succeed?** ~

Etymological wordplay is always present, I repeat, in nearly “*ev’ry Line, each Verse*”, just as L. Digges advises, in *First Folio* preface. All ‘Shakespeare’ contains some element of it; and such meaningful play is that which “*shall revive, redeem [the writer] from his Herse.*” (OED) hearse: < (French) *herse*: ‘a large rake used as a harrow’, usually pulled by Oxen in former times, to break up clods after ploughing. So it is hoped the secret communication will relieve Oxford of his false, beastly identity, and tedious labor. Professor Molly Mahood identified its importance to the question of Authorship:

“once we have grown accustomed to Shakespeare’s verbal habits, the absence of any one of them from a play casts doubt upon his authorship.”

(Mahood, M. M.; *Shakespeare’s Wordplay*, 1957)

The effortless alignment of Shakespeare’s words to real historic events, and to the substantial rumor of the Queen’s early pregnancy as well, is a feat no other theory of his art can approach. All we need is to posit *Hamlet* is allegory of the writer’s life—that all the plays are ‘episodes’ of his life. To achieve this kind of agreement, I suggest, would be impossible if it were not essentially true. There should never have been a question of Shakespeare’s identity. It is consistently presented as a curiosity within the works themselves and in contemporary commentary. It is an enigma, to be sure, but as previously noted, one that is fully solved by the Artist.

Though etymological wordplay (*wp*) often seems silly—and not as serious as ‘Shakespeare’ ought to be—we remember the comment of his greatest “wit-snapper” FALSTAFF:

“A good wit will make use of anything : I will turn diseases to commodity.” (2 *Henry IV* 1.2 241)

~ *A Çey’mour Muse-will make use of anything : More I, veer ‘de Veres’ to Som’Mor-ity.* ~

good, (Fr) *marchandise*: *wp* ~ psalm-mer (sommer)d’ise ~ ; alt. (Fr) *bien*: ‘well’ — (Fr) or: ‘now, well’
will, (Fr) *mœur*: ‘custom, manner’, ‘will’ **disease**, (Fr) *maladie*, *wp mala de, de mâle* < (L) *vir*: ‘male’
commodity, *wp* (Fr) *çom* + (Fr) *mode*: ‘manner, more’ — (Fr) *mœur* + *ity*, suffix: ‘expressing a condition’

Format

The first line of *Love’s Labor’s Lost* (1.1 1) begins:

1 Let Fame, that all hunt after in their lives, ...

~ **Fame**, [(Fr) *renom*: ‘renown’, fame’, *wordplay* (Fr) *renommer*: v. ‘to name again’, (Latin) *fama*: ‘report, rumor’; report plays as re: ‘twice’ + port: ‘door’ = Two-door, Tudor.] **that all** [(Fr) *tous, tout*, (L) *totus*: *wordplay* *Tudo[r]s*, restates the Tudor subject] **hunt after** [(Fr) *poursuivre*: *wp* (MFr) *parsuivre* / ‘Parr follow’] **in their** [*wordplay*, frequently denotes ‘th’ Heir’ or t’Heir] **lives** [(Fr) *vie*: (*leur vie*): *sur*name de Vere (*non-rhotic* r); “lives” likely hints at (Fr) *vivre*: ‘to have life’, *wordplay* de Vere.], ~

~ *Let Re-naming, that Tud’[ohs] Parr-sue in de Vere heirs,* ~

Reading ‘Shakespeare’ is a challenging game. Here the reader is supposed to consider for a moment, the nature of “fame”—(Fr) *renom*, the repeated naming, or ‘re-naming’, of someone with notoriety; they are frequently a topic of conversation. The repetition of their name brings ‘fame’. “All”—*Tout le monde*: ‘All the world’—hints at (French) *orbe* as a cognate of (Latin) *orbis*, with *wordplay* (*wp*) on ‘twice Or’ or Two-d’or / Tudor. To “hunt after”, (Fr) *poursuivre*, plays better in Middle French (14th-16th c.) as *parsuivre*, with the idea of ‘following Parr’ or ‘according to [Katherine] Parr’: *wp* = *Saumoneau*: ~ young salmon/St Maur ~ , in whose home Oxenford/‘Shakespeare’ appears to have been conceived. “Their” is frequently the root of puns indicating ‘the heir/t’heir—heir of Tudor; eg. “Who’s t’Heir?” (*Hamlet* 1.1 1). Finally, “lives” is essential *wordplay* for Vere, the false identity apparently created for the Tudor-St Maur child by Katherine Parr-St Maur.

Once More—first I indicate the line number and present the line as it appears in the *First Folio* text. Then we show how the meaning of words may vary by **polysemy**: ‘the fact of having several meanings..or multiple senses’ (OED), **homonymy**: ‘words sounding the same, but having unrelated etymologies’, or by **amphiboly**: ‘A figure of speech—ambiguity arising from the uncertain construction of a sentence or clause’. Both devices are used to an extraordinary effect, such that **double-entendre**

pervades the entire Canon. From experience, our first impression of significance is usually mistaken; only in reading, and reading again, can we approach the political sense Oxford/'Shakespeare' intended.

Transitive Alexandrian Wordplay is everywhere. Meaning hides, but then is more deeply revealed in the interplay of two languages. It's worth considering whether 'Shakespeare' thought of Latin as a separate language. Rather, it might be a Treasury of roots from which to draw better defined, more particular words. Latin and French influence can be seen in most English words. In *Love's Labour's Lost*, both languages serve for wordplay and soundplay—Latin for the heady, 'elevated' lines of HOLOFERNES, NATHANIEL, and friends, and French for much of the rest.

I note the Latin analogues of Shakespeare's words to provide the extensive polysemy associated with that particular word. Readers do not need to know Latin *per se*, but they should learn the established range of meanings which Latin analogues yield for English words. There lies the source of Shakespeare's conscious effort to improve our language. As noted before, I have used *A Latin Dictionary*, by Charlton Lewis and Charles Short (Lewis & Short), 1975, together with *Cassell's Latin Dictionary, Latin-English—English-Latin*, edited by D. P. Simpson, 1968.

I begin by assuming we know nothing of the context from which to understand HOLOFERNES, DON ADRIANO de ARMADO, MOTE, or in further discussion below, NATHANIEL, and DULL. The true and historical context will only be revealed by wordplay—so the Author tells us in the voice of HAMLET: "The play's the thing / wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king." (*Hamlet* II.2 543).

Examination of Wordplay: *Love's Labor's Lost* V.1 42-55 ~ *The St. Maur Succeeds* ~

MOTE/'Moth'

► The name intended by 'Shakespeare' is MOTE, signifying (*OED*) mote: *n.4*, 'clod', from (*French*) *mote, motte*: 'the ball (clod) of earth that adheres about the root of a tree' (here figuratively, a family tree or lineage); the name plays on (*French*) *mote* as the (*Fr*) *terre, wp Tu-d'RR* (earth), **Tudor**, that clings to his roots or origin.

In addition, MOTE likely alludes to the infant of Thomas Seymour and Princess Elizabeth as the "pitch", the manifestation of a small error, a royal sin (*rosin, roi-sin*), a mote. The sins committed by Lords Leicester and Burghley—murder, great theft, extortion against the English State (read the list in *Sonnet 66*)—are a 'beam' by comparison. (*OED*) defines mote: *1c* 'something very minute or trivial', or *2a* 'a spot, blemish, fault', thus minimizing the Princess' crime and hinting at the 'taint' of legal attainder.

ARMADO calls his page MOTE "dear imp" (*LLL* 1.2 6). 'Dear'/(ME) *deor* is an epithet used throughout the Canon to signify the second syllable of Tudor, the golden particle *d'Or*. 'Imp' is defined (*OED*) *1a* 'A young shoot of a plant or tree, scion'; *figuratively 3a* 'Scion (especially of a noble house), offspring'. Of further interest is *4a* 'A child of the devil'. If this implies play upon devil as de Vere, as it does elsewhere (eg. *The Tempest* IV.1 188), it would suggest that ARMADO's "*tender Iuvenall*" (1.2 7-17) plays on the Roman satirist Juvenal, but also intends a 'juvenile' representing the mischievous youth of Oxford in a 'de Vere' phase.

In *Love's Labor's Lost*, MOTE may be thought the precocious child within DON ADRIANO de ARMADO (Ed. 'de Vere'), the son of HOLOFERNES' (Th. Seymour), and NATHANIEL's (John de Vere) godson — MOTE might be called 'child', or (*Latin*) *pueritia* (see V.1 74) by each of these men. This is an exceptionally clear example of the writer's authentication of character by a range of fairly complex rhetorical schemes. Each line in *Act 1, sc. 2* points to a senior-juvenile characterization of the same individual. Later, it will be a cause of concern to the KING that "honey-tongued BOYET" (William Cecil) puts MOTE "out of his part" in the masque of *The Nine Worthies* (V.2 158-73). His natural 'part' is heir to Tudor, but in the masque he is HERCULES. One of his labors will be to kill the water monster called Hydra—the (*Fr*) *ver*: 'worm, serpent' of many faces.

The name MOTH might have signified (*L*) *blatta*: ‘moth’, playing on (*L*) *blatio*: ‘to utter foolish things, babble’, but it does not. The word (*Fr*) *mot*: ‘word’, (*E*) *mote*: *n.1* ‘something insignificant’, leads in the wrong direction because MOTE is neither a ‘babbling’ nor ‘insignificant’.

42 Peace! The peal begins.

~ **Peace** [(*L*) *taceo*: ‘to be silent’, ‘to say nothing, to hold one’s peace’, (*L*) *tacitus*: ‘that is not spoken of, kept secret, unmentioned’]! **The peal** [*wp* = *wordplay* (*L*) *orbis*: ‘a ring’ — *bis*: ‘twice’ + *or*: *timesis*, *second syllable of Tudor*, hence Two-dor; (*L*) *tinnire*: ‘to make a ringing noise’; *alt. wp, pun* (*E*) *regional peal*: ‘a young or small salmon’, (*MFr*) *saumon*, (*Fr*) *St Maure*, *St More* (*French pronunciation*).] **begins** [(*L*) *ordior*: *II* ‘to begin, commence’; (*L*) *ordo*, *I. B* ‘the right order, regular succession’; here the word ‘begins’, (*L*) *ordior*, plays on (*L*) *ordino*: *II. A* ‘to govern’, and *ordo*: *I* ‘a methodical arrangement’, order’]. ~

~ **Be silent! The Ring succeeds.** ~

~ **Be silent! The St Maure Tu-dor goes forward.** ~

► The word “peal” can mean (*OED*) *n.1* *1b* ‘any loud or prolonged ringing of a bell or bells’, or *n.1* *2* ‘a loud discharge of guns’. But “The play’s the thing”—somewhere in the literal or figurative play of words we will find the matter. This passage is about names, and family beginnings and belongings. It is a brief restatement of many obscure points hinted in *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, *Act IV*, *sc. 2*. *Pêl* is a Welsh word meaning ‘a sphere, orb, globe, world, earth’ (*GPC*). The Tudor royal family is often represented in Oxford’s wordplay by each of these metonyms. They signify the transitive idea of (*Latin*) *orbis*: ~ Or-twice ~ *i.e.* Two-d’Or, Tudor. Whether overtly demonstrated, as in these selections, or more subtly in all plays by ‘Shakespeare’, the true subject is hidden from the eyes of censors. The forbidden subject is royal succession. ‘Peal’, (*W*) *pêl*, is also a noun used in Wales, Ireland, and South-western England for (*n.2*) ‘young or small salmon or sea trout.’ Among HOLOFERNES’ merry band of jesters, ‘peal’ plays on the (*French*) *saumon*, ‘salmon’, as a near homonym of (*French*) *St Maur*, Seymour—the writer’s surname. Thus, MOTH notes that a “ringing begins”, and that both the ‘*Saumon*’ / *St Maur* and the ‘Two-d’Or’ / Tudor begins.

The speaker, we will later find, is a son of HOLOFERNES, referring to the Assyrian general beheaded by Judith in the Deuterocanonical *Book of Judith*. As HOLOFERNES says: “Th’ allusion holds in the exchange.” (*IV.2* 41), ~ the *allusio* (‘play’, ‘play on words’) holds true in either case ~ . We assume the character represents a general who is beheaded by an “Ebrew Jew” (*i.e.* ‘bruided Tu[dor]’ = famed Tu[dor] — see FALSTAFF’s jest, *1 Henry IV II.4* 172). It’s true, the name may have otherwise been chosen for its construction, perhaps as *Holo*: (*Greek*) *ὅλος*: ‘all, entirely’ + *ferum*, *firmus*, *ferreus*: ‘made of iron’ + *ne*: ‘negative particle’, suggesting in some way a transitive pun from (*French*) *Tout*[*non*] *dur*, or another twist on the surname Tudor (Tu’dur). ‘Shakespeare’ loved wordplay that worked on multiple levels.

ARMADO

► DON ADRIANO de ARMADO: representing ‘Hadrian Armed’, Esq., likely refers to Roman Emperor Hadrian (*Hadrianus Augustus* 76-138 AD), who built a wall in northern England to protect from Pict invasions at the northern limits of Roman *Britannia*. Our Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ identifies Hadrian and himself as figurative ‘walls’ (*L. murae*) against Scottish advance — perhaps from the line of Margaret Tudor (1489-1541), married to James IV (*James Stuart*, 1473-1513) of Scotland. The allusion does indeed hold ‘in the exchange’ (see *LLL IV.2* 41-44). Hadrian, descended of Adrian stock (of Atri, or Adria, Italy), and was probably born in *Italica, Hispania*, ~ (6 miles NW of present day Seville, Spain); therefore, ADRIANO is characterized as Spanish.

Willobie His Avisa (1594, recalled and destroyed 1599), a work purportedly by one Henry Willobie, with an introduction by Hadrian Dorrell (a Two-doRR pseudonym) advances the interests of both Dorrell and Willobie (transitive pun (*L*) *more* + *sum*, or St Maur) in the defense of Britain (see ‘*Shakespeare’s Will*’, Michael & Spencer Stepniewski, 2018, p. 329-32).

43 Monsieur, are you not lettered?

~ **Monsieur** [(MFr) *monsieur*: ‘my lord’, *etym.* ‘originally restricted to men of high station’, ‘a title given to the younger brothers of Princes (end of 15th c.)], **are you** [*wordplay, anagram* are-tu, Tut’are, Tudor] **not lettered** [(L) *litteratus*: ‘marked with letters, branded’, (E) brand: ‘To mark or stamp with infamy, stigmatize’ — (E) attainer; *alt.* (E) lettered: ‘branded’, *wp* *surname* Brandon, (Fr) *brandon*: ‘a fire brand’, alluding to Charles Brandon (1484-1545), 1st Duke of Suffolk married Mary Tudor (1496-1533), Queen of France; he was the paterfamilias of the Suffolk-Grey Tudors.]? ~

~ **My Lord, you are not branded?** ~

~ **My Lord Tut’ar, not Brandon?** ~

► The use of “lettered” meaning ‘a man of letters’, or *l* ‘to instruct in letters or learning’, (*OED*) are both possible. Or it might more fully imply the *verb* ‘letter’ as *2a* ‘To inscribe..or otherwise write out a word, sentence..[or name]; or *2b* ‘To assign..an alphabetic character to distinguish or classify by means of a letter [or letters]’. Because we seek reasons for the curious riddles and circumlocutions of Shakespeare’s characters, I assume DON ARMADO likely intends the meaning of (L) *litteratus* (as noted above)—‘to brand’—‘to mark with infamy, stigmatize’ (as in the novel *The Scarlet Letter* by Nathaniel Hawthorne, 1850), or to be (L) *libero* / *le Vere*-o: ~ to be lettered (as a book) ~ . I posit HOLOFERNES’ represents the Artist’s father, Lord Admiral Seymour, attainted and suffering the full penalty—“*Cap a Pe*”: “from top to toe”, *i.e.* he was beheaded—for ‘treason’. The princess was spared the axe, but her name was not heritable by her son.

attainder, *n.* ‘The action or process of attainting; the legal consequences of judgement of death..in respect of treason..., viz. forfeiture of estate real and personal, corruption of blood, so that the condemned could neither inherit nor transmit by descent, and..extinction of rights.’ (*OED*)

► Here is the crux of the matter. The identity of the writer as Edward ‘de Vere’ was meant to be a yoke or hobble towards subservience—the surname Vere, aptly serving as *Verna*: ‘a slave born in his master’s house’—and in bondage to the Suffolk-Tudors including the Grey-Sidney-Dudley political alliance. Only by asserting the name of Edward Tudor-Seymour can he realize his true royal status. With it he might emancipate the Crown Tudors, including Elizabeth I, from control by Robert Dudley, William Cecil, and their clients. This plan created a dilemma in 1571 when Edward proposed to marry William Cecil’s daughter Anne. According to historians, Cecil was dedicated to raising the status of his family to the peerage. Nothing could beat marrying his favorite daughter into the royal family—but Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, intruded by angling to marry Mary Queen of Scots, creating a strong competing claim to the throne. The execution of Howard in 1572 appeared as a warning to Oxford of what might well be in store for himself, but at the same time, rid Oxford of a Pretender with whom he might later contend.

MOTH

44

Yes, yes! He teaches boys the Horn-book. What is

~ **Yes, yes** [(Latin) *Vero, vero!*]! **He teaches** [(L) *educō, educare*: ‘to rear, educate’] **boys** [(L) *juvencus*: ‘a male child’, ‘a calf’, referring to Oxford’s title: Bolbec] **the horn-book** [(E) horn-book: *1b* ‘a primer’, *1a* ‘A leaf of paper containing the alphabet, the ten digits, some elements of spelling’; *wp* (L) *cornu*: ‘horn’: (L) *corona*: ‘crown’; *wp* (Fr) *corne, bois* (of a stag): (Fr) *couronne*: ‘crown’ + book, (L) *corpus*: ‘body’, or (L) *liber*, *wp*, *surname* l’Vere, de Vere]. **What is**

~ **Verily, verily! He teaches boys in the crown-body. What is** ~

~ **Verily, verily! he teaches bois the crown-l’Vere. What is** ~

~ **Verily, verily! he teaches bois the Crown Corpus. What is** ~

45

A, b, spelled backward with the horn on his head?

~ **A, b** [? (Latin) *ab*: *particle, Figurative II* ‘from, out of, down from’, ~ descended from ~], **spelled** [(L) *scribo, scribere*: ‘to write, draw’] **backward** [(L) *retrosum*: ‘backwards’, *wp* (L) *retro*: ‘backwards’ +

Or-Sum, reversed *Sum-or* / *St Maur*] **with the horn** [(*L cornu*: ‘a hard and generally crooked growth upon the head of many mammals’, especially the males.)] **on his head** [(*L caput, summus*)]? ~

~ **A, b, written *Sum-or with the crown on his Summus?*** ~

HOLOFERNES, the PEDANT

► HOLOFERNES is generally thought to represent a school-master who is fond of learning and not shy about revealing his knowledge. Isaac Asimov calls him “a most unbearable pedant”. (see Asimov, Isaac; *Asimov’s Guide to Shakespeare*, Vol. I, p.433; 1970). I think not. He’s ‘tutoring’ the reader in a pleasant, sing-song, manner. If you find him tedious, you’re not attuned to his clever ways or the significance of his words. His information on Oxford’s biography is complete as may be, considering he lost his head when his child was less than eight months old. The *First Folio* identifies him as PEDANT, derived from the (*L*) *paedagogus* < *paedo*: ‘of a child or children’ + *agogice*: ‘denoting a technique of metal sculpture using wax’, known as the ‘lost wax process’, (*Fr*) *cire perdu*, with wordplay on ~ (*Fr*) *Sire perdu* ~, hence ‘lost father’ (see *OED*, *pedant*, and *pedagogue*, etymology). I suggest the idea is simply that the lost father still ‘draws forth’ the child.

A secondary pun involves (*L*) *paedo*: ‘of a child’ + (E) *-ant*, *suffix*: ‘used as nouns meaning a) a personal agent, or b) a material agent’, hence ~ ‘the agency of a child’ ~; alternately (E) *maur*: ‘an ant’, ‘a small insect of family *Formicidae*’, hence, ‘the agent of a *Maur*’—a fine pun indeed.

► Two views of HOLOFERNES—*i.e.* Oxford’s father, Thomas Seymour—emerge in *Act 5, sc.2 589-624*. He is to portray the Biblical Judean patriot Judas Maccabaeus (*d. 160 BC*), in a play within a play called “*Nine Worthies*”. However, several in the audience reproach him as Judas (*wp* ‘Tuda’s’/Tudor’s) Iscariot; this introduces Lord Thomas as a traitor in the eyes of some, and a Tudor loyalist to others. HOLOFERNES says to BOYET (Cecil):

“*Begin, sir, you are my elder.*” (LLL V.2 599) — *Meaning the agency of his death.*

This passage is rich in figurative allusions to beheading. Ultimately, HOLOFERNES is chided for not fleeing prior to arrest. History would repeat itself in the ‘treason’ of Thomas Howard (1536-72), 4th Duke of Norfolk, in 1569. Edward Tudor-Seymour, our subject, urged Norfolk to escape to the Continent at least twice, and Oxford may have married William Cecil’s daughter Anne in a bid to save Norfolk’s life. The PRINCESS of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (masking Elizabeth Tudor) tells a truth of both Th. Seymour and Th. Howard; both appear to have been ‘baited’ by William Cecil:

“*Alas, poor Maccabaeus, how hath he been baited.*” (LLL V.2 625)

46 Ba, *pueritia*, with a horn added.

~ **Ba** [(*Norman Fr*) *bai*, (E) *baa*: ‘The cry of a sheep or lamb; a bleat’; (E) *bah*: ‘an exclamation expressive of contempt’; *alt.* (E) *ba*: v. ‘To kiss, as a child; also substantively for the action of kissing’ (?)], **pueritia** [(*Latin*) *pueritia*: ‘boyhood, childhood’—in the *First Folio* (*Sp*) *puericia*: a pre-teen child, likely indicating a general reference in *Latin*.], **with a horn** [*wp* (*L*) *cornu*: ‘horn’: (*L*) *corona*: ‘crown’; *wp* (*French*) *corne, bois* (of a stag)/(*Fr*) *couronne*: ‘crown’] **added** [(*L*) *summam facere*: ‘to-do sums’, *wp* Tudor’ Sums / Tudor [St]Maur.]. ~

~ **Ba, child, with a crown Tudor-More’d.** ~

► MOTH represents the youthful writer Edward Tudor-Seymour—the talented scholar/Artist of a “hundred” disguises. I suggest he drifts into the character of HOLOFERNES/Thomas Seymour, DON ADRIANO/Edward ‘de Vere’ and several other characters as well.

► The occasional use of Latin words—here we find (*Latine*) *pueritia*, as in (*Spanish*) *puericia*—suggests ideas being derived from, or referencing, Latin. It is evidently the reference language for scenes with HOLOFERNES, while scenes about the Court of Navarre may base wordplay in French. Once again, the reference language gives the reader the established polysemy by which various meanings of English analogs may be known.

► Repetition of the word ‘Ba’ suggests an element of the multi-faceted soul as understood in ancient Egypt. Plutarch translated the (*Egyptian*) *Ba* as (*Latin*) *psyche*: ‘Breath, the animating

principle of man and other living beings; the soul or spirit'. The 'Ba' is often mentioned as representing an individual's distinct personality. The number of facets varies according to the commenter, but I'll note five:

Ren: 'one's name'.

Ka: 'the breath of life, separating the living body from the lifeless'.

Ib: 'the heart, as seat of the soul'.

Ba: 'that which makes each of us unique (different from all others).'

Sheut: 'a person's shadow'.

This "Ba" "with a horn added" suggests the inalienable soul of HOLOFERNES, and his name "lettered" (spelled): (*L*) *ovis*: 'a sheep' (with a horn added)—the 'Ram'—**spelled backwards**. As an allusion to Classical Myth, this riddle likely identifies the Ram as *Aries*, the 'Golden Ram' who gave *his* life to save those of *Phrixus* and *Helle*, son and daughter of *Nephele* and her husband *Athámas*, a Boeotian king. *Athámas* had another wife, *Ino*, who was jealous of *Nephele*, and contrived that men sent to consult an oracle return with a false message calling for the sacrifice of the children of *Nephele*. Before this could occur, *Aries Chrysomallus*, the Ram of the Golden Fleece, spirited the children away towards Colchis on the eastern coast of the Black Sea. Along the way, *Helle* fell from the Ram and was lost near the Hellespont ('Sea of Helle') which bears her name. *Phrixus* arrived safely in Colchis and was welcomed by king Aeëtes, who gave his daughter, *Chalciope*, in marriage to *Phrixus*. At the suggestion of *Aries* (the Ram), *Phrixus* sacrificed that self-same *Aries* to *Zeus*, and the Golden Fleece was given as a gift to king Aeëtes, who nailed it to an Oak tree in the grove of *Ares / Mars*. I suggest this fable is seen by Oxford/ 'Shakespeare' as roughly parallel to his own humble beginnings, freely allowing the Ram to be conflated or confused with *Ares / Mars* (St *Maur*), 'god of war'. *Phrixus* and *Helle* compare well with Edward and Mary St Maur / Seymour.

— see Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 'Golding' trans. 1565-67, Bk.6 ff.145.— see theoi.com *Khrysomallos*, etc.

Mars—the mythic god of War—assumes some attributes of Zeus-Ammon, the hybrid Greek-Egyptian 'King of the gods' who is figured with the horns of a Ram upon his head. HOLOFERNES, who enjoys playing with words, is a Maur, or St Maur, enigmatically represented as Mars. However, the "Sheep" without horns, (*L*) *ovis*, plays on the writer's de Vere identity — as 'O-Vir' or O'Vis (*O n.4* 'a prefix in Irish patronymic surnames', 'indicating descent from an ancient Irish family', and likewise in (*Welsh*) *o: 2a* 'from, denoting person's origin'); (*L*) *vis* and *vir* refer to manly strength. Hence, the difference between the writer's two identities is simply this: **Seymour** is Mars /anagram Ram, imagined with horns. **De Vere**, de *Vir* / de *Vis*—'hornless sheep'. If he accepts the surname 'de Vere', the writer will be without force; to rule the Queen's powerful 'Regents', he must have the surname Tudor-St Maur.

MOTH

47-8 Ba, most silly Sheep with a horn. You hear his learning.

~ **Ba** [*Latin* *balo, balare*: 'to bleat', as a lamb; *II Trop.* 'to talk foolishly'], **most** [(*L*) *amplius*: 'more', comparative of (*L*) *amplus*: 'great, large, wide'] **silly** [(E) *seely, wp sealy*: (E) *sea, (L) mare*: 'the sea' + -ly, *suffix1*: 'attached to nouns forming adjectives, hence 'having appearance, form of' — 'Sea-like'; (*OED*) 8 'Foolish, simple, silly', 5 'Innocent, harmless'] **Sheep** [(*L*) *ovis: Figurative 2* 'with allusion to the sheep's timidity, defenselessness, inoffensiveness, tendency to stray and get lost'] **with a horn** [(*L*) *cornu*; again suggesting (*L*) *aries / Ares*—(E) Ram]. **You hear** [(*L*) *audire, wp T'udire/Tu-deor*] **his learning** [*anagram (L) eruditio: II Transf.* 'learning, knowledge, erudition']. ~

~ **Ba[a], Sea-Maur'ly strength... with a Crown. T'audir his Tudor-ition.** ~

► Playing with (*Latin*) *eruditio*, MOTH discovers an amusing anagrammatic association between "learning"/erudition, and the Tudors— ~ Tuderition ~. This is shown in the following line (49) in which the missing element— *Tu* / thou—is discovered. We find the essence of MOTH, (*L*) *blatta*: 'an insect that shuns the light', in a false etymology. The *blatta* is apt to *blatio*: 'to utter foolish things, to babble, prate'—to (E) blather: 'to talk foolishly, talk nonsense'. But wait! The Tudors

had the knack for languages. Henry VIII was taught Latin, Greek, French, Italian, and Spanish, from about the age of five. His tutors were among the finest in Europe. Both Mary I and Elizabeth I excelled in languages, as did Edward VI. MOTH, as another Tudor, does not ‘talk nonsense’.

HOLOFERNES

49 *Quis, quis, thou Consonant?*

~ **Quis, quis** [(Latin) *quis*: ‘who, which, what’? Repetition is a rhetorical figure of emphasis, and must be examined even more closely.], **thou** [(L) *Tu*] **Consonant** [(L) *consonans*: *B Trop.* ‘agreeing, consonant, fit, suitable’, *alt.* (L) *consono*: ‘to sound at the same time, or together’; *wp* (E) consonant: *I* ‘An alphabetic or phonetic element other than a vowel’]? ~

~ *Who, what? Resounding Tu — Two — You — Ewe?* ~

~ *Who, what? Tu sounded twice — You — Ewe?* ~

MOTH

50 The third of the five Vowels, if You repeat them;

~ **The last** [(Latin) *ultimus*: *II* ‘most distant, most remote’, ‘Superlative of *ulter*’] **of the five Vowels** [(L) *vocalis*: *IA* ‘to utter a voice’, *wp* to-utter / tutor / Tudor, (L) *vocalis*: *BI* ‘a vowel’ (E) vowel: ‘voiced breath modified by some definite configuration of the super-glottal passages, but without friction (which would make it into a consonant’), **if You** [*wp* U / You / Tu — The first syllable of Tu-dor.] **repeat** [(L) *iterare, itero*: ‘to do a thing a second time’, ‘to repeat’, ‘to say again’—if you say them in their usual order; *alt.* *wp* (E) re: ‘again’ + peat: *la* ‘A girl, young woman. Frequently as a term of endearment’—dear, d’eor, d’or.] **them**; ~

~ *The third of the five Vowels, if You Tu-d’eor them*; ~

► Editorial changes made to the text of the *First Folio*, often prove unnecessary, or worse, they may disguise the writer’s wordplay; however changing “last” to “third” in *line 50* resolves a conflict in *lines 52-3*. First noted by Lewis Theobalds (1688-1744), this point was argued in the Furness *Variorum of Love’s Labor’s Lost* (p.219).

A logical solution that could maintain the original wording (“last of the five”), would be if HOLOFERNES and MOTH somehow represent individuals with the same surname, *i.e.* they are father and son, but the son is ‘Tudored’.

► There is good evidence that players (and, therefore, printers) received ‘fair copies’ of Shakespeare’s works—transcripts free from errors or corrections:

“I remember the players have often mentioned it as an honor to Shakespeare, that in his writing, whatsoever he penned, he never blotted a line.”

(Ben Jonson; *De Shakespeare Nostrati* — ~ On our Shakespeare ~).

Because the presentation of Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ must emphasize the rhetorical devices used to suggest a particular interpretation, the manuscripts had to be excellent. Capitalization, the use of Italic print, punctuation, arrangement, etc., could not be left to the printers imagination.

51 or the fifth, if I.

~ **or** [(English) Or, the second syllable of Tudor, Seymour.] **the fifth** [(Latin) *quintus*; likely an allusion to (E) quintessence: ‘In classical and Medieval philosophy: a fifth essence existing in addition to the four elements, supposed to be the substance of which the celestial bodies were composed and to be latent in all things’; that is to say: MOTH, as the quintessence, holds latent within himself qualities found abundantly in HOLOFERNES.], **if I** [(L) *ego, ego ipse*; (E) myself: (L) *me*, hence *Si me*]. ~

~ *Or the fifth, if I.* ~

HOLOFERNES

52 I will repeat them: a e I. —

~ **I will** [wordplay (E) will: *n1 3a* ‘That which one desires’, *surname More, Maur, wp (L) mores, mos, moris*: ‘the will’, ‘custom, manner, practice’, ‘humor, self-will’] **repeat** [(L) *iterare*: ‘to repeat’, ‘to say again’, *alt. wp (E) re*: ‘again’ + *peat*: *1a* ‘A girl, young woman. Frequently as a term of endearment’ — dear, d’eor, d’or.] **them: a, e**, [(Middle Welsh) *ae ... ae*: ‘either ... or’, perhaps in the sense of ~ either way (I am descended from you) ~; *alt. (L) participle -ae, suffix*: ‘forming various declined plurals’, *wp (E) ~ us* ~, ‘dative personal pronoun’; *wp (Middle Welsh) ae ... ae*: ‘either ... or’] **I** [(L) *ego, ego ipse*] — ~

~ **I More-Two-d’eor them: ae I.** — ~

~ **I Maur-Tud’eor them: either I** ~

- “Will”, (L) *mos, moris, more*, reinforces the intentions of MOTH in *l.53*, and “sheep” transfers as, or is synonymous with, ‘simpleton, fool’. The careful reader observes that HOLOFERNES is not simple. He is, in fact, very quick with wordplay. Furthermore, he knows many essential details that cannot be found elsewhere. Only when characterized as one who will lose his head or external form, (L) *facies*—to any Judith (or Elizabeth)—does he fulfill his name.

Hence we discover an essential theme of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* in the confusing identities of most characters. As the bevy of beautiful maidens accompanying the PRINCESS: ROSALINE, MARIA, and KATHERINE, may all be confused with one another if not exhibiting some outward identifying mark, so it is with the King of NAVARRE and his lords: LONGAUILL (‘Longwill’), DUMAINE (‘of the Hand’), and BEROWNE (Two-d’Or; names printed variously in the *First Folio*). Likewise are HOLOFERNES and MOTH, who must be distinct from each other by appearance, but who’s names —surnames at least—should be the same. So it seems. And again, DON ADRIANO de ARMADO will prove to characterize the “tough signeur/senior” to MOTE’s “tender” Juvenal/juvenile.

MOTH

53

The Sheep. The other two concludes it — o u.

~ **The Sheep** [(L) *ovis*: ‘sheep’, *IIB Transf.* ‘sheep, for simpleton, ninny, fool’, *wp (E) ewe*: *1a* ‘a female sheep’, *Figurative 2* ‘with allusion to the sheep’s timidity, defenselessness, inoffensiveness, tendency to stray and get lost’]. **The other** [(L) *alter*: ‘the other of two’] **two** [*wp (L) duo / Tu*] **concludes** [(L) *concludo*] **it — o u.** ~

~ **The O’Vis. The other Tu ends it — Of Ewe!** ~

~ **The O’ of Man. The other Tu ends it — Of You!** ~

Hence: ~ **I will More-Two-d’eor them: either way I am of — the sheep.**

The other Tu ends it — Of You! ~

- (Welsh) *O: 2a* ‘from’, denoting a person’s origin’; similar to (Irish) *O’*, is ‘a prefix in Irish patronymic surnames (as O’Connell, O’Connor, O’Neil) indicating descent from an ancient Irish family’. Hence (Latin) *ovis* plays on *O’Vis / O’Vir* as essentially identical with ‘de Vere’.

- The similarity between MOTH and HOLOFERNES appears to be that they are bound by a surname. This is plausible, but the multiple levels on which the puns succeed is confusing.

ARMADO

54

Now, by the salt wave of the *mediterraneum*,

~ **Now** [*wp (Latin) iam: pun (E) I am*], **by** [(L) *ab: 1* ‘from, down from, by’] **the salt** [(L) *muria*: ‘brine’, *1* ‘Salt water’, *2* ‘The water of the sea; the sea’] **wave** [(L) *fluctus: 2B* ‘turbulence, disturbance’, *wp* ‘tumult’, *Tu-Much*; (L) *unda*: ‘surge’, (L) (*ignis et*) *unda viros*: ‘real, proper husbands’, ~ a manly surge ~ if I catch the drift in Latin.] **of the mediterraneum** [*metonym (Welsh) môr mawr*: ~ Sea Mawr ~, ~ Great Sea ~; *alt. (L) mediterraneum*: ‘interior’, ~ amid-terra ~, *Mediterraneum mare*: ‘The inland sea’—(Fr) *lande*: ‘moor’ + (Fr) *mer*: ‘sea’, hence ‘Sea-More’], ~

~ **I am, by the Mure surge a’Mid-Terra,** ~

~ **I am, by the Mure surge within Tu-d’RR,** ~

► The “salt wave”, a ‘Mure surge’, as a figurative phrase for a ‘real, proper husband’ suggests that Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour married Princess Elizabeth at some point, perhaps in the secret manner of Edward Seymour’s (1539-1621) marriage to Lady Katherine Grey (1540-68; m. 1560-68), or of other advantageous Seymour marriages. “*Mediterraneum*” as (Welsh) *môr mawr*: ‘Sea-Great’ / ‘Great Sea’ is fairly unmistakable transitive wordplay on St Maur; ~ in’lande Sea ~ , *Mediterraneum Mare*: ~ In’lande Sea / Sea Moor. Likely you’ll recognize this “salt wave” as alluding to the sea foam—representing the ejaculate of Uranus’ genitals—from which *Venus* (transferred meaning ‘sexual love’) was born.

55 a sweet touch, a quick venue of wit! Snip, snap, quick

~ a **sweet** [(English) suite, (Latin) *sequere*: ‘to follow’, in sequence.] **touch** [(L) *atingo, attingere*, (E) touch: *Fencing* ‘A successful hit on an opponent’; (L) *ferire*: ‘a strike’, ‘a thrust, hit’], a **quick** [(Latin) *subitaneus*: 2 ‘to come on secretly’, 2B ‘to succeed stealthily’, (L) *alacer*: II *Transf.* ‘quick, ready’] **venue** [(E) 2a ‘A thrust or hit in fencing’; (L) *venio*: 1B ‘to come, spring, be descended’, likely wordplay on (L) *accedere*: ‘a coming near, an approach’ — hence (E) Accession.] **of wit** [(L) *sal*: ‘salt’, IB *Metonymy* ‘salt water, sea’, II *Trop.* ‘Intellectual acuteness, cunning, wit, a witticism’, (L) *Musa*: ‘cleverness, wit’, *wp* (L) *mus, muris*: ‘mouse, rat, weasel’,],! **Snip, snap** [James Orchard Halliwell (1820-89) suggested this should be understood “Snip-snap”, a phrase used “to express the cutting of a tailor’s shears” (Howard Furness, *A New Variorum: Love’s Labor’s Lost*, Vol. 14, 1904, p.220); this figure is used elsewhere to describe the ‘Tail’ (see: *King Lear* I.2 123) of inheritance as part of the Attainder passed on Oxford’s father, Thomas Seymour.], **quick** [(L) *subitaneus*: 2 ‘to come on secretly’, 2B ‘to succeed stealthily’, (L) *alacer*: II *Transf.* ‘quick, ready’] **venue** [(E) 2a ‘A thrust or hit in fencing’; (L) *venio*: 1B ‘to come, spring, be descended’] ~
~ a **succeeding thrust, a Sutton accession of Sea! Snip-snap, Sudden** ~
~ a **Fair succession, a Sutton descent of Mure! Snip-snap, Sutton** ~

► DON ARMADO (again, ‘de Vere’), like BEROWNE (Tudor-Seymour) is satisfied with his own wit. In Part I of this essay, I review the linguistic ‘proofs’ of BEROWNE that announce his success at whatever word game he’s playing at. Here, ARMADO does the same, only ... to prove (*averer*) that Wit to ARMADO needs a “sudden”/‘Sutton’ misappropriation from Tudor-Seymour—that is, robbing Edward-One to pay Edward-Two.

► “Quick” may play on the surname Sutton as ‘Sudden’, denoting the Dudley Family, arch-rivals of the Tudors. Here it refers to the ‘Sutton’ change of names—of the Sutton surname to Dudley, and of the Author from Tudor-Seymour to ‘de Vere’—and thereby the stealthy approach (*subitaneus*), or (L) *accedo*: ‘coming, arrival’, ‘accession’ of ‘Dudley-serving’ successors. Hence MISTRESS QUICKLY (see 1 & 2 *Henry IV*), as a sort of mistress to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, would be Queen Elizabeth I. She was indeed the Hostess of the Garter. Though she may not have had a sexual relationship with Dudley, he was, in a sense, her ‘husband’: ‘the male head of household, master of the house’ (see I.56).

56 and home! It rejoiceth my intellect, true wit!

~ and **home** [(Latin) *domus*: ‘a house, home’, II *Metonym* ‘one’s native place’, IIB ‘a household, family, race’, *wordplay, timesis Do-Mus*, to-do(r) + *mus* / *muris*]! **It rejoiceth** [(L) *gaudeo, gaudere*: ‘to rejoice, to be glad or joyful’] **my intellect** [(L) *mens, ingenium*: (*in-geno*) I ‘innate, or natural quality, nature’, IIB ‘With respect to intelligence — Natural capacity’], **true** [(L) *verus; legitimus*: ‘fixed or appointed by law’] **wit** [(L) *musa*: ‘wit, genius’, *wp* (L) *mus, muris*: ‘marten, sable, ermine, mouse, rat’, (Latin) *Mus, Muris*: ‘Roman surname’]! ~

~ and **Do-Mus! It makes joyful my Mens, Legiti’Mus!** ~

► With a ‘snip-snap’ of the ‘Tail-ers’ shears, the Tudor Monarchy falls into the hands of their great rivals—the Grey-Dudleys. The Ram of Mars thus becomes a Ewe; and Vere is made ‘legiti-Mure’.

Many readers of ‘Shakespeare’ will not try to understand such riddling passages.

I suppose the usual response is to pass them over with little concern, as I did when I first encountered them ... but **no more!** The heart of the Matter—the Writer’s name and his story—is buried there:

Example **“Full fathom five thy father lies; ... Sea nymphs hourly ring his knell.”**

(ARIEL’s song, *Tempest* 1.2 397 & 403)

~ *Fully fathom five things; ... there thy father lies; Se-ym-our — Tudor-Mors ~*

If OTHELLO is ‘The Moor’; and AARON is ‘a Moor’; if HAMLET is a ‘Morio’; if ROMEO is a *verso* (‘twisted about’) More; then perhaps there’s something special in that quality of the ‘Sea’—(*Latin*) *Mare*: (*Spanish*) *Mar*, (*French*) *Mer*, (*English*) *Mere*, (*Welsh*) *Môr*, (*Latin*) *Muria* (‘brine’)—something found in protagonists throughout ‘Shakespeare’. The MERCHANT of Venice is a ‘Psalm-Mer’, or Sommer / Summer / St Maur. He represents a facet or form of the writer: The ‘Sommer of Venus’—The St Maur of Amor—*The Maur of a Maur*. Has the writer memorialized his true but lost name? Remember the admonition of Heminges and Condell prefacing the *First Folio*: “his wit may no more lie hid, then it may be lost.” — ~ *his wit may ‘More-less’ lie hid, then it may be lost ~ . ~ If you doe not a’Maur him, surely you are in some Boar-ish danger not to understand him. ~ (see “[Counsel] To the great Variety of Readers”, this essay, pp 19-21)*. In the present selection from *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, we find HOLOFERNES is a Ram, but Mar (Sea) if we solve for the reversal of “**a, b**” to “**b, a**” in line 45, and thus solve another of Shakespeare’s riddles and linguistic *Metamorphoses*.

“Nothing of him that doth fade / But doth suffer a Sea change. (*Tempest* 1.2 400-01)

Even by the simplest wordplay and a similar reversal of letters, we can find the identity of BEROWNE, protagonist in the writer’s scheme. With (*Latin*) sum substituting for (*English*) Be, we might guess the first syllable of his name to approach Som / Seym / or (*Fr*) *Saint*; otherwise it may signify (E) be, bi/(L) *bi*: ‘twice’ + the second syllable, (E) rowne: *pre 1700 form* ‘round’, relating to (L) *orbis*, playing on bis-Or = Two-d’Or. (E) ROWNE, also suggests an anagram of Mowre / Nowre / Maure / Mar, since in Latin “M is interchanged most frequently with N” (Lewis & Short, *A Latin Dictionary*), otherwise (E) rowne. Hence the surname St Maur or Seymour is a plausible substitution for BEROWNE, and so is Tudor. HOLOFERNES too, may justly claim the name Mars/Ram—like son, like father. As with Coriolanus, they may be thought to be members of the Latin *gens (surname) Marci, Marti*.

As noted elsewhere in these pages, MOTH/MOTE is affectionately called the ‘*pueritia* / child’ of both HOLOFERNES and ADRIANO DE ARMADO. As with our ‘Oxford’, two blood lines claim him, Tudor-Seymour as his birth parents, and Golding-de Vere as his ‘Godparents’ (*LLL* 1.1 88-93).

Once More:

MOTH

Original 42 “Peace! The peal begins.”

42 ~ **Say no more! The St Maur begins.** ~

ARMADO

Orig. 43 “Monsieur, are you not lettered?”

43 ~ **My Lord, you are not branded?** ~

alternate ~ My Lord Tut’ar, not Brandon? ~

MOTH

Or. 44 “Yes, yes! He teaches boys the Horn-book. What is?”

44 ~ **Verily, Verily! He teaches calves in the *Crown-cornus*. What is ~**

alternate ~ Verily, Verily! He teaches calves in the Cornu-body. What is ~

Or. 45 “A, b, spelled backward with the horn on his head?”

45 ~ **Ab (my descent)—spelled backward ... with a *cornu* on his head?** ~

HOLOFERNES

- Or. 46 “Ba, *pueritia*, with a horn added.”
46 ~ **Ba, child, with a *corona* added.** ~
- MOTH
Or. 47-8 “Ba, most silly Sheep with a horn. You hear his learning.”
47-8 ~ **Ba, Maur-Sea’ly rams ... with a *Corona*. Tu’*audir* his Tudor-ition?** ~
alternate ~ Ba, Maur-Sea’ly Mars ... with a *Corona*. Tu’*audir* his Tudor-ition? ~
- HOLOFERNES
Or. 49 “*Quis, quis*, thou Consonant?”
49 ~ **Who? What? Resounding Tu — Two — You — Ewe?** ~
- MOTH
Or. 50 “The [last] of the five Vowels, if You repeat them;”
50 ~ **The third of the five Vowels, if [You] Tu-d’eor them;** ~
Or. 51 “or the fifth, if I.”
51 ~ **Or the fifth, if I.** ~
- HOLOFERNES
Or. 52 “I will repeat them: a, e, I, —“
52 ~ **I, Will (*More*) Tu-d’eor them: either I, —** ~
- MOTH
Or. 53 “The Sheep. The other two concludes it — o, u.”
53 ~ **The O’Vir / de Vere. The other Tu ends it — O’ Ewe.** ~
- ARMADO
Or. 54 “Now, by the salt wave of the *mediterraneum*,”
54 ~ **I am, by the Mure surge a’Mid-Terra,** ~
alternate ~ *I am, by the Mure surge within Tu-d’RR,* ~
Or. 55 “a sweet touch, a quick venue of wit! Snip, snap, quick”
55 ~ **a succeeding thrust, a Sutton descent of Mure! Snip-snap, Sudden** ~
alternate ~ *a Fair succession, a Sutton descent of Mure! Snip-snap, Sudden* ~
Or. 56 “and home! It rejoiceth my intellect, true wit!”
56 ~ **and Do-Mus! It makes joyful my Mens, Legiti’Mus!** ~

Challenging wordplay is found throughout ‘Shakespeare’, and accounts for much of the difficulty students have in reading him. Audiences can enjoy a good production of the play for the charm of fine actors, but if you would understand the verses, take a little time to learn the Artist’s rhetoric. I’ll point out the most important and interesting devices under the headings for individual lines.

Now let’s go back a little to discover more information on the life and times of ‘Shakespeare’. At the end of *Act IV, sc.1 145-49*, COSTARD, a clown, thinks on ARMADO—“O a most dainty man”...“and his page (MOTH) at other side; that handful of wit, Ah, heavens, it is a most pathological nit.” Nit: *etym.* (*Middle Dutch*) mite: ‘woodworm, bookworm’, (English) worm = (*French*) *ver*, (*Middle Fr*) *mite*: ‘moth’; dainty: (*Old Fr*) *dainté* < (*L*) *dignus*: ‘worthy’, *wordplay* ~ Vere-thy ~ . We get the message: ARMADO is ‘O’, a man, (*L*) *vir*, and masks Edward ‘de Vere’, 17th Earl of Oxford, ~ a man which (‘witch’?) Never was, nor no man Ever saw ~ (*The Taming of the Shrew Ind.2 94*). With any luck, he’ll turn Sonnet — Son E[lizabeth] T[udor] — Son-ET (*see LLL I.2 176*).

DON ARMADO calls MOTH ‘boy’ eight times in *Act I, sc.2*. He calls him this because he is (*OED*) 3a ‘A male child or youth’. Though the point is murky, we discover that ARMADO and MOTH represent the writer — the “tough *seigneur*” and “tender *Juvenal*” of the same person, Lord and satirist. It’s interesting

that HOLOFERNES also calls MOTH (*L*) *puericia, pueritia*: ‘child’. Let’s keep that in mind as we digest the characters in *Act IV, sc. 2*, because this is a kind of history, and we suspect all terms to be apt—none more so than “congruent epithetons” (*l.2 13*) such as those for the merry band of linguists in this play.

As COSTARD exits the stage, he calls “Sowla, sowla!” (*IV.1 150*), combining ‘soho’ and ‘hola’; (*OED*) soho: ‘an Anglo-Norman hunting call’, *1a* ‘a call used by huntsman to direct the attention of dogs or other hunters to a **hare** (*wordplay* heir) which has been discovered or started, or to encourage them in the chase’. Now, in *Act IV, sc. 2*, we join the verbal chase. The Artist—‘Great Oxford’ as he was called by King James I—proceeds to define or demonstrate his method. An eminent cast of Elizabethans join him. **Note**: Unless otherwise indicated, all Latin definitions are taken from *A Latin Dictionary*, Lewis and Short; English definitions from the *OED*, and French definitions, *Cassell’s French Dictionary*. Welsh are taken from *GPC - Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*, Dictionary of the Welsh Language.

Part III **HOLOFERNES tells how the PRINCESS killed One ‘Déor of Two’; Or — How to distinguish Lord Oxenford from Lady Jane Grey.**

Next we’ll look at an entire scene to demonstrate the method of ‘Shakespeare’ in a larger context, showing that he uses such wordplay at all times and with an un’ Shake-able purpose ...

~ *Every word doth almost tell his name, showing their birth, and where they did proceed.* ~ (*Sonnet 76*). His name must be complex, perhaps hyphenated — likely indicating two or more lineages. Otherwise, why refer to them in plural? And the name must be important.

Regarding the character of HOLOFERNES, Samuel Johnson (*1709-84*) thought it a mistake to include “personal invective”—meaning railing on contemporary matters or individuals. The true meaning would become obscure in time:

“I am not of the learned commentator’s [William Warburton (*1698-1779*)] opinion, that **the satire of Shakespeare is so seldom personal**. It is the nature of personal invectives to be soon unintelligible; and the author that gratifies personal malice ... destroys the future efficacy of his own writings and sacrifices the esteem of succeeding times to the laughter of a day ... Yet whether the character of Holofernes was pointed at any particular man, I am ... inclined to doubt.

Johnson was correct about personal attacks. But HOLOFERNES is treated humorously; he isn’t aspersed. He is ‘The Pedant’: (*L*) *pes, ped*: ‘foot, base’, hence seat or *see* + (*L*) *formica*, (E) ant, *maur*, (ME) *mor*, *mour* — See-Maur. Though he may be interpreted as ridiculous, I believe his characterization was meant to be a respectful tribute to the writer’s father. Nonetheless, ‘Shakespeare’ is deeply personal *and* public — personal for the artist, public for the reader. These are matters of State. ‘Shakespeare’ limits future losses by a comprehensive rhetorical scheme including metonymy and epitheton, by which he hoped to avoid complete misunderstanding. However, literary theory has failed to catch the associative cues within the text. The result is as Johnson predicted — much of Oxford’s work causes general bafflement.

NATHANIEL, ‘a Curate’, is *3* ‘an overseer’, *2 Scottish* ‘The guardian of a minor or other person not fully capable of conducting [ones] own affairs’. As a mask for John, 16th Earl of Oxford, he was an historical guardian, or godfather, to the youthful Edward ‘Oxenford’. JAQUENETTA seems to confuse NATHANIEL’s position as a Curate, *i.e.* without benefice (material endowment) in the church, with that of a Parson, who is beneficed. The question is of feudal land grants that accompany a Parson’s position, and likely alludes to problems concerning the estates of the Earldom of Oxford and their appropriation by Edward Seymour (Protector Somerset) and Robert Dudley (Earl of Leicester).

Examination of Wordplay: *Love’s Labor’s Lost IV. 2 1-161*

Longer scenes in ‘Shakespeare’ often reveal an episodic structure—a division into discrete ‘Articles’—in which the subject varies according to the word or words being played upon. So wordplay governs structure. A longer scene may explore the semantic range of words as they hint at the Writer’s

story. *Act V, scene 2*, of *Love's Labour's Lost*, is probably the best example in the entire Canon, though all plays follow the same technique. *Parts I and II* in this book, are coherent 'Articles' within larger scenes. In *Part III*, I'll cover an entire scene of medium length and comment on the articles as they occur.

Article 1: "*Haud credo*" or ~ Old Grey Doe? ~ (*LLL IV.2 1-21*)

The first Article raises the importance of rhetoric to the entire scene. A pun on (*Latin*) *haud credo*: 'I cannot believe it!' is mistaken by the unschooled constable DULL for ~ Old Grey Doe ~. We are told the error is by way of his "inclination" (*IV.2 16*), "in way of explication *facere*" (*14*): (E) to do, ~ To-do(r) ~, Tudor. That is, DULL prefers a ~ Tu-Doe'r ~ of the Grey variety—some descendant of Mary Tudor-Grey, (1496-1533), younger sister of King Henry VIII. We understand this is due to her alliance in marriage with the cadet Grey-Dudley branch of the Plantagenet-Tudor family. DULL's preference suggests his interests are Yorkist, and thus contrary to the hereditary line down from King Henry. Likely, he's "a cut-throat dog". His DULL, (ME: Middle English) *dulle*, (OE) *dol* (!): 'foolish' name tells us the writer is speaking as 'de Vere', under license from Grey-Dudley overlords. Just a touch of 'Dudley' will make Oxford '*Claudi*', Grey and obscure; yet some-(E) moria: 'mental dullness', some [St] Maur-ia shines through. DULL's confusion of "allusion" for "Collusion" and "Polusion" (*IV.2 42-6*) note crimes which he may confidently claim—they are crimes he has committed. DULL is yet another iteration of the relationship between the Writer's true (*Welsh*) *Mawr*: 'great' identity, and the false one that's ~ '**thrust upon him**' ~; (see *Twelfth Night II.5 138*).
(E) **thrust**, *wp* (*Latin*) *trudere*: 'thrust', 'press hard upon', *wp*, *anagram* Tudor.

NATHANIEL

History ► An Honest Man — "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" (*St. John 1: 47*), i.e. ~ Honest Oxford ~ as 'de Vere' (verily). He is 'the Man', (*L*) *vir*, (E) *were*. NATHANIEL is sometimes addressed as Master Parson or Person. This may refer to a metamorphosis of his identity by dowager queen Katherine Parr, in which John de Vere is 'recreated' as a suitable and very wealthy parent for princess Elizabeth's brat. Hence, NATHANIEL represents the guileless 'de Vere' name—Vere, (*L*) *verus*: 'truthful'—and reveals the 16th Earl of Oxford. NATHANIEL of *Love's Labour's Lost* is represented in *Hamlet* by the character FRANCISCO. He is a '*Centinel*', a sentinel or guard of the royal castle. Francisco plays on the meaning (English) frank: 3 'not practicing concealment; open, sincere'—honest, true; likewise as FRANCIS in *1 Henry IV II.4*.

John de Vere (1512?-62), 16th Earl of Oxford, took a stand for Mary Tudor upon the death of Edward VI (6th July, 1553), sometime between July 9th and 17th, 1553. Earl John had been under the direction of Protector Somerset since mid-year 1548. Somerset apparently enforced Oxford's marriage to Margery Golding, and installed at Hedingham (the Oxford seat) his own deputies—Sir Thomas d'Arcy and the Golding family. There, they guarded the Protector's claim to the estates of the Earldom of Oxford. After Somerset's fall (October, 1549), the positions held by d'Arcy and the Goldings fell to the control of John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland. John de Vere was commanded by Dudley to support Jane Grey in July, 1553.

Some historians mistake John Oxenford's turn of allegiance from Jane Grey to Mary Tudor as being due to the opinions of his employees. It would be unlikely for Oxford's retainers to know enough of the legal issues concerning the right of succession to overrule Earl John's judgement. Could they persuade him to risk his life? It makes more sense that Oxford was ordered to sign for the accession of Jane Grey, but then chose to throw his military strength for Mary. To follow Dudley instead would violate the longstanding de Vere support for the Crown, and his friendship with Katherine Parr and Thomas Seymour. Lord President Northumberland was on a parallel course to that of Protector Somerset, and had already freed the estates of the Earldom of Oxford from Somerset entailments. It was reasonable for John de Vere to fear his lands would then be lost to Dudley.

1 Very reverend sport, truly, and done in the

(*Furness Variorum 2*)

~ **Very** [*wp* = *wordplay*, *epithet* Vere-y] **reverend** [*wp* *re-*, *prefix*: ‘again’ (once more) + *surname* Vere + *-end*, *suffix*: ~ making nouns from verbs ~; ‘from Latin gerundive form’] **sport** [(*OED*) *sport of nature*: 6a ‘A plant or animal..which shows abnormal..variation from the parent type; (*Latin*) *ludus*: ‘play, sport’; (*L*) *lascivia*: II ‘wantiness’], **truly** [(*L*) *vere*: ‘according to truth, truly’], **and done** [(*L*) *facio*: ‘to do’, *passive fio, fieri*: to be done’, (*French*) *faire*, (*Italian*) *fare*: ‘to do’, as epithet, and ultimately metonym, for Tudor, (E) fare, *wp* fair.] **in the ~**

~ **Vere-y re-Vere’d variation, Verily, and Done in the ~**

► A key tenant of Oxford-Seymour Theory is that the works of ‘Shakespeare’ are entirely allegories pertaining to the writer’s life. The framework of each story is rooted in something Edward Tudor-Seymour regards as fundamental to himself and the nation. A premise is that each character represents an historical figure, and each will speak language based in one’s identity.

In *Act IV, scene 2* of *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, we’ll discover two individuals—NATHANIEL and HOLOFERNES—who appear to represent the father of a bright young pupil named MOTH / MOTE. Both reveal the historic person represented by the syllables and words they utter; *i.e.* their words suggest their historic names, or hint at something critical about the figure.

We will find NATHANIEL and HOLOFERNES are good companions. Characterizing John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford, and Admiral Thomas Seymour, Baron Sudeley, respectively, they appear to have been friends in life. Both served together in the Siege of Boulogne during the summer of 1544—and found common cause against the overbearing rule of Seymour’s eldest brother, Lord Protector Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset (*see* Green, Nina, *The Fall of the House of Oxford*, 2001, oxford-shakespeare.com). We will probably never learn the exact nature of Earl John’s ‘Treason’, beyond what can be guessed from the allusion to the prior Thane of Cawdor—*wp* Cow-d’Or: Oxford (*Macbeth*).

Neither NATHANIEL nor HOLOFERNES seem fully accomplished in Latin. As with many FOOLS in ‘Shakespeare’, they make barbaric errors; yet these errors tell some forbidden truth if we listen with “attent ear” (*Hamlet* I. 2 193), *wp* (*Fr*) *a’teint heir*: ‘attainted heir’—2 ~ condemned heir ~ .

► There is a series of confusing points in *Act IV, sc. 2*, especially with regard to the speaker—whether certain lines are to be understood as NATHANIEL’s or HOLOFERNES’. Because the two enjoy language and wordplay, their style is somewhat similar. Attributions noted in the *First Folio* may be incorrect due to printer’s errors; or perhaps the writer made changes without fully editing the manuscript. I suggest some confusion is intended by the writer to introduce the idea that both were positioned to be the father of MOTE. Frederick G. Fleay (1831-1909), guessed the confusion of these two characters was “intended to disguise a personal satire which, however pertinent in 1589, had become obsolete in 1597” (*Variorum* LLL p.136). We will soon find this ‘personal satire’ is essential to the writer’s purpose and the reader’s understanding. Furness, however, did not guess at the likelihood of pertinence and disagreed:

“I find it difficult to believe that a mere exchange of names would have increased the interest in the play to royal ears. The ‘wytt and mirthe’ would remain about the same whether the speeches be given to HOLOFERNES or NATHANIEL.” (*Ibid.*)

I’ve reviewed the *Variorum* for *Love’s Labor’s Lost* (Furness, ed.) to ascertain which speaker would know the historical information given, or whether a speaker gives clues to their own identities by epithets or metonymy. My results are indicated in the present text.

HOLOFERNES can also be identified by certain patterns of speech. He practices (*rhetorical*) reinforcement—**emphasis**—by synonymy. In this, he stresses the importance of a specific quality by raising a series of nearly synonymous terms, and simultaneously clarifies his meaning with subtle shades of contrast. He may interject a Latin synonym to cinch our understanding—and he’s always (like the writer, *always*) thinking of the Latin to secure a range of meanings. To excess, it’s comic; but it’s also comic if the reader correctly selects a witty definition within the true range of polysemy. Among the variety of meanings is one in particular that has the power to make you smile — that’s The One.

NATHANIEL generally defers to HOLOFERNES.

~ **ripe** [(E) *mure*, (L) *maturus*, (Fr) *mûr*: ‘ripe, mature’] **as a Pomewater** [Likely referring to Greek god *Oceanus*, son of *Caelus* and *Terra*; *wp* (E) *pome*, (L) *pomum*: ‘fruit, apple’, (Fr) *pomme*: ‘apple’, (OED) 2 ‘A ball or globe, especially of metal; the royal..orb of sovereignty’ + (E) *water*: 1 ‘the principal constituent of seas, lakes and rivers’, 10A ‘the water of a sea, lake, river’; the Sea as an emblem of (Welsh) *môr*: ‘sea’, and (W) *mor*: ‘so’—hence ‘Somor’ (St Maur)—and (W) *mawr*: ‘great’], **who now** [(L) *iam*] **hangeth** [(L) *suspendere*: ‘to hang, suspend’, *wp* (L) *sus*: ‘swine, hog, boar’ + (L) *pendere*: ‘to hang’] **like a Jewell** [(L) *gemma*: ‘a bud, eye, or gem on a plant’, ~ the germ of green, fresh growth—a child ~; *alt. wp* Jew = Tu + (L) *vel*: ‘or’, hence Tudor, see 1 *Henry IV II.4 172*: FALSTAFF “or else I am a Jew else — an Ebrew Jew.” i.e. of the Tribe of *Judah*, *wp* Tudah, Tudor.] **in** ~

~ ***Mure as the Sovereign Sea, who now Sus-pends like a Tudor in*** ~

~ ***Mure as the Global Sea, who now is Sus-pended like a gem in*** ~

► The *Variorum* (p.137) makes an interesting note for “Pomewater”—“The Pome Water tree” (from “*Gerard’s Herbal*”, Ch. 101, 1633)—which is not easily supportable because understanding the allusion requires very specific regional knowledge. It is safer to attempt understanding the works of ‘Shakespeare’ by etymological study *and* within the Artist’s rhetorical framework. Oxford aimed for enduring meaning; he generally avoids references without classical and linguistic significance.

5 the ear of *Caelo*, the sky, the welkin, the heaven; (Variorum 6)

~ **the ear** [(Latin) *auris*: ‘the ear’—in *aurum* implying something whispered ‘in secret’; *wp* (L) *heres*: ‘an heir, heiress’] **of Caelo** [*anagram, metonym* (Latin) *caelum*: ‘heaven; *wp* Sea-mul, Cea-mur, Seymour, in contrast to (L) *terra*: ‘earth’ (*wp* Tu-d’RR), hence, the writer’s lineage. Here, wordplay freely substitutes the letter *r* for *l*.], **the sky** [*synonymy* (L) *caelum*], **the welkin** [(L) *caelum*, (E) 2 ‘the apparent arch or vault of heaven; the sky’], **the heaven** [(L) *caelum*]; ~

~ ***the heir of Cae-lum, the Sea-mul, the Seymour, the St Maur;*** ~

6 and anon falleth like a Crab on the face of *Terra*, the soil, (Variorum 7)

~ **and anon** [(L) *mox*: ‘directly, presently’, *wp, pun* (L) *mos, moris*: ‘the will, humor’, the writer’s surname More, Seymour, St Maur (see *Sonnets 135, 136*); *wp* (Fr) *Tout d’heure—Tudor.*] **falleth** [(L) *cadere*: ‘to fall’, to fall dead, ‘to fall, to become less (in strength, power, worth), to decrease, lessen’; (L) *mors*: *II.C Transf.* ‘that which brings death’] **like a Crab** [(L) *cancer*: *III* ‘a crawling, eating, suppurating ulcer, malignant tumor’—*wp, timesis* Tu-Mor] **on the face** [(L) *os, oris*: *II. Transf.* ‘the face, countenance’, ‘mouth, cheek, face’, *IIC* ‘Speech’; (L) *species*: ‘form, appearance’, *II. C2* ‘honor, reputation’] **of Terra** [(L) *terra*: ‘land, ground, soil’, *pun* Two-d’RR; ‘opposite the sea’], **the soil** [(L) *solum, terra, humus*], ~

~ ***and More, mors like a Cancer on the honor of Terra, the Te-RRa,*** ~

~ ***and More, kills like a Cancer on the countenance of Terra, the Te-RRa,*** ~

► Here is a fine example of a transitive pun. The writer uses (E) *anon*, (L) *mox*, to suggest (L) *mos* or *moris*: ‘the will, humour’. (L) *moris* is an anagram of the writer’s surname Seymour—Si-mor, Oxford’s subtle word game is nearly complete, with (L) *mox* relating to the ‘Will Sonnets’, 135, 136. Also, (E) *anon*, (Fr) *tout à l’heure, tout d’heure*: ‘straight away’, plays on *surname* Tudor.

The heart of ll.6-7 is wordplay on Tudor, with four iterations ranging from the countenance or face of Tudor, the (L) *oris orbis*; the Tudor base, (L) *solum, terra*; extending outward to the country of Tudor, (L) *terra*; and further to the globe, earth, (L) *terra, orbis*—and all naming the (L) *orbis*, *anagram* bis-or, Bis’Or, as ~ Two-d’Or ~ Tudor. Oxford is laying the groundwork for his classical genealogy from Myth: *Caelum*, ~ *Sae-Mur* ~ ‘the Heavens’ is his father; *Terra*, ~ Tu-d’RR ~, ‘the Earth’, his mother; and he is *Oceanus*, ‘the Sea-Môr’.

7 the land, the earth. (Variorum 8)

~ **the land** [(L) *terra, tellus*], **the earth** [(E) the globe, (L) *terra, orbis*, wordplay on Two-d’or]. ~

~ ***the Two-d’RR, the Tud’or.*** ~

NATHANIEL

8 Truly, *Master Holofernes*, the epithets are (Variorum 9)

~ **Truly** [(L) *vere*: ‘according to truth, truly’], **Master** [(L) *dominus*: ‘lord, commander’, *II poetic*. ‘the possessor of an art’] **Holofernes** [As above, a general (admiral) who has lost his head.], **the epithets** [(L) *epitheton*, (E) epithet: 1 ‘An adjective indicating some quality or attribute..of the person or thing described’, 2 ‘A significant appellation’] **are** [wp *R(egius)*: ‘royal, regal’, as appended to the Christian name of a monarch, eg. Elizabeth *R(egina)* = Elizabeth-Queen.]

~ *Vere-ily, Master Holofernes, the appellations R[egius]* ~

~ *Vere-ily, Master Holofernes, the descriptions R[egius]* ~

► **epitheton, epithet**: *Rhetoric* ‘What is ascribed to a person; an attribute’ (*OED*); ‘an adjective or adjectival phrase that characterizes or describes a person or thing’.

In a sense, most of Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ (*O/S*) performs as a series of adjectival phrases, since all nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs are likely to qualify the surnames of the historical person on whom a character is based. Here, NATHANIEL/John de Vere speaks “truly”/‘verily’ of epithets “sweetly”, (*Fr*) *doux-ly* (wp *Tu-doux’ly*) ~ *Vere-ied* ~ . This is a vital element in the writer’s double entendre. HOLOFERNES has spoken (*II.3-7*), and we notice he constructs larger passages of words that suggest the (E) *sea*, (L) *mare*, (*Welsh*) *mor*, (*Fr*) *mer* or, alternately, of (E) *heaven*, (L) *caelum*, wp (*Fr*) *ciel*, (W) *coelum*, ~ *sea-mur* ~ ; the sea is a principal emblem of St. Maur or Seymour. He also emphasizes words that may be called attributes of the (E) *earth*, (*Fr*) *terre*, (L) *orbis*: *anagram*, *timesis Bis*: ‘twice, two’ + *or*, hence ‘Two-d’Or, Tudor. So, “Heaven and Earth” are roots of the author’s surnames, Seymour and Tudor. Oxford uses many epithets for each name and they are usually apt, though he was not afraid to stretch an etymological pun. As James J. O’Hara has observed, even “Cicero himself will not hesitate to make any possible pun with the name of a forensic target” (*True Names*, 1996, p.47). In this way, ‘Shakespeare’ simply followed Latin practice and adapted Alexandrian wordplay and ‘soundplay’.

The matter is Succession and Treason. It was illegal to speak of Royal Succession and of the Seymour Affair (between Thomas Seymour and Elizabeth Tudor). This is a reason characters speak in a figurative manner. When, in *Hamlet*, the guards question or remark, they do not do so directly; eg. MARCELLUS asks FRANCISCO: “Who has your place?” We suspect he’s talking about the estates of the Earldom of Oxford — ‘The Fall of the House of Oxford’. It was MARCELLUS (Somerset) who had attempted to extort the lands of FRANCISCO (16th Oxford). Naturally, it is BARNARDO (“The Bear”), as Duke of Northumberland, who succeeded Somerset and encouraged him to lose his head (*22 Jan. 1552*).

9 sweetly varied, like a scholar at the least: but sir I assure ye, (Variorum 10)

~ **sweetly** [(*Fr*) *suite*, (L) *sequor*: *II Trop*. ‘to follow, succeed’ — hence: varied in such a way that one may succeed (to the crown); *alt.* (English) *sweet*, (*French*) *doux*, wp (E) *do*, (*Fr*) *faire*: ‘to do’] **varied** [(*Latin*) *varius*, *diversus*: ‘turned different ways’, *I* ‘Set over against each other’; wp (L) *verso*: *IB1 Trop*. ‘To turn, twist’, *IB2* ‘to turn upside down, i.e. to discompose, disturb, vex’ — all with wordplay on surname Vere], **like** [(L) *simulo*: wp ‘simuro’ / Seymour-O] **a scholar** [(L) *vir doctus*: ‘a man of learning’; (L) *doctus*: *wordplay* (E) *doctor*: v. 2a ‘to adulterate or dilute’, 2b ‘to make alterations to something in order to deceive’] **at the least** [wp, *pun title* *Leicest(er)*, the Earl of *Leicester* as the agency of Oxford’s metamorphosis—thus, grammatical ambiguity: ~ scholar under the influence of Leicest’ ~]: **but** [(L) *verum*: ‘but in fact’] **sir** [(L) *bone vir*, *Vir bonus*: ‘a morally good Man’, ‘Good Man’, *vir optime*: ‘noblest Man’] **I assure ye** [(L) *adverare*: (*OED*) *etym.* (E) *aver*: ‘to make true, verify, prove to be true’; *alt.* (L) *confirmo*, *confirmare*: ‘to make firm’; *alt.* wp (L) *confirmare*, (E) to *dure*, ~ ‘I to dure you’ ~ .] ~

~ *Succeedingly Vere-ied, like a Vere doct’ard at the Leicest—, I aver ye,* ~

~ *Duly Vere-ied, like a versed Vere at the Leicest—, I aver* ~

► Do you see how referring to a Latin analogue or translation can suggest a particular reading? Understanding (E) “scholar” as (L) *vir doctus* yields a pun: ~ Vere-doctored ~ , ~Vere altered ~ ; and this is well within the rhetorical scheme wherein NATHANIEL/de Vere speaks in his (L) *verus*, guileless way. NATHANIEL agrees with HOLOFERNES’ description of the ‘Deare’, but adds his own proper ‘Vere’-iation for the sake of a full twofold accounting of its condition.

Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, is a lesser (Leices’er) quantity and quality in every way except that he possesses the invaluable secret of Elizabeth’s child:

12 ’Twas not a *haud credo*, ’twas a Pricket.

Leicester also held a grudge against John de Vere for throwing his large militia behind Princess Mary, 18 August, 1553. This is often mentioned as the decisive factor in the downfall of John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland (Robert’s father), and of Henry Grey (DULL), Lady Jane Grey, and her recent husband Guildford Dudley (Robert’s brother).

Leicester and his successor, Robert Devereux (1561-1601), *Earl of Essex*, and the Cecils, had been the ‘chain of iron’ around the Queen’s neck, and that of Oxford. In February of 1603, as the Elizabeth’s health deteriorated, she was at first unable to express her wish for the Succession and said to Lord Admiral Charles Howard (see: Whittemore, Hank; *The Monument*, 2005, p.558).

“My Lord, I am tied with a chain of iron about my neck ...
I am tied, I am tied, and the case is altered with me.”

When pressed, Howard stated the Queen advised for James VI of Scotland.

It is probable that DULL represents a conflation of Henry Grey and Robert Dudley, and that the (Mid.E) *dulle* is a metonym for Dudley (see notes for line 11, below).

10 it was a Buck of the first head. (Variorum 11)

~ **it was a Buck** [(E) buck: ‘The male of the fallow-deer’, with wordplay on (L) *malus*, *male*: *adverb* ‘badly, ill, wrongly’, and (E) male, hence (L) *vir*: ‘man’] **of the first head** [*idiom*. “The buck is..called..the fifth year, a buck of the first head” (*O. Goldsmith*, 1774); *alt.* (English) first head, (L) *primus-princeps*: ~ first Prince ~ ,].~

~ **it was a male De’Or — the Primus Prince.** ~

► George Steevens (1736-1800), gave a list of ‘Huntsmens’ terms for deer of various ages in the *Variorum* for *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (p.138, l.11).

HOLOFERNES

11 Sir *Nathaniel*, *haud credo*. (Variorum 12)

~ **Sir** [(L) *bone vir*, combines the bone: ‘good’, also used for Seymour, with (L) *vir*, as a homonym of the de Vere surname.] **Nathaniel** [As above, representing the surname ‘de Vere’ as an metonym for the writer, Edward Tudor-Seymour.], ***haud credo*** [(English) *translation* ~ By no means do I believe it ~].~

~ ***Sir Nathaniel, I can hardly believe it!*** ~

► Having been executed when his son was less than 8 months old, HOLOFERNES/Th. Seymour expresses disbelief at the reported death of his innocent child. A consequence of an attainted traitor was the “corruption of blood” in the offspring. Generally, they could not inherit; and because of the special nature of Thomas Seymour’s target—Elizabeth being a possible heir to the throne—the offensive child would be easier to hide in a grave. Nonetheless, like the innocent babe of AARON (a Moor) who was spared death by an oath (*Titus Andronicus* V.1 86), the Moor’s/Maur’s vengeance would live to be told by that ‘Vere-y’ infant.

DULL

► DULL is a constable who, though a little slow-witted, knows a few things for certain:
~ ’Twas not an old Grey Doe (d’Or) ~ (*see l.12*). DULL almost certainly represents a conflation of two important individuals representing the Grey-Suffolk-Dudley faction. The first is Henry Grey (1517-54), 3rd Marquess of Dorset. He and Lady Frances Brandon (1517-59) were the parents of

the famous Grey sisters: Ladies Jane (1537-54), Katherine (1540-68), and Mary (1545-78). Henry Grey conspired with Thomas Seymour / HOLOFERNES to challenge the unique power of Edward Seymour, Protector Somerset, by arranging marriage between King Edward VI, then of about eleven years, to Lady Jane. Dorset was, in fact, Lord High Constable of England to oversee the coronation of Edward VI (17-20 Feb. 1547). **A third element: Oxford under influence of Dudley?**

The second element within DULL, and one that extends Suffolk influence into the reign of Elizabeth, is Robert Dudley. Dudley was also a 'Constable', (*Latin comes stabuli*: 'officer of the stable'. His position in the Queen's household was 'Master of the Horse', a figure of cabinet rank, a peer, and a privy councillor. There is extant a letter written by Robert Dudley to Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, dated 4th September, 1563, "informing him of the Queen's decision to make a gift to Parker of a deer killed with her own hand" (Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge—*CCCC MS 114A*, p. 190 No. CXLII).

This 'gift' requires some explanation. A few weeks before Anne Boleyn, mother of Elizabeth Tudor, was executed (19th May 1536), one of Anne's chaplains, young Matthew Parker, accepted her charge to watch over the young Elizabeth should anything happen to Boleyn. He appears to have taken the commission earnestly; yet there were strong differences of opinion between Parker the Reformer and conservative Elizabeth, when she became Queen. One particular point was the Archbishop's enthusiasm for clerical marriage:

"no christian man can denie, but that a godly wyfe is an helper to honest and godly lyfe in this worlde, to all such as have not the gyft of single lyvying geven them of the lord.

Wherefore, it cannot be sayde that holye wedlocke, yf it be begun in the Lorde, should be by it selfe an impediment to the office of a priest.

— Parker, Matthew. "A Defence of priestes mariage..." pp. 340-41

— see also: Bjorklund, Nancy Basler. "A Godly Wyfe is a Helper": Matthew Parker and the Defense of Clerical Marriage", *Sixteenth Century Journal* XXIV/2 (2003)

This idea was vehemently rejected by Elizabeth. It is said the Queen's violence caused consternation in Parker and William Cecil, who communicated on the issue. It was not typical for the Queen to step so deeply into Church matters, especially those unresolved among Reformers; yet she stood firm in forbidding wives and children from living within the grounds of cathedral churches and colleges as of 9th August, 1561 — just as BEROWNE finds in *Love's Labor's Lost*:

O, these are barren tasks, too hard to keep — **too hard**, *wp* Too-dure, Tudor

Not to see ladies, study, fast, not sleep. (*Love's Labor's Lost* I.1 47-8)

I suggest her adamance was based in a personal concern of great importance. Otherwise, her desire to punish Parker (and Parker's wife) is unaccountable. Perhaps the Archbishop had been involved with his friend, Sir Thomas Smith in managing the Seymour Affair (1547-49). It appears Elizabeth was forced to 'play false', not only with a [Thomas] Smith—that famous "Doctor *Bellarion*", the ~ curer of bad heirs ~ (see *Merchant of Venice* I.1 42 & III.4 50)—but with a Parker as well. Parker deftly joined John Dudley, Earl of Warwick (following the attainder of Thomas Seymour), and placed himself among the offending Grey-Suffolk faction. This was not the sort of 'protection' Anne Boleyn had in mind for Elizabeth.

Thus, it is natural to suppose the 'Virgin' Queen was such by mandate rather than by choice—as Oxford too, was corralled and 'Leices-en'd (in effect "killed") by Dudley entailment—and both Elizabeth and Oxford had good reason to resent Parker deeply for his argument, influence, and association. If the Privy Council could forbid the marriage of Elizabeth to Admiral St Maur, she could turn the tables and 'alienate' a Bishop's children (consider again: *Hamlet* III.2 146-49):

HAMLET (to OPHELIA, as a youthful Elizabeth, and possibly with Anne Cecil conflated?)

emphasis Go to, I'll no **more** on't; it hath made me mad. **mad**, (L) *morio*

I say, we will have no **more** Marriages. Those that are **are**, *wp* *R[egius]*

married already, all but one shall live, the rest shall keep

as they are. To a Nunnery, go. **nun**, (L) *monacha*, *wp* (E) monarchy; *monachium*: 'monastery'

This would also explain Elizabeth's strong dislike of Matthew Parker's wife, Margaret Harlestone, who was given by Parker as the model of an ideal wife and who, presumably, was as mild as the Queen was not. John Strype, in his *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, (1711)*, takes particular note of the Queen's injunction against cleric's wives living within the close:

“But to show here, what Prejudice the Queen had against the Clergies taking Wives, it may appear hence, That near this time ... the Archbishop [Parker] came according to his Custom to wait upon her Majesty, to know if she had anything to say to him concerning Religion or the Church: When she took occasion to speak in that bitterness against the Holy Estate of Matrimony, and especially against this Estate in the Clergy, that the Archbishop was in a horror to hear her. Angry in Effect she was with the Bishops, and the whole State of the Clergy upon that account, and repented her for making married Men Bishops, and wishing it had been otherwise.” (Ch.8, p.109)

Gifting the slain deer/Deor to Parker appears to have been a bitter reminder of some offense committed against the Queen. It is a symbol, in the Artist's scheme, of her dire predicament in having produced a child without sanctioned wedlock, and of the Reformist hand—the Opportunist hand—in killing her “pricket” and sole heir.

~ **Aut, aut, brief Pricket** ~, ~ Two-d'Or, brief pricket ~, “Out, out, brief candle”

(*Macbeth* V.5 23) Varronian /Alexandrian progression (wordplay): (L) **aut**: ‘or’ — aut, aut = two-d'or; **brief**, (L) *breve*, wp (E) brave, (L) *fortis* (Beaufort) **pricket**, 1a ‘a candle’; 2a ‘a male deer in its second year’

The Queen's son would have been considered legitimate in the eyes of Catholic Cannon Law because Elizabeth Tudor and Thomas Seymour had several times expressed the desire to be married. They had petitioned the Privy Council for permission to marry and had made required banns of marriage. Unfortunately, some reformed churches determined this was not sufficient — that a formal ceremony in an appropriate church was required as well. This is the reason for Oxford's, and the Queen's, preference for a conservative Code of Cannon Law. It also explains the need to amend English Common Law to allow a child “of the Queen's body” to succeed her.

Historical assessments of Robert Dudley vary widely. I do not make a judgement on his character here, only emphasize Oxford/Shakespeare's characterizations, and remind readers he has very personal reasons for his opinion.

DULL

12 'Twas not a *haud credo*, 'twas a Pricket. (Variorum 13)

~ 'Twas [possible wp (L) *tuus*: ‘your, yours’] **not a *haud credo*** [pun (Latin) *haud credo*: ~ ‘I don't believe it’ ~], 'twas [possible wp (L) *tuus*: ‘your, yours’] **a pricket** [pricket: 2a ‘A male deer in its second year’ (OED)]. ~

~ **Yours [was] not an old Grey doe, yours was a second year male.** ~

~ 'Twas not an old Grey-Tu'doe, 'twas a second year male. ~

Bio. ► Among two ‘deors’ (Tu-d'Ors), the one killed by this PRINCESS (masking Elizabeth Tudor) belongs to HOLOFERNES. It is not an (L) *haud credo* /‘Old Grey Doe’ (Jane Grey-Dudley), but another *who must not be named*. The ‘Princess’ who killed the Grey Doe was Mary Tudor (Mary I). But another ‘deor’ has been killed by Elizabeth; this one is Edward Tudor-Seymour, born the night of Lammas Eve (July 31st) 1548, and recorded at *Romeo and Juliet* 1.3 17. His other self, his *alter ego* Edward de Vere, was born April 12, 1550. That date is suspect as it is found only in the papers of William Cecil (1520-98). Cecil stood to profit greatly by delaying the date. As Master of the Court of Wards, prolonged wardship meant greater profit for himself; but it also protected Princess Elizabeth's reputation. This made Elizabeth, in effect, a permanent ‘ward’ of Dudley and Cecil—‘The Cloud Captors’, ‘The Clowd-capt Towres’ (*The Tempest* IV.1 152)—and “leave not a racke behinde”. I should note that a rack: 3a ‘a mass of cloud moving quickly’ is excellent wordplay on ‘The Tempest’ that makes ‘obscure’ the power of Elizabeth's monarchy, and in turn hides the mysterious agency itself.

History ► English historian Eric William Ives (1931-2012) records the varying assessments Henry Grey, *Lord Dorset*. Wilbur K. Jordan (1902-80) called him “that most stupid of peers”, “surely the most empty-headed peer of England”; this may stem from our affection for the innocent Lady Jane and sympathy for her difficult situation. Her parents were very much at fault for her death. Of course, ‘Shakespeare’ did not call him DULL without cause. The writer, Oxford/‘Shakespeare’, is solidly anti-Grey-Dudley and knows the facts of the case, though he views the family and their extended family relations with the Dudleys as a liability (see Ives, Eric. W.; *Lady Jane Grey – A Tudor Mystery* (2009), Ch. 4, pp.39-41).

Henry Grey was dull indeed to allow his daughter, an heir to the Crown, to be pawned by political schemers. Ambition drove him to risk his own life in the venture, but he won’t be so keenly missed. John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, continued the manipulations of Dorset after the fall of Admiral Seymour (*Jan, 1549*) and Protector Somerset (*Oct, 1549*). Thus, Warwick too became DULL—‘brainless’ you might say—as they “off-capped” to royal succession (see *Othello I.1 10*). DULL may well be wordplay on (Middle English) *dulle*, suggesting the surname Dudley, who was *Custos l’Or-um*, and *Rato l’Orum Tu* (*Merry Wives of Windsor I.1 6-7*)—that is, ~ guardian of the Gold, and the *Rat-O’Gold* too ~ . **Rat**, mouse, weasel, ermine, (*L*) *mus, muris*: *worplay* Si-mur

► Frederick Chamberlin made a survey of commentary on the acuity of Robert Dudley. In his review of the question in *Leycester and Elizabeth* (1939), ch. IV (p.43-50), he found only one contemporary, first hand disparagement of Dudley’s mind—and that was by Spanish Ambassador Don Guerau de Spes from 1571:

“The principal person in the [Privy] Council at present is William Cecil ... he is a man of mean sort, but very astute, false, lying and full of all artifice. ...

The next after him, the man who has most to do with affairs is Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, not that he is fit for such work, but because of the great favor with which the Queen regards him.”

If we consider the characterizations of POLONIUS and CLAUDIUS in *Hamlet*, the opinion of Oxford agrees in either case. POLONIUS/Cecil *is* artful; and CLAUDIUS/Dudley is a wily plotter—a more than competent, self-advancing murderer who [*aside* Damn it All!] “could not but by” his Queen (*Hamlet IV.7 16*). For this reason there may be a good measure of Henry Grey along with Robert Dudley in the dull DULL of *Love’s Labour’s Lost*.

HOLOFERNES

13 Most barbarous intimation! yet a kind of insinuation, (*Variorum 14*)

~ **Most** [(*Latin plurimus*: ‘most, very much’; *alt. (L) summum*: ‘highest, greatest’] **barbarous** [(*L barbarus*: ‘foreign, strange’, (E) barbarous: (*OED*) 2 ‘uncultured, uncivilized, unpolished; rough, wild’, 3 ‘Of people: speaking a foreign language, foreign’; *alt. wp (L) barbarus IB4* ‘any hostile people (among the Romans after the Augustan age, esp. the german tribes’, hence (*L germanus*: *IIA* ‘Of or belonging to brothers and sisters’, (E) germane: *I* ‘closely related’] **intimation** [*wp (L) intima*: *II B2* ‘in the inmost part’ + (*L mare*: ‘the sea’; *alt. (L) significatio*: *IID* ‘meaning, sense, import’]: **yet** [(*L verum tamen*: ‘nevertheless, but yet’] **a kind** [(*L genus, modus*: *IIA Transf.* ‘A measure, limit’, *IIB* ‘A way, manner, mode, method’] **of insinuation** [(*L insinuat*io < *insinuo*: *IB* ‘to bring in by windings or turnings’, *IB2* ‘to wind one’s way into, to steal into’; further wordplay is likely as ‘in-sinew-ate’ with reference to the difficulty of severing thickly sinewed necks. Again, I suspect the “windings” are (*L verso*: ‘twisted’ manipulations of the So / Vere identity.), ~

~ **Most alien inmost Sea! yet of More in-sinew-ation**, ~

~ **Most Strange meaning! yet a way of stealing into**, ~

Rhetoric ► “Barbarous” indicates a rhetorical figure called *barbarismus*, as defined below. The mix-up of (*L haud credo*, and (E) ‘old Grey doe’ is an example.

barbarism: *1a* ‘The use of words of expressions not in accordance with the classical standard

of a language, especially such as are of foreign origin; originally the mixing of foreign words or phrases in Latin or Greek' (*OED*). 'Foreign mode of speech' (*Rhetorical Terms*; Lanham, R. A.)

14 as it were *in via*, in way of explication *facere*; (Variorum 15)

~ **as it were** [(*OED*) as it were: 'a parenthetical phrase used to indicate that a word or statement is not perhaps formally exact, but practically right'; by Alexandrian Wordplay, were is a near homonym for *surname Vere*; it becomes epithetical, functioning as de Vere's by-line or signature.] **in via** [*wp* (*L via*: *II Trop.* 'a way, method, mode, manner'; a near homonym for *surname Vere*, is a substitution for (*L mores*: 'mode, manner, etc.'], **in way** [(*L via*, reinforcement of Vere and (*L via*.)] **of explication** [(*L explication*: *etym.* 'the process of uncoiling; the solution (of a difficult problem)', (*MFr*) *explication*: 'the process of making clear the meaning of something'] **facere** [(*L facere*, (*Fr*) *faire*, (*Italian*) *fare*: 'to do', *wp* *surname Tudor*.]; ~

~ (*as it vVere*) *in vVi[r]a*, in way of making clear the sense of 'To do[r]' ~

~ (*as it vVere*) *in Vere*, in way of making clear what is 'To do[r]' ~

Rhetoric ► The phrase "as it were" occurs three times in this passage. It plays on the surname **Vere** with Latin pronunciation of V being the same as English W, and the soft, non-rhotic R (as in French) fairly disappearing—much as 'Oxford English' pronounces 'were' today. Happily, (*E*) were from (*OE*) *wer*: *n.1 1*: 'a male person', *2* 'a husband', puns on (*L vir*: 'a male person' (see *Othello V.2 137-68* for most significant use). "As it were" is NATHANIEL's / de Vere's 'by-line', yet we know this is a false name; Oxford is really something More. In truth, 'Oxford' is a DULL / Grey-Dudley 'creation'. Both HOLOFERNES and NATHANIEL use this phrase to mark the transition of Seymour to Vere.

Here, HOLOFERNES simply remarks on the insinuation of the surname 'de Vere'/'*in via*' (*Vere*) to solve the riddle of a missing (*L facere*: *surname To do(r) = Tudor*. There are several iterations of the pun on (*L via* for *surname Vere* in 'Shakespeare'; I suggest the lack of rhotic R indicates Oxford often spoke soft or nearly silent Rs in postvocalic (after a vowel) use.

"In way of explication", *i.e.* ~ In way of making clear the sense ~ , defines the role of Varronian or etymological wordplay. Its purpose is to reinforce a particular meaning within the established semantic range of a word. BEROWNE suggests the problem of obscure writing in *Act I, sc. 1 57*:

"Things hid and barred, you mean, from common sense?"

Yes, Oxford's *noema* is a device used to avoid 'common sense', and words so composed need a little help by way of figurative interpretation or various forms of wordplay.

15 as it were replication, or rather *ostentare*, (Variorum 16)

~ **as it were** [see 1.14] **replication** [(*Latin replicatio*: *IV* 'A repetition', also *I* 'A folding or rolling back again', *etym.* '(in legal use) any response made by one party to the others argument' (*OED*), 'contrary motion'], **or** [(*L vel*: 'or', and (*L orum, aurum*: 'gold', the golden morpheme of *Tudor* and *Seymour*; *wp* 'Or' replicated is Two-d'Or.] **rather** [*wp* (*English*) *rother*: 'an ox, bullock'; *alt. (L malo*: *I* 'I would prefer', *wp (L male, malus*: 'bad, evil, deformed, destructive'; *wp (E) male, (E) Man, (L vir*] **ostentare** [(*L ostentare*: *II. E* 'To show, by speech or signs, to reveal'], ~

~ (*as it vVere*) *Two d'Or, a bullock reveal*, ~

16 to show as it were his inclination after his undressed, (Variorum 17)

~ **to show** [(*Latin demonstro, demonstrare*: *I* 'to point out', with added sense (*L monstrum*: *II Transf.* 'a monster', *B* 'of the sea', 'wonder, prodigy'] **as it were** [see 1.14 above] **his inclination** [(*L inclinatio*: *II Trop.* 'an inclination, tendency', 'disposition, propensity', *II. CI* 'An alteration, change'] **after** [(*L ad*: 'according to'; *i.e.* ~ in the manner of ~ (*L modo, more*] **his undressed** [(*L crudus*: *B1a* 'Unripe, immature', (*English*) *crude*: (*OED*) *1a* 'In a natural or raw state'; (*L rudis*: 'unwrought, unformed, rough, wild'], ~

~ to demonstrate (as it vVere) his disposition in more of his rough, ~
 ~ to de-Monster (as it vVere) his disposition in More im-Mure, ~

17 unpolished, uneducated, unpruned, untrained, (Variorum 18)

~ **unpolished** [(L) *impolitus*: II Trop. ‘unrefined’, (L) *impolite*: ‘without ornament’], **uneducated** [(Latin) *indoctus*: ‘untaught, unlearned, uninstructed, ignorant, unskilful’; (L) *ineruditus*: ‘unlearned, illiterate, awkward’], **unpruned** [*un*: ‘Used to express negation’ + (MFr) *prougner*: ‘to cut branches from a (plant) in order to regulate growth and promote flowering’], **untrained** [(L) *inexercitatus*: ‘untrained, unpractised’; (E) *in-*, *prefix3*: ‘expressing negation’ + (L) *edoceo*: ‘to teach thoroughly’], ~
 ~ **unrefined, unlearned, ungoverned, untrained**, ~

► HOLOFERNES’ response to DULL’s simple comment grudgingly admits to its truth, but then lays on the insults—Dudley, DULL, (ME) *dulle*, is dull-witted, unpracticed, ignorant, and rough.

18 or ratherest unconfirmed fashion, (Variorum 19)

~ **or** [*wp* (L) *orum*, *aurum*, as the root of Tud’or.] **ratherest** [*wp* (E) *rother*: ‘an ox, bullock’ + *-est*, *suffix*: ‘superlative of’] **unconfirmed** [(L) *un*: ‘Used to express negation’ + *firmitas*: II Trop. ‘to fortify, secure; to make lasting, durable’, hence ~ not durable ~, (Latin) *durus*: ‘hard’, *wp* root of Tu-dur; (English) *unconfirmed*: ‘Not having received the rite of confirmation’ according to Christian doctrine; 3 ‘not formally confirmed or sanctioned’] **fashion** [(L) *mos*, *moris*, *mores*.:], ~
 ~ **Or-Rother’est un-Fort’ified More**, ~

Rhetoric ► Both Furness and Schmidt (1831-94) were perplexed by this use of “ratherest”. ~ Rother-est ~ as etymological wordplay associated with the title ‘Oxford’, again shows us how essential is some knowledge of Oxford-Seymour Theory to fathom meaning. I’m not crowing (‘boast, swagger’), but seconding the comment by Ben Jonson: ~ As neither *Vir* nor *Simur* can praise too much. ~ with wordplay on (L) *Vir* / *surname Vere*, and (E) *Muse* / (L) *Mus* / (L) *Muris*. (*To the memory ... The AUTHOR*, 1.4, *wordplay: Two-d’Or*.)

19 to insert again my *haud credo* for a Deare. (Variorum 20)

~ **to insert** [(Latin) *insero*, *inserere*: ‘to implant, ingraft’] **again** [(L) *rursum*: *wp*, *anagram* Sumurr, St Maur] **my *haud credo*** [(L) *haud credo*, (E) ~ I do not believe it ~, puns on ‘Old Grey Doe’, suggesting the deposed Queen Jane Grey Dudley—17 years old at her death in Feb. 1554—was of a pretty good age (for a deer) when slaughtered.] **for a Deer** [(Mid. E) *déor*: ‘deer’, confused with (ME) *dure*, *deore*: ‘dear’, and either may act as metonyms for [Tu-]d’or, Tudor.]. ~

~ **to implant once More my “haud credo” for a De’Or**. ~

~ **to insinuate once More my ‘Old Grey Doe’ for a De’Or**. ~

DULL

20 I said the Deare was not a *haud credo*, ’twas a Pricket. (Variorum 21-2)

~ **I said** [*wp* (English) *sayed*, *assayed*: ‘to test, or make a trial of the quality, fitness, of something’] **the Deare** [(ME) *déor*: ‘deer’] **was not a *haud credo*** [*wp* ‘o(l)d Grey doe’, referring to Lady Jane Grey of the Suffolk Tudors (Tu-de’ors).], **’twas** [*wp* (L) *tuus*: ‘your, yours’] **a Pricket** [(OED) 2a ‘A male deer in its second year, having straight unbranched antlers’]. ~

~ **I assayed the de’Or; was not an ou’d Grey doe, yours was a Pricket**. ~

~ **I tasted the De’or, was not an old Grey doe, yours was a Pricket**. ~

History ► Jane Grey was the great granddaughter of King Henry VII, and the granddaughter of Mary Tudor (1496-1533), Queen of France. Lady Jane was married to Guildford Dudley (1535-54), son of John Dudley (1504-53), Duke of Northumberland, on the 25th of May, 1553. Constable DULL / (ME) *dulle*, as either Henry Grey or a Dudley, knows well enough the identity of this ‘Grey Doe’—she

was his daughter, daughter-in-law, or sister-in-law, respectively. The “Pricket” is another déor—our famous writer: ‘Shakespeare’, Oxford, and Edward Tudor-Seymour.

► Was it necessary to execute Lady Jane Grey? There are several allusions to Jane in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*; notably, she is figured as an ~ **Old Grey Doe** ~ (IV.2 19-20), the words having been misunderstood from (*Latin*) “*haud credo*” (‘I cannot believe it’) by CONSTABLE DULL. In *Act V sc. 2 13*, wise ROSALINE speaks enigmatically to KATHERINE concerning Cupid (*Amor*):

“You’ll ne’er be friends with him: a’ killed your sister.”

The very existence of a’ **Maur**—Cupid—otherwise known as the writer, Oxford/Tudor-Seymour, rendered Jane Grey superfluous and an impediment to Crown Tudors, represented by the two daughters of Henry VIII, and now a magnificent Grand-Son—MOTH / MOTE. This is the Tudor story ‘Shakespeare’ tells!

**Article 2: ‘Simplicity, (*L*) *stultitia*, in a *Morio* — in his DULL’er parts’, (*LLL IV.2 22-33*).
Erasmus to Sir Thomas More: ~ foolishness is a vital element ~ *Praise of Folly*.**

HOLOFERNES

21 Twice sod simplicity, *bis coctus*! (*Variorum* 23)

~ **Twice sod** [*wp, anagram* Two-dos, Tudors; *alt.* (E) sod: ‘a piece..of earth with grass growing on it; grass, turf’, v. ‘to cover up with sod, turf’, (*L*) *gramen*: *wp, surname* Grey men, referring to the effect of Suffolk-Grey Tudors — to cover Tudors with ‘Grey’.] **simplicity** [(*L*) *simplicitas*, *stultitia*: ‘foolishness’, hence (*Latin*) *morio*: ‘an arrant fool, *II Transf.* ‘a monster, deformed person’; *alt.* (English) simple, (*L*) *merus*: *wp, anagram* Sumer, St Maur], **bis coctus** [(*L*) *bis coctus* = (E) ~ twice cooked ~ ; (*L*) *coctus* < *coquo*: *wp* (English) cook: *figurative* 5 ‘to prepare, develop; devise, concoct, especially of deception, fabrication’ — hence ‘conceived’, ~ twice conceived’ ~ , (*L*) *miscere*: ‘to mix, mingle’, *II. Trop.* ‘to throw into confusion’, *wp* (E) miscarry: *Ib* ‘to cause to perish or suffer harm or misfortune’, (*L*) *fingerere*: *I.B3* ‘to alter, change’]! ~

~ **Tudor’s Moria, twice con-cock’t Ed!** ~

~ *Twice Grey’d Moria, twice Cooke’d!* ~

► HOLOFERNES guesses at the nature of the Pricket. He could not have known of the sad fate of Jane Grey, his former ‘foster child’; but perhaps anachronistically, he now understands the altered state both suffer: Edward Tudor-Seymour by ‘transmutation’, and Jane becoming heir apparent to the throne by Northumberland’s altering the ‘Devise for the Succession’ (*Letters Patent, June, 1553*).

(*Latin*) *bis coctus* likely plays on the notion of a ‘double conception’—conceived in two ways.

A second meaning: (*Latin*) *bis coctus* may imply the agency of William Cecil’s wife, Mildred Cooke (1526-89, married 1546) and of her sister, Anne Cooke (1527-1610, m. 1553), in the arrangements made for Princess Elizabeth’s pregnancy. Thus, the child might be ~ Twice Cooke’d ~ . We know that Elizabeth was grateful for Cecil’s assistance at that time (1548), but the brilliant Mildred—a classical scholar—may have worked with Katherine Parr, Henry VIII’s last queen, towards a satisfactory plan. Mildred was the mother of Oxford’s wife, Anne (*née Cecil*), Countess of Oxford, and her brother, Robert Cecil. Anne Cooke was the mother of Anthony (1558-1601) and Francis Bacon (1561-1626). I suppose this is wayward speculation, yet I’ve come to believe highlighted terms, such as “*bis coctus*” hold important factual information for the reader.

— see: Victoria E. Burke, Jonathon Gibson, eds.: *Early Modern Women’s Manuscript Writing, 2004*).

I marvel at the list of great individuals within Oxford’s circle. Anne Cooke’s husband, Nicholas Bacon (1510-79) was made Attorney of the Court of Wards and Liveries by Henry VIII in 1546. This post involved him in the disposition of noble orphans, and he would be concerned in all questions of Edward Tudor-Seymour (‘Shakespeare’) and Mary Seymour. He was clearly favored by Queen Elizabeth Tudor for most of his tenures in State office, particularly that of Keeper of the Great Seal. His involvement in the crisis of the Seymour Affair would explain the benefits falling to Sir Nicholas from the ‘Lord Keeper Act of 1562’, by which he was “entitled to like place, pre-eminence, jurisdiction, execution of laws, & all other customs, commodities, and advantages as

the Lord Chancellor” (see Wiki). Thus Bacon did very well for himself. To be compensated in the same manner as the Lord Chancellor placed him among the highest-ranking of the Great Officers of State in England. Bacon’s advancement is consistent with all those who took part in Elizabeth’s affair, and indicates a coterie of associates to William Cecil, in the manner of the one described by Cecil for Robert Dudley, ‘Earl of Leicester’ — (Chamberlin, Frederick; *Elizabeth and Leycester*, Dodd, Mead & Company, 1939, p.172).

22 O thou monster Ignorance, how deformed dost thou look. (Variorum 24)

~ O [wp, synecdoche ‘O’(xford)] **thou** [(Latin) tu: ‘you’] **monster** [(L) morio: II Transf. ‘a monster, deformed person’] **Ignorance** [(scholastic Latin) inadvertentia, (E) inadvertency: etym. ‘failure to observe, pay attention’ — ~ failure to ‘see’, acknowledge ~; (L) inscientia: ‘want of knowledge, ignorance’; alt. (L) imprudentia: ‘want of foresight, imprudence’], **how deformed** [(Latin) morio: II Transf. ‘a monster, deformed person’] **dost thou** [wp, anagram, inversion (E) thou dost = Tu dost, Tudors] **look** [(L) intueor: ‘to look upon’; (L) videri: II. B7 ‘to seem, appear’]. ~

~ O you Maur inad-Vere’tent — how O’More Tu-do[h]s seem. ~

~ O Thou Blind A’Mor — how of More Tu-do[h]s Seem.

~ O thou careless More — how More-like Tudors look. ~

Rhetoric ► HOLOFERNES now strikes his forehead (I imagine) and addresses himself in (*Rhetorical*) *apostrophe/aversio*. Whatever kind of fool DULL may be—however he may lack perspicacity—HOLOFERNES has also been a fool, a (E) moria, (L) morio: ‘an arrant fool’. The PRINCESS too—she has made a grave error in sacrificing the ‘Déor’/deer for momentary safety, not foreseeing the life of bondage she would create for her son and herself. Note the Alexandrian wordplay in which both monster and deformed are definitions of (L) morio: II Transf. ‘a monster, deformed’

History So this appears to be the moment HOLOFERNES/Th. Seymour learns of his son’s conversion, but NATHANIEL goes on without fully understanding the revelation our PEDANT has had. This is not the last time NATHANIEL misses an “*Apostrophas*”, or *Aversio* (see I.118). We know that John de Vere would live until the summer of 1562, see Princess Elizabeth crowned, and in his final act, agree to the thieving management of the Earldom of Oxford by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester.

NATHANIEL

23 Sir, he hath never fed of the dainties that are bred in a book. (Variorum 25-6)

~ **Sir** [(L) bone vir: ‘good man’], **he hath** [(L) habeo, habere: II. B ‘to have in use’] **never** [wp (E) not ever — not E.Ver.] **fed** [(L) pascere: ‘to feed, pasture’] **of the dainties** [(L) cuppedia: ‘dainty dishes, delicacies’, < (L) cupido: ‘desire, longing’] **that are** [metonym, synecdoche *R(egius)*: ‘royal’, *R(egina)*: ‘queen’] **bred** [(L) generare: II.B ‘to bring forth’] **in a book** [(L) liber: II. B ‘a book, treatise’, II. C2 ‘a religious book, scriptures’—because NATHANIEL is a curate, he may be thinking of this sense; likely wp (L) liber, l’Vere, de Vere.]. ~

~ **He hath not E.Ver pastured of the de-sires that R[egina] begat in the Vere.** ~

► NATHANIEL / John de Vere speaks admiringly of that which can be ‘brought forth’ in a Vere/Ox. The *OED* tells us, the Ox (‘a bovine animal’) figuratively represents something ‘sluggish; stupid’. Though not as quick as HOLOFERNES, NATHANIEL is nonetheless a big step up from DULL.

24 He hath not eat paper as it were, he hath not drunk ink. (Variorum 27-8)

~ **He hath** [(Latin) habeo, habere] **not eat** [wp (L) manduco, manducare: ‘to eat, devour’, ~ to make a duke of a man ~ — a (L) ducator of a (L) vir (wp Vere)] **paper** [(L) charta; wp (French) titre: ‘title, style, denomination’; (L) tabula: II. E ‘public records, State papers’, (L) syngrapha: ‘a written agreement to pay, a promissory note’] **as it were** [By Alexandrian Wordplay, were is a near homonym for *surname* Vere as pronounced in Latin; see I.14.]: **He hath not drunk** [(Latin) bibere: I. 7 ‘to absorb’, wp de Vere] **ink** [(L) atramentum: I ‘writing ink’, ‘any black liquid’, hence, ~ Sea-moor ~.]. ~

~ **He hath not de Vour’ed titles, as it VVere, he hath not de-Vir’ed Moor-Sea.** ~

~ *He hath not de Vere'ed titles, as it VVere, he hath not de-Vir'ed Black-Sea.* ~

25 His intellect is not replenished, he is only an animal — (Variorum 29)

~ **His intellect** [(L) *mens*: 'the mind, disposition; the heart, soul', *II.B* 'reason, judgement'] **is not replenished** [(L) *replere*: 'to fill again, to refill', *wp re*: 'again' + *plenus*: 'full, filled'; (E) *plenish*: 2 'to fill up, stock, supply'], **he is only** [(Latin) *solum, solus*: 'alone, only, single', (OED) *etym.* 'onely', singly; *wp solis, sol*: 'the sun, son'] **an animal** [*wp (L) animalis*: 1 'consisting of air, aerial'; *cf. (L) animal*: 'a living being, includes man', (L) *bestia*: 'a being without reason'; (E) pig: *Ia* 'a pot, pitcher, jar, or other vessel, usually made of earthenware'] — ~

~ **His heart is not twice-stocked, he is solely a vessel**— ~

~ **His soul is not twice-filled, he is 'onely' a beast**— ~

~ **His Rey'son is not twice-filled, he is uniquely an Heir** — ~

► A rumor persists that Elizabeth Tudor had several children, but Oxford repeatedly assures us there is only One, and he is It. In works of 'Shakespeare', a royal or family line typically has a sole heir. Each story proceeds on some mischance concerning the heir—either death, loss at sea, head-strong or wild behavior, or some such impediment to orderly succession. See Appendix 1 for comments on the characters who are 'Shakespeare's HEIRS'. My analysis suggests the Author of 'the Canon' believes he is the sole heir of Tudor. He *is* MAMILLIUS (see *A Winter's Tale*): 'the shining, splendid one'; (L) *mamilus* is of the same root, (L) *mar*, as *marmor*: 'marble, stone', and (L) *marmor* is one of his frequent plays on Seymour / St Maur as Sea-Mor—(L) *mare-mor*.

26 only sensible in the duller parts; and such barren plants (Variorum 30)

~ **only** [(English) *etym.* *onely*: 'alone of its kind..of which there exist no more', (OED) 1 'an only one', 3 'an only child', (L) *unicus*] **sensible** [(L) *manifestus*: 'palpable, clear, evident', (L) *aperio*: *II.C Metaphor.* 'to reveal, disclose', *wp (L) aper*: 'wild boar'] **in the duller** [(L) *hebes, obscurus*: 'dark, indistinct, unintelligible'; *alt. (ME) dulle (dul'le)* suggesting Dudley.] **parts** [(L) *partem*: 'sense, interpretation', *in malam partem accipere*—'taken in the adverse sense']; **and such** [(L) *huius modi*: 'of this kind'] **barren** [(L) *sterilis*: 'unfruitful, barren, sterile', *II Trop.* 'vain, unproductive, fruitless'; *alt. (L) infecundus*: 'unfruitful'] **plants** [(L) *planta, wp Planta-genista*—Plantagenet.] ~

~ **one-ly Boar'ne in the Leices'er sense, and Maur sterile Plantas-genet** ~

► Robert Dudley (DULL) was not fecund—not (L) *ferax*: 'fruitful'—not 'Fair'/*Fer*; he was neither *Beau* nor *Fort*. In Oxford's estimation, he fell short of Fair Tudor.

History I suggest Oxford here gives information about Leicester's want of a legitimate heir. Dudley's son by his second wife, Lettice Knollys (*m. 1578-88*), was named Robert Dudley, Lord Denbigh (1581-84), who died at age 3. Leicester had no children with his first wife, Amy Robsart, but is thought to have had an illegitimate child by Douglas Sheffield in 1564. Leicester's brother, Ambrose Dudley, 3rd Earl of Warwick (1530-90), also died childless. This verse seems to slight a generation of Dudleys for want of abundance.

The question has been raised as to whether Leicester's children were his, or 'adopted' as his own. There was competition for the hand of Robert Dudley after the death of his first wife, and after the consideration of marriage to the Queen had passed. It would not be unlikely for Lettice Knollys to have contrived a pregnancy by a more productive man.

After the death of Leicester's child, Philip Sidney (1554-86), son of Mary (Dudley) Sidney and Sir Henry Sidney, became *de facto* heir to Dudley's powerful position. When Philip died at Zutphen, Robert Devereux (1565-1601) assumed that favored role.

► It so happens that John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford, also lacked a male heir. This made his Earldom vulnerable to assaults by newly created nobles (eg. Leicester), who lacked estate.

27 are set before us, that we thankful should be, which we taste (Variorum 31)

~ **are** [(Latin) *R(egius)*: ‘royal, regal’] **set** [(L) *imponere*: ‘to place, set’; (E) *set*: v.I ‘To cause to occupy a seat’, ‘to set on a seat; to set on a seat, a throne’] **before** [(L) *prius, ante*: ‘before, in time’] **us, that we thankful** [(L) *gratus*: wp *Grai*: ‘Greek’ + *timesis Tuus*: ‘yours’, wp th’Ors, th’Ours—hence Grey Tu(dors).] **should be, which we taste** [(L) *sapere*: II *Trop.* ‘to taste, savor’; alt. (L) *gustare*: ‘to take a little of’, I. A ‘have a superficial knowledge of’; (L) *gustus*: II. A *Trop.* ‘a foretaste, specimen’, II *Trop.* ‘heard, attended for a while’] ~

~ **R enthroned before us, that we should be Grey-Tu[dor]s, which we savor, ~**

► Likely wordplay on (E) witch/which that often occurs in ‘Shakespeare’. Oxford nods to the supposed witchcraft of Anne Boleyn that lives on in Elizabeth Tudor and Edward Tudor-Seymour. Anne was accused of bewitching king Henry VIII, inducing him to love her. These ‘three witches’, or (L) *moirae*, are the same as found in *Macbeth* (I.1 1-13):

“When the hurl a’ Burghley’s Done,” a, variant ‘of’, forming compounds: ‘off, from, of’

28 and feeling are for those parts that do fructify in us more than he; (*Variorum* 32-3)

~ **and feeling** [(L) *sentire*: II. A ‘observe, notice’] **are** [(L) *R(egius)*: ‘royal, regal’] **for** [(L) *pro*: II. B1 ‘in favor of, on the side of’, II. B2 ‘in the place of, instead of’] **those parts** [(L) *pars*: II. B2H ‘a part of the body, member’, ‘the private parts’, ‘a testicle’] **that do** [(L) *facere*: metonym ‘to do’; alt. (L) *ferre*: ‘to bear’] **fructify** [(L) *fructifico*: ‘to bear fruit’; (L) *ferax*: ‘fruitfulness’] **in us more** [*epithet, surname* Maur, St Maur, Seymour] **than he**; ~

~ **and sense R in favor of those members that bear in us More than he**; ~

► Lines 27-8 present grammatical problems that many have tried to amend. I can make sense here without adding words, though a comma at the end of l.27 helps. The word “are” often makes best sense as R appended to the name Elizabeth *R(egina)*, indicating ‘Queen’, or *R(egius)*. Then the idea of altered identity towards an heir apparent develops.

29 For as it would ill become me to be vain, indiscreet, or a fool: (*Variorum* 34-5)

~ **For as it would ill** [(Latin) *male, malus*: ‘deformed’, ‘badly, wrongly, erroneously, improperly’, playing (English) male: 2a ‘Of or relating to a man or men’, (L) *vir*: ‘a male person’, hence *surname* Vere.] **become** [(L) *convenire*: ‘to fit with, to suit’] **me to be vain** [(L) *vanus*: ‘fruitless’, playing on “fructify” in l.28; likely wordplay (L) *vanus* and *Venus*?], **indiscreet** [(L) *inconsultus*: I ‘not consulted, unasked’, II ‘unadvised, inconsiderate’], **or** [(Latin) *aurum, orum*: ‘gold’, (English) or: *heraldry* ‘gold or yellow in armorial blazoning’—wp (L) ora’m-Maur = ‘golden fool’, “Golden Ass” (by Apuleius)] **a fool** [(L) *morio*: ‘an arrant fool’]; ~

~ **For as it would mal-suit me to be fruitless, unregarded, ’Or a Maur**: ~

~ **For as it would Vere-ly suit me to be fruitless, unregarded Ora’m Maur**: ~

30 So were there a patch set on Learning, to see him in a School. (*Variorum* 36-7)

~ **So were** [wp Latin pronunciation of surname Vere] **there** [wp? t’heir, ‘the heir’] **a patch** [(E) patch: I ‘a foolish person, a simpleton; a fool, a clown’, < (Italian) *pazzo*: ‘fool’, ‘mad, crazy’; alt.? (L) *pannus*: I ‘rags, tatters’, wp? (L) *panus*: II *Transf.* ‘a swelling, tumor’; wp (E) patch: 6a ‘A part of a surface recognizably different..from the rest’, ‘a mark or spot’, hence ~ stain ~ .] **set** [(L) *statuere*: ‘to place, set, fix’] **on learning** [(L) *erudita*: wp (L) *rudis* < (E) rude: ‘rough’, *anagram* ~ Tue-dair ~ ; (L) *doctrina*: I ‘science, learning’, II. B *Transf.* ‘principle’], **to see** [(L) *videre*] **him in a school** [(L) *schola*: ‘A place for learned conversation, a place of learning’, ‘a college’; (L) *ludus*: ‘a place of exercise, practice, an elementary school’; alt. wp *schola* / (hi)’s collar: ‘a band or chain for the neck’, (L) *torques*: ‘a coupling collar for oxen’]. ~

~ **So vVere t’heir, a’taint put on Tuedair, to see him in ’s collar**, ~

~ **So vVere there a stain put on principle, to see him in ’s yoke**. ~

History

► *ll.29-30*, NATHANIEL / 'de Vere' speaks of his view regarding an exchange of identity, in which he assumes the role of a Tudor-Maur parent, and DULL (Dudley) mounts the Ox's yoke. Again, we remind ourselves that de Vere is not indifferent to Constable DULL (Dudley). The 16th Earl was without a male heir and his title vulnerable to extinction. Rich holdings of the Earldom of Oxford had been marked by Lord Protector Somerset, King Edward's Regent, to furnish himself (and his young son Henry Seymour, *b. 1540*) with a suitable estate; hence Somerset sought to affiance his son to Katherine Vere (*1548-1624*), and entail the Oxford inheritance to himself.

It has been supposed that John de Vere attempted to frustrate Somerset's plan by marrying his love interest—one Dorothy Fosser—but that both Somerset and de Vere were foiled by Sir Thomas Darcy, brother-in-law to de Vere, who interceded in Earl John and Dorothy Fosser's planned wedding, scheduled for Weds., 4th August, 1548. This reasoning is not plausible. Darcy, undoubtedly under the direction of Edward Seymour (Somerset) advised or coerced John de Vere to marry Margery Golding on Tues. 3rd August, according to a deposition made by John Anson (who would marry Miss Dorothy the following year). Confusingly, the date recorded in the Church of Belchamp St. Paul was 1 August, 1548 (?).

Sir Thomas Darcy was cousin to Somerset and had communicated with the Protector his intention to stop de Vere's marriage to Miss Fosser. It is unthinkable he would check Somerset's stratagem when the Duke represented Royal Authority. Rather, it seems more likely that the Protector's desire to marry his son to de Vere's daughter altered due to new circumstances. The birth of a child to Princess Elizabeth—a Seymour child, and the possibilities in 'possessing' that child—presented interesting prospects to the ambitious Lord Protector and his wily secretary, William Cecil. Likely, he saw the need for control of Oxford's resources, ranging from de Vere's income from lands, to the private militia he retained, should Somerset need support in a contest with competing claimants. A challenge from his popular brother Thomas Seymour had been the immediate threat. At any rate, Thomas Darcy presented young Margery Golding and her brothers to John de Vere, as his new wife and overseers to be.

History

I suspect Somerset had known of Princess Elizabeth's pregnancy almost from the beginning, and was immediately informed of the delivery of a healthy child in Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, on the evening of July 31st (Lammas Eve), 1548. This is probably the event that forced Sir Thomas Darcy to act when he did. According to a simple but ingenious scheme, the infant's identity could be kept secret from most. The principal actors—trusted Tudor, Seymour, and Vere, friends and advisors—would know: (1) dowager **Queen Katherine Parr** (*1512-48*), who had been instrumental in reconciling the relations between Henry VIII and his daughter Elizabeth in the king's final years; (2) **Sir Anthony Denny** (*1501-49*), a close friend of Henry VIII (chosen to give the King news his death was imminent, *Jan. 1547*), took Elizabeth to his home in Cheshunt when the extent of the Seymour Affair became evident to Queen Parr. Sir Anthony's wife (3) **Joan Champernowne**, her sister (4) **Kat Champernowne** (Kat Ashley), Princess Elizabeth's governess, and Elizabeth's cofferer (5) **Sir Thomas Parry** (were instrumental in managing Elizabeth's responses during the Privy Council investigation into the Affair.

Others who were probably informed of the matter include: (6) **Edward Seymour, Lord Protector or Somerset** (*1500-52*), eldest uncle to young King Edward VI; (7) his brother, **Admiral Thomas Seymour**, final husband of Katherine Parr (and the guilty party in Princess Elizabeth's supposed pregnancy); (8) Lord Somerset's personal secretary, **William Cecil** (*1520-98*), who would become the most powerful minister of Elizabeth Tudor's reign; (9) **Sir Thomas Smith** (*1513-77*), Protector Somerset's Secretary of State, later Oxford's foster father; (10) **Katherine Brandon**, (Willoughby) (*1519-80*), the dowager Duchess of Suffolk—a close personal friend of Katherine Parr who took the deceased Queen's child, (11) **Mary Seymour** (*1548-1624*), into her home for two years until Mary was placed, together with her half brother Edward Tudor-Seymour (Oxford/'Shakespeare') under the name 'de Vere'—Mary Seymour / 'de Vere' married the only son of the Duchess of Suffolk, (12) **Peregrine Bertie** (*1555-1601*), 13th Baron Eresby de Willoughby.

(13) **John Gates** (*1504-53*), surveyor (overseer) of the estates belonging to Queen Katherine Parr, & brother-in-law to Anthony Denny; (14) **Sir Thomas Darcy** (*1506-58*), secretary to Edward

Seymour, Protector Somerset, and brother-in-law to (15) **John de Vere**, 16th Earl Oxford; the Golding Family, agents of Thomas Darcy and Somerset, were apparently placed as overseers of the Earldom of Oxford, *i.e.* informants who prohibited John de Vere from making most financial decisions regarding his own lands, to preserve them for use by Protector Edward Seymour—they include (16) **Thomas Golding** (1522-71) a “servant” of Somerset, and the Protector’s chief agent over John de Vere; (17) his younger brother **Henry Golding** (1528-76), apparently the on-site manager at Castle Hedingham, Essex; and (18) **Margery Golding**, who married **John de Vere** (1516-62), Earl of Oxford, godfather to the famous Edward (‘de Vere’) Tudor-Seymour. It is a tightly knit group, is it not? The Tudor-Seymour child could be moved about among these discreet clients of the Tudors without much notice being taken of him. (see Green, Nina; “*The Fall of the House of Oxford*”, 2001, for historic documents revealing the coercion—as it was termed in Parliamentary documents—against John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford).

To this number we must add **John Dudley**, Earl of Warwick and Lord President of the Privy Council, who succeeded when the Protectorate of Somerset fell in Oct. 1549. He assumed some agents formerly with Somerset—Sir John Gates and Sir Thomas Darcy (*see above*)—and thereby seems to have become aware of the Princess’ son. Dudley visited Elizabeth at Hatfield, Hertford., in the Spring of 1550, and the two got on “famously” (*see Elizabeth, The Struggle for the Throne*, David Starkey, 2000). Thus, we discover the source of critical information that was later used to coerce Queen Elizabeth towards policies and distributions beneficial to John Dudley’s son, Robert—and the ‘favor’ at the root of ‘Leicester’s Commonwealth’. By the 17th of January, 1549, news of suspicions concerning Lord Thomas Seymour and Princess Elizabeth reached the Privy Council and likely to a wider audience. That day, Thomas was committed to the Tower of London.

We don’t know when the decision was made to announce the two Seymour children, Edward and Mary, to the world as children of John de Vere. We do know that a gold baptismal cup was sent on 17 April, 1550, from King Edward VI to John de Vere, marking the occasion. William Cecil noted in his private papers Edward de Vere’s birthday as 12 April, 1550. It’s of interest to consider that Catherine de Vere (1539-99), and later her descendants, contested the validity of John de Vere’s marriage to Margery Golding on specious grounds. Catherine, of course, would never be able to state any certain knowledge of her supposed half-brother’s—Edward Tudor-Seymour’s—identity without revealing Princess Elizabeth’s maternity, and thereby, her involvement in the treasonable adventures of Admiral Thomas Seymour.

Edward Seymour, Lord Somerset, was removed from power in Oct. 1549 for several reasons, not least of which was the widespread condemnation of his role in his brother’s lethal Attainder. Ultimately, John Dudley, Earl of Warwick (later Duke of Northumberland), received much of the blame for having stirred envious resentment between the Seymour brothers, uncles to Edward VI:

“The Earl of Warwick was a mischievous instrument between the [Seymour] brothers, using his greatest efforts—unfortunately with too much success—to inflame the quarrel, and thereby raise his own fortune on the ruin of both.”

(*see* Maclean, John; *The Life of Sir Thomas Seymour, Knight*, 1869)

You can get the general drift by reading Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, in which KING HAMLET masks for the writer’s father Thomas Seymour. PRINCE HAMLET is the displaced Prince Tudor-Seymour (‘Oxford’); KING CLAUDIUS represents a John Dudley-like figure, *i.e.* ‘Northumberland’, and his survivor, Robert Dudley, ‘Earl of Leicester’. LAERTES represents an *alter ego* to PRINCE HAMLET — his Classical Greek name reveals a necessary allegiance to the ‘Greek’ faction at Court. He performs as the conspiratorial and ‘electable’ Edward ‘de Vere’, the *de facto* son and creation of POLONIUS (Cecil)—a client to Dudley overlords. I can’t overstate the importance of identifying LAERTES and HAMLET as competing identities within the same individual (the Writer)—they must die together by the same sword. Such a split of personalities is found in each play by Oxford/ ‘Shakespeare’; one is a ‘Leices[t]er’ (lesser) puppet for the Suffolk-Grey Tudors, the other, the benign Prince representing true State or Crown Interests.

31 But, *omne bene*, say I, being of an old Father's mind, (Variorum 38)

~ **But** [(L) *modo*: 'only'], **omne bene** [(E) 'everything is well', playing on the (L) *omne*: 'everything, all', the first suiting NATHANIEL (~ E.Vere-thing ~), and the second Tudor-St Maur, i.e. (E) all's well, wp (L) *totus*: 'all', surname Tudors + (L) *vel* (pron. ~ well ~, hence not Totus, but Tot(ors)/Tudors], **say I, being** [(L) *esse, sum*] **of an old** [(L) *vetus*, (French) *vieux*: wp Vere; alt. (L) *grandis*: 'great', I. B 'aged, old', metonym (Welsh) *mawr*, surname St Maur] **father's** [(L) *pater, parens*] **mind** [(L) *mens*: 'the intellect, reason'], ~

~ **Only 'Tout-or', say I, being of a Vere parent's mind, ~**

- The correct solution for (Latin) *omne bene* depends whether 'a Vere (wp *Vieux*) thing is well', or 'Tout'or' (All's Well / *vel*).

32 Many can brook the weather that love not the wind. (Variorum 39)

~ **Many can brook** [(Latin) *ferre*: 'to bear, tolerate', wp (E) bear: 'to produce a child'; (Fr) *faire*: 'to do(r)', wp, epithet (E) fair: metonym Tudor; additionally (E) brook: I 'to make use of, profit by'] **the weather** [wp (E) wether, (West Frisian) *veer*: 'a ram', 'a male sheep..especially a castrated ram'] **that love** [(L) *amor*: wp, surname—(E) a, prep.2: 'of' + Maur; (L) a, prep. = ab: 'from, away from, out of; down from; since, after; by, at in, on'] **not the wind** [(L) *aura*: II Transf. 'the air', wp (E) heir]. ~

~ **Many can Ferre the Ram that A'Mor not the heir.** ~

~ **Many can tolerate the Ram that a'Mor not the heir.** ~

~ **Many can profit by the Maur that a'Mor not the heir.** ~

- A homely aphorism, is it not? Yet it does not follow; it is rhetorical *non sequitur*. What is the "old father" thinking? Is this simply inserted to help characterize NATHANIEL as an undisciplined speaker? Of course, he does not speak of the weather, he speaks of the wether: 'a male sheep, a ram, especially a castrated ram'—the Ram is a marred, anagrammed Mar, Maur, St Maur. No, though not as quick as HOLOFERNES, NATE is no bleater, nor prattler, nor twaddler. What he has to say is significant if you take the time to consider his words, and perhaps 'again and again'. Yes, ~ many can make use of the inverted Ram, yet they refuse to a'Maur the heir ~ .

- Etymological wordplay is often critical to understanding 'Shakespeare'. For example, "brook" is ambiguous, but we posit the most plausible meaning by referencing a Latin analogue, (L) *ferre*, which playfully suggests (E) fair: 'beautiful, agreeable', a root metonym for Beaufort (naming the Beaufort descendants of Edward III), or else (E) fare: 4a 'to behave, conduct oneself, act', hence, 'to do' and its analogue (L) *portare*, with wordplay on ~ to door ~, Tudor; this nearly confirms the Artist's line of thought. By this means, dictionaries provide several options for defining a word, but our experience with Oxford's subject increasingly points us to his particular truth and name.

The "wether"/wether allows a simple pun on the previously noted riddle at LLL V.1 42-56 (as demonstrated in Part II of this essay, p.39): "Ba most silly sheep with a horn".

Article 3: "Dictynna? nay Dictisima! A title to Phebe, to Luna, to the Moon." (LLL IV.2 34-47)

~ **The Moon? nay, Say-More! A title to Phœbe, to Luna, to the Moon.** ~

HOLOFERNES considers the enigmatic Moon, Phœbe, Luna, Dictynna.

DULL

33 You two are book-men: Can you tell me by your wit, (Variorum 40)

~ **You** [(Latin) *tu*] **two** [(L) *duo*] **are** [wp synecdoche R(egius), R affixed to the first name of royals designated the particular member of the family] **book** [(L) *liber*, wp l'Ver / de Vere; likely pun on (L) *libero*: 'freeman', having been in some way liberated, the condition of (L) *libertas*: 'without obligation', likely pointing to loss of feudal tenure in lands.] **men** [(L) *vir, plur. virum*]: **Can you** [(L) *tu*] **tell** [(L) *referre*: II. B3 'to report, recount', (E) report, wp ~ again door ~] **me by your** [wp y'our: y-, prefix:

‘Designations of persons associated or related by birth’; Y represents (Old English) ge- + Or, *timesis*, the golden syllable common to Tud’Or and Seym’our] **wit** [(L) *ingenium*, *sal*: ‘salt, sea’, (L) *musa*: ‘genius, wit’, *wp* a property of (L) *mus*, *muris*: ~ Mures, surname Maurs ~], ~

~ **You two are freemen: Can you Tu-tor me by y’our Muse**, ~

~ **Tudors R Lacklands: Can you tell by Or-Maurs**, ~

~ **You two are landless: Can you Tu-tor me by your Muse**, ~

History ► Likely a grim jest on a condition shared by Thomas Seymour and John de Vere. The Earldom of John de Vere was entailed (1548, reversed in 1552) to Edward Seymour, Protector Somerset, meaning John could not pass his lands to his heirs. Thomas Seymour, by the Act of Attainder (1549), lost his name, title, and property. Thus both are Freemen in a feudal sense: ‘without ties or obligations to land’, indicating loss of tenancy under the King, and thus loss of benefits from, and obligations to a Lord. John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford died—apparently murdered—in 1562, days after ceding control of his lands to Robert Dudley.

34 What was a month old at *Cain’s* birth that’s not five (Variorum 41-2)

~ **What was a month** [(Latin) *mensis*] **old** [(L) *aetas*: ‘the period of life, age’, *wp* (L) *aestas*: ‘summer’ / Seymour; (L) *natus*: ‘born, since birth’] **at Cain’s** [(Hebrew) *qyn*: ‘spear’, (L) *hasta*, *lancea*: possible *wp* Moor-Cea / Cea-Moor — several languages define ~ land ~ as ‘heath, moor’, eg. (Irish) *lann*: ‘enclosure’, (Welsh) *llan*: ‘enclosure’, (Cornish) *lan*: ‘heath’, (Breton) *lann*: ‘heath’, (French) *lande*: ‘moor’, hence (Hebrew) *qyn* is possible wordplay for Sea-lan, ~ Sea-moor ~] **birth** [(L) *ortus*: II ‘A rise, beginning, origin’, *wp*, anagram Tutors] **that’s not five** [(L) *quinque*: ‘five’, as sound-play on (Hebrew) *Qyn*: ‘Cain’.] ~

~ **What was one month St. Maur at a Spear’s birth that’s not five** ~

~ **What was one month Sommer at a Spear’s birth that’s not five** ~

35 weeks old yet? (Variorum 42)

~ **weeks** [(Latin) *septum dies*] **old** [(L) *natus*] **yet** [(L) *etiannunc*: ‘still, even now’, today, as wordplay on surname Tu-da(y), Tudor.]? ~

~ **weeks born Tuda(y)?** ~

Rhetoric ► Refers to Princess/Queen Elizabeth as Diana from Classical Myth. The Queen was frequently given the metonym ‘Diana’ for her mythic chastity. Diana is, of course, the goddess of the Moon—hence the following discussion on “*Dictisima*” and “*Dictynna*”. The renewal of the Moon each month apparently reminds DULL of a ‘Doe asset’ that renews and thus maintains her virgin status despite guarded claims from Oxford/Shakespeare’ that he is her son.

HOLOFERNES

36 *Dictisima* goodman Dull, *dictisima* goodman Dull. (First Folio / F1) (Variorum 43-4)

Dictynna goodman Dull, *Dictynna* goodman Dull. (Modern Printings)

~ **Dictisima** [< (Latin) *dict*: ‘say’, *past participle* (L) *dicere*: ‘to say’, *wp* surname Sey(mour) + *isima*: ‘an inflection of Latin suffix *issimus*, playing as superlative of (L) *mus*, *muris*: ‘mouse, rat, ermine, sable’] **goodman** [(E) goodman: 4b ‘Prefixed to the name of a person below the rank of gentleman, as a yeoman, a farmer..any householder’, 4c *humorous or ironic* ‘As a mock title for someone deemed unworthy of respect’, intending to depreciate the humble beginnings of DULL/Dudley.] **Dull** [The surname Dudley is a habitation name of the West-Midlands town of Dudley, Worcestershire, but the original surname of his family was Sutton.], **dictisima goodman Dull** [Immediate repetition of a word or phrase is (rhetorical) *comoratio*: ‘emphasizing a strong point’ intended by the writer; by no means is it to be understood as *pleonasmus*: ‘needless repetition’] ~

~ **Say More goodman Dull, Say More goodman Dull.** ~

Rhetoric ► “*Dictisima*” (F1) is amended in many texts to *Dictynna*: “the moon, (a rather rare classical name for her, appropriate in the mouth of the pedantic Holofernes”; (*Riverside Shakespeare*, p.193).

However, a general rule I follow is to resolve apparent errors of spelling and grammar in favor of the writer's family names, or some qualification of his biography, history, or condition. I suspect there is wordplay on (English) Say-more/Seymour, based on (*Latin dicta*: 'to say often', (*Italian dire*: 'to say', *indicare, dicitura*: 'words' + (*Latin summa*: 'summit', *II Transf.* 'principal point', (*Italian cima*: 'summit, top', '(of persons) genius'—likely as a superlative inflection of *Say*, *i.e.* Say-more, Say-most. This would be one among many sly allusions to the 'married name' of the Queen—*Dictynna* : *Dictisima*, or Diana : Saymore (Seymour).

This reading is in line with HOLOFERNES / Sir Thomas St. Maur's mission to preserve the family name despite *Attainder*: (again) 'the extinguishing of name, title, and legal rights'. We are also shown the quickness of the father's mind—he immediately solves DULL's riddle.

DULL

37 What is Dictynna? (Variorum 45)

 What is Dictima?

~ **What is Dictynna** [*II* 'An appellation of Diana' (Ovid), hence a metonym for Elizabeth I of England, as with *Phoebe*, *Luna*, the *Moon* (see l.38) — DULL is still having trouble hearing.]? ~

~ **What is Dictynna?** ~

Rhetoric ➤ The Virgin Queen, Elizabeth I, was often symbolized in contemporary literature as *Diana*, the 'Virgin goddess' of Classical Myth but, *tout au contraire*, reveals 'Shakespeare' (see l.35).

As at *IV. 2 12*, DULL doesn't hear Latin quite right, and says *Dictynna* instead of *Dictisima*. He unwittingly commits *barbarismus*: 'mispronunciation through ignorance', as noted by HOLOFERNES at *IV. 2. 13*—"Most barbarous intimation". Hence, rather than a printer's error, the writer certainly intends "*Dictisima*". DULL (masking Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester) will continue these barbarous barbarisms because he doesn't seem to comprehend, or won't acknowledge, that 'The Moon' (Elizabeth Tudor) is surnamed *Dictisima* / ~ Say-more ~ .

➤ 'Dictynna' may allude to the 'hunting net', (*Gr dictya*, of *Diana* or *Britomartis*, etymologized as (*L*) *virgo dulcis*, 'sweet virgin' by Solinus, a 3rd century grammarian; this virginity is an attribute of the Moon. DULL, again as Robert Dudley (Master of the Horse), might also be associated with the 'net' of Diana. — see O'Hara, James J.; *True Names*, p.56

➤ George Steevens (*Variorum* p.141) notes the Golding translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: "Dictynna guarded with her train, and proud of killing deer." (*Book II*)

At any rate, allusion and wordplay are at work here and everywhere in *Love's Labor's Lost*. 'Diana' / Elizabeth Tudor is not likely to be proud of killing her deer / dear child.

NATHANIEL

38 A title to Phoebe, to Luna, to the *Moon*. (Variorum 46)

~ **A title** [(*L*) (*hominem*) *appellare*: 'to address, to call upon'] **to Phoebe** [*I* 'The moon goddess, sister of *Phæbus*, *i.e.* Diana, Luna, or the moon' (Lewis & Short); hence, NATHANEAL gives a textbook definition of the subject.], **to Luna** [*Personified II Transf.* 'the Moon-goddess'], **to the Moon** [*Ib* 'The moon considered with reference to its changes and phases', *Id* 'With feminine personification, sometimes identified with certain goddesses, such as Cynthia, Diana, Phoebe']. ~

~ **An appellation to Phoebe, to Luna, to the Moon.** ~

➤ NATHANIEL uses *Synonymia* as a means of amplifying (enlarging) the *Epithets* used for the goddess *Diana*, which itself is a *metonym* for Queen Elizabeth I. *Synonymia* gives emphasis.

➤ Later, at *Love's Labor's Lost* *V.2 202-30*, ROSALINE is courted by the KING of NAVARRE ('Ne-Verre'), but Moon-like, her mood changes, and she will 'dance' with him "no More" (l.224).

HOLOFERNES

39 The Moon was a month old when *Adam* was no more. (Variorum 47-8)

~ **The Moon** [*historic metonym Elizabeth R(egius)*] **was a month** [(L) *mensis*] **old** [(L) *aetas*: ‘the period of life, age’, *wp* (L) *aestas*: ‘summer’] **when Adam** [(L) *princeps*: ‘the first man, first person’, thus Adam: 2 ‘A parent (usually a man) likened to Adam (I ‘the first human...’ especially in being a forebear, progenitor, founder, etc.)’, here as child of Elizabeth, probably suggesting agnatic primogeniture; *alt.* *wordplay* Adam: ~ a dam ~, *etym.* ‘a variant of dame’; 2a ‘A female parent. Correlative of (English) sire’, 3 ‘Mother (human), usually in contempt’] **was no more** [*wp* ~ no longer ‘a More’, a ‘St Maur’ ~], ~

~ **Elizabeth R was one month St Maur when a Dam was no Maur.** ~

~ **Diana was a month old when A Prince was no More.** ~

- This is the heart of ‘Shakespeare’—classic double-entendre. By “slow endeavoring Art” (*Folio 2*, John Milton), Oxford repeatedly comes to this point: ‘a dam’ and Adam, mother and son, were altered. A dam: *n.2* = dame, 2 ‘a female parent (of animals). Correlative of sire’, and/or Adam: ‘the first man’, lost their true names. Elizabeth Tudor was either secretly married to Thomas St Maur/Seymour after the death of Katherine Parr (*Sept. 5, 1548*), or should be considered to have been married under religious Canon Law. The writer conveys the message that he is not a bastard, but the marriage of his parents was erased or annulled as an element of Attainder. In *Hamlet*, KING CLAUDIUS (representing the Dudley Family, especially Robert) darkly hints at the mortal consequence to the QUEEN should she insist on the true identity of the child:

“The queen his mother / Lives almost by his looks ...” (*Hamlet IV.7 11-12*)

~ *The queen, his mother / Survives by his (altered) appearance ...* ~

- Again I’ll mention the key advice mentioned by Heminges and Condell in their preface to the *First Folio*: Inquire deeply into the words of ‘Shakespeare’ in order to discover them.

To the great Variety of Readers.

“for [Shakespeare’s] wit can no more lie hid, then it could be lost.

Read him, therefore; and again, and again: And if then you do not like him,

surely you are in some manifest danger, not to understand him.” (*see ? Where to place?*)

40 And wrought not to five-weeks when he came to five-score. (*Variorum 49*)

~ **And wrought** [(English) *wrought*: I ‘To act, do, function, etc.’, Ia ‘To do, perform (a task, deed, process, etc.)’; this word is often corrected in modern editions (E) *raught*: *past tense* (E) *reach*; it would be an error to believe it must be one or the other, as both contribute to the solution of the ‘to do(r) / Tudor riddle.] **not to five** [(L) *quini, quinum*: II *In gen.* ‘five’, *possible wordplay* (E) Queen E(lizabeth)] **weeks** [(L) *septum dies*; *alt.* *wp* (E) *weak*, (Latin) *debilis*, *wp* *surname de Veres*] **when he came** [(L) *accedo, accedere*: ‘to come to’, ‘to approach’] **to five-score** [*i.e.* “five score (weeks)”, hence 1 year, 11 months (approaching 2 years); *alt.* (E) *score*, (L) *viginti*: ‘twenty’, likely playing on (L) *summa*: ‘score, total, sum’]. ~

~ **And was not Tu-do(r) five weeks, when he approached two years.** ~

- The Bible tells us Adam lived 930 years (Genesis 5.5). Because of his great age we are inclined to guess HOLOFERNES speaks of ‘five-score’ years, but the discussion is of weeks. Hence, HOLOFERNES calculates (weakly) the lost weeks between 31 July, 1548, Oxford’s birth date according ‘Oxford-Seymour Theory’, and 12 April, 1550, as it is thought in Oxfordian Theory. Edward Tudor-Seymour was approaching two years of age when he was ‘born again’ as de Vere.

“Five” is repeated, and may be significant. Five, (L) *quini*, *wp* ~ queen E ~, may allude to the Queen as subject, both as chaste Diana, and Luna with a monthly cycle. This change suggests wordplay on “Adam”/~ a dam ~ that may intend a link between both the disappearance of her marriage (Tudor-Seymour) and the loss of one year and 9 months in Oxford’s age.

41 Th’ allusion holds in the Exchange. (*Variorum 50*)

~ **Th’ allusion** [(Latin) *th’ allusion*, *wordplay* (L) *thallus*, (Gr) *θαλλος*: ‘a green stalk, green bough’, ‘perhaps a myrtle bough’ (*Vergil*), (L) *myrtus, murtus*: ‘tree sacred to Venus’, and alluding to miraculous

birth of *Adonis* from *Myrrha* (*Murra*) who, in the myth of changed to a tree in Greek myth—hence, various plays on the Writer’s surname Maur and myths of illicit births by father figures changing to ‘green shoots’—(L) *viridi stipuli*; (L) *allusio*: ‘a playing or sporting with’, (E) *allusion*: *etym.* ‘a game, play on words’, I ‘An implied, indirect, or passing reference to a person or thing’ (OED)] **holds** [(L) *tenere*: ‘to hold, keep, have’, I. A2a ‘With the accessory idea of possession’, ‘to have sole possession of’, I. A2d ‘to hold back, hinder, restrain, check’, I. B Trop. ‘to hold, contain’, II. A1 ‘to hold a position’] **in the exchange** [(L) *conversio*: II Trop. ‘subversion, alteration, change’, *alt.* (L) *excambium* = *ex*: ‘out from the interior of something’ + *cambium*: ‘change’, ~ that which comes out from the change ~]. ~

~ ***Thallus’ scion takes possession in the con’Vere-scion.*** ~

~ ***Th’allus-ion is confirmed in the con’Vere-scion.*** ~

► Many contracted words—here, “Th’allusion” (*First Folio printing*)—indicate special significance. Each example should be examined for possible wordplay. By removing the apostrophe, we find (Latin) *thallus*: ‘a green stalk’ + *-ian*, *suffix*: ‘of or belonging to’, hence ~ of a Green Scion ~ (*i.e.* *Vere* heir), which we may guess to be the Writer by his false ‘de Vere’ name. The allusion does ‘indeed’ hold, or is upheld, in the physical exchange of a Vere heir for a Tudor-Seymour heir by way of criminal “*collusion*” (*see next line, IV.2 42*). Further, the Greek myth of mortal Castor and divine Pollux—twins by mortal mother Leda, but of separate fathers—suggests the outcome of DULL’s clumsy but effective artifice. A successful theft by Dudley is a continuing loss for Oxford.

► As we know, “The play’s the thing / Wherein I’ll catch the conscience of the king.” (*Hamlet II. 2 543*) — in the wordplay is the matter. Here the matter is played out in puns on the writer’s surnames. The mysterious ‘exchange’ of *Adam* for *Cain* appears to be an equivalency and a rare reference to the name Shake-*speare* in the works of ‘Shakespeare’. *Cain*, (I.35), the son of the *Princeps* (*i.e.* first man) is replaced by *Adam*, (I.39), the ‘first man’, (L) *princeps*: ‘first in a hierarchy’. Queen Elizabeth, ~ a dam ~ and “Adam”, was Oxford’s Queen and ‘Prince’. He is Cain, son of “a dam” and the (L) *Princeps*.

Likewise, *Dictissima*: ~ Sey-more ~, is replaced by *Dictynna*: ‘the moon’—they are the same person, Elizabeth Tudor-Seymour and, by metonymy, ‘The Moon’. This would solve the questions by H. H. Furness concerning the meaning of “Exchange” in this use (*Variorum*, pp.141-42). Oxford / ‘Shakespeare’ is referring to a change of identities and forms.

The name Cain is derived from (Hebrew) *qyn*, *qayin*: ‘spear’. Another etymology finds (Hebrew) *kaniti*: ‘I bought’ as the root of Cain/Kain, and (H) *havel*: ‘empty, vain’ as the basis for Abel. The second origin would accord well with Oxford’s sense of his two principal identities; Cain, as Edward Tudor-Seymour, is the first-born and the *Cain*, or ~ *coin*: ‘means of exchange’ ~, Abel, as Edward de Vere, is the (L) *vanus*: ‘nothing’, ‘idle, null’, yet the (L) *amor* of *Venus*: ‘the beloved object’ of his mother’s heart. (“Cain and Abel”, Ancient Hebrew Research Center, J. A. Benner.)

DULL

42 ’Tis true indeed, the collusion holds in the Exchange. (Variorum 51-2)

~ **’Tis** [*wp* (English) *-ty*, *suffix*: ‘forming nouns denoting quality or condition’, hence (Latin) *verus*, (E) true, may form the noun Verity/Vere-ty.] **true** [(L) *verus*] **indeed** [(L) *vere*: ‘in truth, truly, in fact’, but perhaps ironically as (E) *indeed*: 2b ‘In adversative clause, emphasizing the real fact..in opposition to that which is false’ (OED)—(E) deed: 1a ‘That which is done, acted, or performed’ < (E) *done*: past participle v. *do*: ‘to do’, *wp* To-do(r).], **the collusion** [(L) *collusio*: ‘a secret, deceptive understanding’ (Lewis & Short), (L) *collusion*: 1a ‘a playing together, or into each other’s hands’ (OED); *additional wordplay* (L) *collus*, *collum*: ‘neck’, likely a shy glance at ‘headless states’.] **holds** [(L) *teneo*, *tenere*: ‘to hold, keep, have’, I. A2a ‘With the accessory idea of possession’, ‘to have sole possession of’, I. A2d ‘to hold back, hinder, restrain, check’, I. B Trop. ‘to hold, contain’, II. A1 ‘to hold a position, maintain oneself’] **in the Exchange** [(L) *conversio*: Trop. ‘subversion, alteration, change’; (L) *conversio* = *wp* ‘with a twist’]. ~

~ ***A To-do[r] Verity, the deception holds in the conVere-sion.*** ~

Allusion ► “Exchange” is simple conversion from one name to another — Tudor-Seymour to de Vere. William J. Courthorpe (1842-1917) notes:

“I am not aware that the blunders in language had been made the subject of ridicule on any stage before Dull and Costard started a tradition which was continued in English comedy, through Bottom and Dogberry, down to Mrs. Malaprop. Shakespeare, however, was under some obligation to a predecessor. (*Variorum, Love’s Labour’s Lost* p.142. l.51)

Courthorpe gives the example of faulty syllogisms by the Master Constable and two Watchmen in Lyly’s *Endimion* IV. ii 83-115, as being a similar device:

2ND WATCHMAN

94 If I say to my wife, wife I will have no Reysons in my
pudding, she puts in Corance, small Reysons are Reysons, and boys **boys**, (L) *bos*: ‘ox’
 96 are men. Even as my wife should have put no Reysons in my
pudding, so shall there no boys see *Endimion*. **pudding**, (L) *placenta*: ‘pancake, pudding’

Rhetoric In fact, the two devices are identical when atypical spellings, capitalization, and playful logic, are combined in a mix. The writer puns on Middle English orthographies of raisins and currants, developing from (*French, before 16th c.*) *raisins de Corinthe*, evolving to (ME) raysons of Coraunte or reysyns of Corance. Separately, “Reysons” plays on (*Spanish-English*) ‘Rey’s son’, or ~ King’s son ~ (l.95), and “Corance” plays on (*Latin*) ~ *corons* ~ or ‘crowns’; both of which are within the range of foolish ‘Shakespeare’. Wife (l.94) in the context of this allegory is (*OED*) 2 ‘the female head of a household’, not 4 ‘a female partner in a marriage’ as we might imagine today. It is marked for careful consideration by repetition. A similar distinction is made with husband in *Othello* (V.2 137-56), also emphasized by repetition.

A little further we find Oxford’s game and subject again—“men” as (L) *vir* / *virum* = *wp* Vere, and “fools” as (L) *moriae*: *wp*, *surname* Maur, St Maur, Seymours:

MASTER CONSTABLE

Then say I, neighbors, that children must not see **children**, (L) *liberi*, *wp* le Vere
 108 *Endimion*, because children & fools speak true. **fool**, (L) *moria*: *surname* Maur

What is the 2ND WATCHMAN’s point? If we assume that a watchman is akin to a guard, we might guess that this particular ‘watchman’ represents the wardship of either Wm Cecil, Robert Dudley, or some related individual. Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ is the *placenta*—the “pudding”. If a WATCHMAN demands there be no ‘King’s son’ in the *placenta*, but the Wife (Queen Elizabeth) slyly slips ‘small Rey’s Sons’ into the ‘Crown’—say a ‘boy’ or (L) *bos*: ‘an ox’—has she not violated a rule? and will the result be the same? for both the ‘Vere’ (*liberi*) and the ‘Maur’ (*moria*) will speak the truth. Similar wordplay appears in *As You Like It* 1.2 61-5., and Jonson’s *Every Man Out of his Humour*.

► Is there enough difference in the subject and technique of ‘John Lyly’ and ‘Shakespeare’ to justify separating the two Authors? ‘Lyly’, I think, is simply an earlier allonym of the same writer.

► DULL (ME Dulle)—Dudley—is a (E) collusioner, (*Latin*) *collusor*: ‘He who has a secret understanding with one to the injury of a third’. DULL seems straightforward, but stern and a little dull—there’s something sinister in the matter-of-fact corrections he makes to HOLOFERNES’ words. HOLOFERNES / Thomas Seymour was dead by 1550, and would be unaware of Dudley collusion with William Cecil, and perhaps Princess Elizabeth, in wounding the writer’s identity:

“O, good Horatio, what a wounded name, **good**: (L) *merces* / Se-mer (*epitheton*)
 (Things standing thus unknown) shall I leave behind me.” **wound**, (L) *vulnus*, *wp*? sun-luv
 (*Hamlet* V.2. 327-28)

HOLOFERNES

43, 44 God comfort thy capacity, I say th’ allusion holds in the Exchange. (*Variorum* 53-4)

~ **God** [(L) *deus*: II *Transf.* ‘of highly distinguished or fortunate persons’, *wp* (Tu)-**Dos** as highly distinguished persons.] **comfort** [(L) *consolo*: ‘to comfort’, *wp* (L) *con*: ‘with, together with’ + *sol*: ‘sun’] **thy capacity** [(Latin) *capacitatem* < *capax*: II *Trop.* ‘capable, that can keep or conceal secrets’, II. B ‘that has a right to an inheritance’ ... but an inheritance that is not his own?], **I say** [(Latin) *dico*] **th’ allusion** [2 ‘a metaphor, a parable, an allegory’, 3 ‘a play on words, a pun’] **holds in the Exchange** [(L) *conversio*: II *Trop.* ‘subversion, alteration, change’; at our pleasure we may read *conVere-scion*, (English) *scion*: ‘A descendant, esp. one belonging to a wealthy or noble family.’.] ~

~ *d’Ors Sons keep y’Our secrets, I say the pun holds in the conVere-scion.* ~

DULL

45 And I say the polusion holds in the Exchange: (F1) (Variorum 55)

~ **And I say** [(L) *dico*: ‘I declare’, as a peremptory statement.] **the polusion** [(E) pollution, 16th C. *form*: (E) polusion: 3a ‘Spiritual or moral impurity or corruption’, hence (E) marring, ‘to be marred’, < (E) mar: 2 ‘to destroy or impair the quality of an object’, 4c ‘to corrupt’ (OED), (Latin) *colluvio*: II *Trop.* ‘the impure conflux of different objects, impure mixture’; *wp* Polluxion, referring to the *Dioscuri*—*Castor and Pollux*.] **holds** [(L) *teneo, tenere*: ‘to hold, keep, have’, I. A2a ‘With the accessory idea of possession’] **in the Exchange** [(L) *conversio*: II *Trop.* ‘subversion, alteration, change’, see ll.41-2.]: ~

~ **And I Say the Mar holds in the conVere-scion:** ~

~ *And I say the Polluxion holds in the conVere-scion:* ~

~ *And I say the gemination holds in the conVere-scion:* ~

► In a tragic vein, GRATIANO, a noble Venetian, comments at the close of *Othello, The Moor of Venice*:

“All that is spoke is marr’d.” (*Othello* V.2 358) = ~ All that is Say’d is Marr’d. ~

And so we find. DULL is emphatic that pollution has marred Adam/’a Dam’, who is now ‘no Maur’.

Allusion ► I suggest this alludes to the Classical Myth of *Pollux* (polusion/polluxion) and *Castor*, twin half-brothers conceived by Leda from different fathers. *Pollux* was by *Zeus*, while *Castor* was by king Tyndareus of Sparta. They were inseparable in life (as were Tudor-Seymour and ‘de Vere’, since they are as two names inhabiting one body) and inseparable in death. *Zeus* immortalized both boys as emblems of friendship in the twin stars of the constellation *Gemini* (twins); their lives were thenceforth a shared existence with each ‘living’ on alternate days.

Bio. DULL simply notes an allusion to the *Dioscuri* to the Tudor-Seymour form and the ‘de Vere’ form of the Artist. Compare the death of OTHELLO, *OTHELLO* V.2 338-56, in which the Moor reenacts the killing of “a malignant and turbaned **Turk**”—a historic nickname for Oxford—as he stabs himself to death. There are several connections between the *Dioscuri* and ‘Shakespeare’ protagonists, particularly those relatable to the Welsh hero *Brân* (‘raven, crow, chough’), of the 2nd branch of the *Mabinogi* (Welsh Myth). *Brân*’s father was King Llŷr who, as you may guess, is the same KING LEAR / Elizabeth Tudor whose child, CORDELIA/Oxford, is loving and faithful when other ‘daughters’ (GONERIL/W. Cecil and REGAN/R. Dudley?) are not.

The myth of the *Dioscuri* is represented in several ancient traditions, particularly the Vedic (Indus Valley), the Baltic, and Greco-Roman, as understood by reconstructions in comparative mythography. The *Dioscuri* are:

“the star-crowned, twin gods of St Elmo’s fire, an electrical discharge that appears in the rigging of ships, portending the deliverance from storms. They were also the gods of horsemanship and protectors of guests and travelers”. — see Dioskouroi (theoi.com)

► ARIEL appears as the spirit of these twins in *The Tempest* (I.ii 196-206), delivering sailors—Seamen—from peril. By way of classical allusion, the writer is the definition of Seaman/Sey-man. This represents another element of the Artist’s own figurative genealogy from mythic parents. Out

an historic nickname for Lord Burghley (see also Asquith, Claire; *Shadowplay*, p. 299, 2005). Hence, I suggest *The Tempest* refers to the “Winter and rough weather” (*As You Like It* II.5 40) — (Fr) *Hyver and Béliér ebouiffé*: (E) ~ E.Ver and Boar-ified Ram ~ , as an effect of Cecil upon the Crown Tudor family—(L) *extemporalis*: ~ Out of Cecil ~ or ~ As a result of Cecil ~ .

49 Epitaph on the death of the Dear, and to humor (Variorum 59)

~ **Epitaph** [(L) *epitaphium*: a ‘An inscription upon a tomb’, ‘a brief composition characterizing a deceased person’; alt. (E) summary < (L) *summarium*: ‘a summary, epitome, abstract’. Edward Capell (1713-81) noted that an epitaph records something of the life of a deceased person, not of their death; I believe Oxford’s use of the word is correct.] **on the death** [(Latin) *mors*, *wp*, *surname* Maurs, Seymours] **of the Dear** [(E) deer, (ME) *deor*: *wp*, *surname* (Tu’)d’Or; note below, 1.49, dear is repeated for Two-d’or.], **and to humor** [(L) *morem gerere*, *morigerari*: ‘to comply with, gratify, humor, endeavor to please’, (E) *morigerate*: ‘to be obedient or compliant’, *wp* (L) *mori*: *surname* More + *gerere*: II Trop. ‘to bear, deport, conduct one’s self’] ~

~ *Epitaph on the Maur of the De’Or, and to Maur-de’port* ~

~ *Summa’ry on the Mort of the De’Or, and to bear hu’Mor* ~

50 the ignorant call I the Dear the Princess kill’d, a Pricket. (Variorum 60-1)

~ **the ignorant** [(Latin) *ignarus*, *inscius*: ‘not knowing’, II ‘unknown’] **call I the Dear** [(E) deer, (Mid. E) *deor*: *wp*, *surname* (Tu’)d’Or] **the Princess kill’d** [(L) *conficio*: ‘to sweep away, kill, wear out, consume’ — as the Princess Elizabeth did not kill, but attempted to ‘wear out’/~ Vere out ~], **a Pricket** [(English) pricket: 2a ‘A male deer in its second year’]. ~

~ *the unknowing call I the De’Or the Princess did vVere out, a Pricket.* ~

NATHANIEL

51 *Perge*, good Master Holofernes, *perge*, so it shall (Variorum 62)

~ **Perge** [(Latin) *pergo*: ‘to go on, continue, proceed’, hence, ‘more’; alt. *wp*, *place name Pergameus*: ‘Trojan’, II *Transf.* ‘Roman (on account of the descent of Romans from the Trojans)’, thus ~ Romanize, Latinize ~], **good** [(L) *merx*, *merces*: ‘goods, wares, commodities, merchandise’, *wp*, *anagram* (Latin) *merces*/scemer; alt. (E) ware = *surname* Vere] **Master** [(L) *magister*: I ‘a master, superior, leader, commander’, (L) *adv. magis*, *v. magnus*: ‘great, grand, mighty’, epithet for Admiral Thomas St Maur/ (Welsh) *mawr*: ‘great’] **Holofernes**, **perge** [above, 1.51], **so** [(Welsh) *mor*: ‘so’, *wp* (French) *St*, *saint* and (Welsh) *môr*: ‘sea’; alt. (Latin) *modo*:] **it shall** [(English) shall: I ‘An utterance of the word ‘shall’; a command.. or determination’ (OED)] ~

~ *More, man! good Master Holofernes, More, man! so it shall* ~

~ *A Roman, good Master Holofernes, a Roman, so it shall* ~

► I think it likely that (Latin) *Perge* refers most particularly to the use of Latin as the writer’s base language. The success of Oxford’s playful polysemy depends on some knowledge of the literal and tropical use of words as found in Latin, and it’s fair to give readers warning of the scheme. Only a few readers need notice Oxford’s Method, and pass the idea to others.

52 please you to abrogate scurrility. (Variorum 63)

~ **please you to abrogate** [(Latin) *abrogare*: II Trop. ‘to take away, to deprive of’, ‘to repeal entirely’] **scurrility** [*wp* (English) squirrel-ity: referring to small rodents, (L) *sciurus*, *scurellius*, *scurellus*: ‘from (Greek) *skiouros*: ‘shade tail’, with jest on the ‘shady tail’ of Vere heritability — the entailment of the de Vere earldom to Seymour; hence, to reveal the truth about a limitation or destination of the Oxford inheritance.]. ~

~ *please you to annul squirrel-ity.* ~

~ *please you to remove obscure tails.* ~

Rhetoric ► Make your own judgement on the depth and quality of Oxford's knowledge of words.

Bio. NATHANIEL makes no ordinary pun on "scurrility" / ~ squirrel-ity ~ ; it strikes to the heart of the writer's life, and that of his 'Godfather', John de Vere. The word "scurrility" captures (E) squirrel, out of Greek etymons, to (*Latin*) *scurellius, scuriolus*: 'shady tail', hinting at the dense, shadowy, hair of the tail of many squirrel species, and the obscure entailment of Earl Johns estate to the "Region Kites" (*Hamlet II.2 518*)—Regency Raptors, Regen-Sea thieves—*i.e.* Protector Somerset (a Pi'Rat, *i.e.* 'pirate'), Lord President Northumberland, Leicester, and Burghley.

Allusion to the cloudy, shadowy, maneuvers of Northumberland, his son Leicester, and other Dudleys, is manifest in the character of CLAUDIUS (see *Hamlet*)—a smooth-talking, thieving, murdering, usurper. CLAUDIUS = 'cludy', dudle, dudley. 'Cloud' represents the obscurity, the "umbrage", (*L umbra*: 'shadow', in Northumberland. While Leicester (Robert Dudley) was content to manage and pull profit from significant chunks of Queen Elizabeth's England, his father Northumberland wanted direct Regency control of Edward VI. He wanted it All.

Here, NATHANIEL (John de Vere) appeals to HOLOFERNES (Thomas Seymour) to help end the obscure entailment of his Earldom by Suffolk-Grey-Dudley forces—to "abrogate scurrility", to ~ *remove squirrel-ity* ~ . He wishes to repeal entirely a shady tail, so to speak.

HOLOFERNES

53 I will something affect the letter, for it argues facility. ~ (*Variorum 64-5*)

~ **I will** [*metonym (Latin) more: n.5 1* 'in accordance with the customs or traditions of the country or people (here, a person) specified', 'manner, way usage practice, determined by self-will, humor'] **something** [(*L aliquid: wp ~ a liquid ~ — (L) liquidus: 'fluid, liquid', (L) liquidus moles: 'the Sea', wp Sea-More, surname Seymour, St Maur.*] **affect** [(*L affectio: I* 'The relation to or disposition toward a thing produced in a person by some influence'; *alt. (L) amare: 'to love, to like']* **the letter** [(*L littera: I* 'a written sign or mark'; *II. AI Transf. 'a word, line']*), **for it argues** [(*L arguere: 'to make clear, prove, assert'; wp (L) disputare: dis: II. A* 'in pieces, apart, in two, in different directions' + *puto: II Trop. 'to arrange, settle' — hence ~ dis-arrange ~.*] **facility** [(*L) facilitas: 'ease, facility in doing (L) facere, (Fr) faire: 'to do'*) anything', 'fluency of expression', (English) facility: *3a* 'In action, speech, etc.: ease, freedom; aptitude, dexterity, a talent']. ~

~ *I, more Sea-More, amor the lines for it proves ap 'Tu-do(r). ~*

~ *I, Will Sea-More, relate the words, for it dis-eases fluency. ~*

Can one tell the world how two English Princesses killed Déor claimants to the throne, without losing one's head? Yes! In a brilliant, enigmatic song, of course.

Another enigmatic song tells where the Pricket was laid —

He was buried alive in Green Sleeves ...

~ A'Maur, you Do me wrong. ~

► The following poem is classic. Among the many examples of 'counsel' provided by the Artist to the reader, this may be the most important set-piece. The story plays at etiology, (*L aetiologia*, the causes, reasons, and origins, of the writer's mysterious identity. Most words are at play, but the keywords and key players are these (*OED*):

Or, or, from (*French*) *or*, (*Latin*) *Orum*: 'gold'; when close coupled denote Tud'Or, Tudor.

morel: *adj. and n.1* 'A dark (or black)-colored horse'; also used as a proper name for a horse of this kind. The writer is the Tudor-St Maur 'morel', (*L morellus*).

pricket: *2a* 'A male deer in its second year, having straight, unbranched antlers'.

Sore: *adj.2* 'Of a horse: Of a reddish brown color; *cf.* sorrel; (*Med. Latin*) *saurus*.'

Sore: *n.2* 'A buck (deer) in its fourth year'.

sore: *n.1 2* 'a disease, ailment, or bodily affliction'; *3* 'a bodily injury; a wound'.

Sorrel: *B.1 a* ‘A horse of a bright chestnut or reddish brown color; also as the name of a horse’.

Sorrel: 2 ‘A buck (deer) in its third year’.

ell: (Middle English) el, ell, elle- (in compounds) = alternate forms of else, (*L*) *alius*; (E) ell:

‘measure’, (E) measure: *7b* ‘A unit or denomination of measurement’ — the denomination appears to be the ell, measure /*anagram* Seamure: specifically fifty, the Roman numeral ‘L’.

The following ditty begins with alliteration. The first recurring (and therefore ‘affected’) letter is P, with seven repetitions (*l.56*). S follows with five repetitions (*l.57*). L may be counted six times, and is played as both a letter and the Roman numeral for the Arabic 50. But the phoneme or or ore is repeated sixteen times, and I believe this is the sound to which the writer is truly affected. Ore is the common and ‘golden’—(*L*) *orum*, (*Fr*) *or*—sound of Tud’or and More. (*L*) *littera*: ‘a written sign or mark signifying a sound’, “argues facility”, ~ *proves ap[t]’Tu do(r)* ~ as suggested in line 53. Such a proliferation of Sores and sores, ors and mores, sorels and more “L”s, is a significant rhetorical event.

Our writer produced a hundred or more aliases according to his own estimation. In *1 Henry IV II.4 154*, FALSTAFF notes “A hundred upon poor four of us!”—he refers to false identities that bedevil poor ‘JACK’, and compete by the hundred against him. It would have been better for the Suffolk-Tudors to deal honestly with one Tudor ‘Pricket’, than have to *ferret out*, (*L*) *rimari*, *rimor*: *I* ‘grub out’, *II* ‘search, explore’, scores of false scents left behind by a master of disguise.

► We learn in *Sonnets 135* and *136* the importance of the name Will. This undoubtedly refers to the writer’s surname More, St Maur, as derived from (*Latin*) *mos*, *moris*, *more*: ‘the self-will’. The appearance of a series of sexual puns based on ‘will’ is surely a clever stratagem to throw censors off the scent of political matters.

54 The prayfull Princess pierced and pricked (Variorum 66)

~ **The prayfull** [(English) preylful: ‘Given to or characterized by preying; predatory, rapacious’; (*L*) *praedatorius*, *praedabundas* = *praeda*: 1 ‘property taken in war, plunder’ + *abundans*: ‘overflowing’—hence, ~ having great store of seized property ~; *alt.* (*Latin*) *fera*, *ferus*: *B1* ‘wild, untamed’, ‘a wild animal, a lion, a horse, a stag’; *wp*, *metonym* (E) Fair, fare, (*French*) *faire*: to do(r), Tudor + (E) full: *1c* ‘pregnant’] **Princess** [(*Latin*) *mulier regii generis, filia regis*: ~ king’s daughter ~] **pierced** [(*L*) *transfigere*: ‘to thrust or pierce through’, *wp*, *pun* (*L*) *transfiguro*: ‘to transform, transfigure, metamorphose’; *alt.* *aphetic* (*L*) *aperio*: ‘to uncover, to lay bare’, with additional pun (*L*) *aper*: ‘wild boar’] **and pricked** [(*L*) *pungere*: *II Trop.* ‘sting, grieve, trouble, afflict’] ~

~ **The full-Fair Princess transfigured and troubled** ~

Rhetoric ► H. H. Furness comments on *l.66* (*Variorum, Love’s Labour’s Lost*): “As an illustration of the lawless spelling of Shakespeare’s compositors ...” — Yes, there are many irregularities. Here he cites two spellings of **pierced**: ‘pearst’ (*l.66*) and ‘perst’ (*l.99*). Nevertheless, more often than not, clever wordplay lies hidden in inconsistent or aberrant spelling. The idea of a ‘de Vere’ wild boar, (*L*) *aper*, appearing, (*L*) *aperio*, from transfiguration is apt. Readers should emphasize the writer’s playful message because—Once More—“The play’s the thing” (*Hamlet II.2 543*).

a pretty pleasing Pricket; (Variorum 67)

~ **a pretty** [(*Latin*) *bellus*: ‘pretty, handsome, lovely, pleasant, agreeable’, (E) lovely: *adj.* *1b* ‘amorous’, *II. B* ‘For (*L*) *bonus*: ‘good’, *epithet* (*L*) *merces*; likely playing on (*L*) *bellum*: *II* ‘War’, *II. B5* ‘Personified as god of war (= Janus)’; in myth, Janus was the god beginnings and transitions, of doors and gates’, ‘of the transition from war to peace’—Mars, god of war, is also the tutelary god of the (St) Maurus.] **pleasing** [(*L*) *gratus*: ‘beloved, dear, pleasing’] **Pricket** [(E) *2a* ‘A male deer in its second year’], ~

~ **an a’Morous Two-year Déore**; ~

~ **a Venus’t, a’ Mor-ous Pricket**; ~

55 Some say a Sore, but not a sore, (Variorum 68)

~ **Some** [*wp, timesis, surname* St Mau(r)] **say** [*wp* (E) say — (E) sea, (ME) sæ] a **Sore** [(E) sore: *adj.* 2 ‘Of a horse: of a reddish-brown color’, (Middle English) *orse*: ‘A solid-hoofed perissodactyl quadruped (*Equus*)’, a familiar animal of Tu-d’Ors; ‘a familiar spirit’ — 3 ‘A spirit, often taking the form of an animal’; *alt.* (E) sore: *n.2* 1 ‘A buck in its fourth year’], **but not a sore** [(E) sore: *n.2* *hunting* 1 ‘A buck in its fourth year’; both (ME) *orse*, and (E) *deor* / *deer* / *dear* are frequent metonyms for (Tu)*dors*; *wp* (*Latin*) *uxor*: ‘a wife’, *wp* *uxor*/a sore.], ~

~ **Somme’ say a Sore, but not a’Mor;** ~

~ **Somme’ say a Sore, but not a sorrow;** ~

Rhetoric ► The “sore” spoken of is the Deor’s (Tu-d’Ors) ‘injured state’—their “saucy bark” (*Sonnet* 80), (*L*) *saucius*: ‘wounded’ + (*L*) *ratīs*: ‘a bark, boat’, *worplay* (*L*) *rattus*: ‘rat, mouse, ermine’ — their ‘wounded ship’, their ‘enfeebled *Muris* (~ *Simur* ~)’. The writer, who is himself ‘the wound’ (at least in the eyes of the Queen), argues that he is the innocent offspring of self-wounding parents. This idea may have come to Oxford by way of Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura* (p.359 *Loeb*) in which **amor** (love) is an *ulcus* (a sore) by Venus’ child Amor. Oxford characterizes himself as *Cupid* (*Amor*), “The little Love-god”, elsewhere in ‘Shakespeare’ (see *Sonnet* 154).

till now made sore with shooting.

(*Variorum* 69)

~ **till now** [(*L*) *hactenus*] **made** [(*L*) *facere*, (*It*) *fare*, (*Fr*) *faire*, *wp* (E) *fare*: *v.2* ‘Of a sow: to litter’ (born in a litter of swine)—refers to the ‘Blue Boar’, emblem of the Earls of Oxford.] **sore** [(E) sore: *n.1* 2 ‘Sickness, disease..an ailment, or bodily affliction’] **with shooting** [(E) shooting, (E) **springing**: *adj. 1a* ‘Of a plant, vegetation; sprouting, growing’—this alludes to the conversion to *surname Vere/ver*: ‘the spring’, not (E) shooting: *n. 1c* ‘The sport of killing game with the gun’ (wrong context)]. ~

~ **till now ill-littered with Vere-ing.** ~

56 The Dogs did yell. Put ell to Sore,

(*Variorum* 70)

~ **The Dogs** [(*L*) *canis*: 1 ‘a dog’, *wp* (*L*) *canus*: ‘white, hoary’, likely referring to the white rose of York (see Wars of the Roses), *I. B* ‘gray hairs’, *i.e.* ~ having gray heirs ~, hence ‘Greeks’, *wp* (*Latin*) *Graii*, *Grai*: ‘the Greeks’; the Grey-Tudors (Suffolk Tudors), opposed the Crown Tudors, attempted to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne upon the death of Edward VI.] **did** [*past part.* (E) do] **yell** [(*L*) *ululare*: *II* ‘to cry or howl out to any one’, (E) yell: 3 ‘Of a person: to utter a loud strident cry..to attract attention’, 1 ‘Of an animal: to utter a loud cry’—the “Dogs”/*Canis/Canus*/Greys are persons characterized as “cut-throat dogs” (*The Merchant of Venice* *I.3* 108).], **put ell** [(Middle English) *el*, *ell*, *elle-* (in compounds) = alternate forms of else; *alt.* (E) *ell*: *1a* ‘A measure of length’, *wp*, (E) measure, *anagram, metonym* ~ *Seamure* ~, *St Maur*, *Seymour*.] **to Sore** [(E) sore: *hunting* *n.2* 1 ‘A buck in its fourth year’; *alt.* (E) sore: *v.2* ‘Of the hare: to traverse open ground’; the hare /*wp* *heir* in flight across open ground, crosses and doubles to evade the hunter.], ~

~ **The Greys did howl: put alias to Sore,** ~

then sorrel jumps from thicket —

(*Variorum* 71)

~ **then Sorrel** [(E) sorrel: *adj. and n.2* ‘A buck in its third year’; (*Latin*) *sorellus*, (E) sorrel: *1a* ‘Of horses’ (*1b* ‘Of hair or persons’) ‘Of a bright chestnut color; reddish-brown’—likely refers to the Red Horse of the Crown Tudors—the Lancaster (red rose) of the line from Henry VIII; opposed to the White Horse (white rose) of the Suffolk Grey-Dudleys.] **jumps** [(*L*) *orior*: *II* *Transf.* ‘to come forth, to have one’s origin or descent, descend from, to grow or spring forth’; *wp* (*Latin*) *orior*, ~ two-d’Or ~, *Tudor*.] **from thicket** [(*L*) *dumetum*: *I* ‘a thicket, brake’, *II* *Trop.* ~ a thicket or tangle of words in which a subject is approached ‘creepingly’ ~]: ~

~ **then Red-heir Springs from tangle —** ~

Bio. ► I suggest the ‘sorrel’ color denotes likely descent from Tudors of Henry VIII. The Seymours, Edward (1500-52), and Thomas (c. 1508-49), appear in portraits to have had reddish hair. There

are no portraits known to me showing Jane Seymour's (1508-37) hair color, though it is said to have been blond. Alternately, a 'Red-heir' describes an heir of Lancaster, opposed to a 'White heir' of York.

57 Or Pricket sore, or else sorell,

(*Variorum* 72) ~ **Or** [(L) *orum, aurum, (Fr) or*: 'gold', wordplay again with Two-d'or, Tudor; note *anaphora*: 'The repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of successive clauses' as a device of emphasis; likewise (L) *aut ... aut*, (E) either ... or (i.e. definitely one of two things, and not both)', and (L) *vel ... vel*, (English) or ... or.] **Pricket** [(E) 2a 'A male deer in its second year'] **sore** [(E) sore: *n.1 6* 'Mental suffering, pain, trouble; grief, sorrow'], **or** [*as before, (L) orum, aurum, (French) or*: 'gold', wordplay again with Two-d'or, Tudor] **else** [(L) *alius: II. A* 'the other'] **Sorell** [(E) sorrel: *1a* 'Of horses' (*1b* 'Of hair or persons') 'Of a bright chestnut color; reddish-brown'—likely refers to the Red Horse (orse-Rose) of the Crown Tudors; (E) sorrel: *1c* 'a buck in its third year'], ~

~ **Two-d'Or sore, or Sorell else**, ~

~ (Tu)d'Or grief, second-year Deor, Otherwise (Tu)d'Or red-head, ~

Rhetoric ► *Anaphora*, shown here as the repetition of "Or" in successive clauses, suggests that among two-de'Ors (Tudors) an *alius* may be involved; the two are similar, but the Pricket represents a political wound—a "sore"—to the Princess.

Bio. ► Rather than specific dating, the author appears to refer to the indefinite age of the deer. As we see, it may be said to be two, three, or four years old—a Pricket, a Sorrel, or a Sore—an interval of nearly two years. The poor Pricket is nonetheless a "sore" or grief.

The people fall a hooting.

(*Variorum* 73)

~ **The people** [(L) *homines*: 'men'; *alt. (L) mortales*: 'people'] **fall** [(L) *cadere: I* 'to go down, sink, fall', *II E Trop.* 'To fall, to become less (in strength, power, worth), to diminish, lessen'; (E) to fall to: 'To begin doing something'] **a hooting** [(L) *vociferatio*: 'a loud calling, clamoring; (E) 2a 'To assail with shouts or sounds of disapproval, contempt, or derision', (E) *1a* 'a shout, outcry', 2 'a shout of disapprobation or obloquy (calumny, slander)'; (E) hoot, meaning 'laughter' is a 20th C. development]. ~

~ **The people start to slander**. ~

Bio. ► Princess Elizabeth was alarmed when advised of rumors she was 'with child' by the Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour. She wrote to the Admiral's brother, Protector Edward Seymour, asking for a proclamation against those who slandered her by repeating such rumors. Recently, four letters to Seymour addressing this issue, dated between 28 Jan. and 7 March, 1549, were rediscovered by researchers in England.

While it may seem speculative that Princess Elizabeth produced a child, it is less speculative than that she did not. Only by assuming this to be the case can we unlock the mystery of the Shakespeare's content. Investigators at the time, headed by Protector Somerset and the Privy Council, including Somerset's secretary Sir Thomas Smith, directed Sir Robert Tyrwhitt to interrogate the young Elizabeth. Tyrwhitt was unable to get a confession, even by lying to her that governess Kat Ashley and agent Thomas Parry had revealed her guilt. Sir Robert concluded in frustration: "For I do assure your grace (Somerset), she hath a good wit, and nothing is to be gotten from her but by great policy." **policy**: 3 (*attested 1406*) 'contrivance, an expedient; a stratagem, a trick'. — (see: Bryson, A & Evans, M 2017, 'Seven rediscovered letters of Princess Elizabeth Tudor', *Historical Research*, vol. 90, no. 250, pp. 829–858. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12197>) (Starkey, David. *The Struggle for the Throne*; p.73.4)

58 If Sore be sore, then ell to Sore,

(*Variorum* 74)

~ **If** [(Latin) *si, wp, timesis, surname* Sey(mour); here is a strong hint that 'sore' = (L) *ulcus: II Trop. (amor)* = a More, St Maur, as a mental wound.] **Sore** [(E) sore: *hunting n.2 1* 'A buck in its fourth year'] **be sore** [(E) sore: *n.1 2* 'Sickness, disease..an ailment, or bodily affliction'], **then ell** [(Middle English) el, ell,

elle- (in compounds) = alternate forms of else, (*L*) *alius*; (E) ell: ‘measure’, (E) measure: 7b ‘A unit or denomination of measurement’ — the denomination appears to be the ell, the measure /anagram Seamure: specifically fifty, the Roman numeral ‘L’.] **to Sore** [(E) sore: *adj & n.2* ‘Of a horse: Of a reddish-brown color’; *alt. hunting n.2 1* ‘A buck in its fourth year’], ~

~ **If (H)Orse be sore, add alias to Sore**, ~

~ **If red (H)Orse be sorrow, add L to (H)Orse**, ~

~ **If reddish Tud’Orse be sorrow, add alias to d’Orse**, ~

makes fifty sores O sorell:

(*Variorum 75*)

~ **makes** [(*L*) *facere*: *I. B2* ‘to make’] **fifty** [(*L*) *quingenta*] **sores** [*wp (L) sory, soreos* < (*Greek*) *σῶρον*: ‘ink stone’, produces an ink — black, green, blue; *alt. (L) ulcus*: ‘sore’, ‘a delicate subject’]

O [Often represents O(xford) as a false name or alias.] **sorell** [(*L*) *spadix*: *I* ‘sorrel’, *wp (Latin) spado*: ‘one who has no generative power’, *I. B* ‘a castrated person, a eunuch’, (English) *spado*: ‘a eunuch; a castrated person’; *alt. (L) rumex: anagram Murex* — ~ Semur ~]: ~

~ **makes fifty inky sorrows**: ~

~ **makes fifty eunuch sore-O’s**: ~

► If Oxford intended (E) *sory*, (*L*) *sory*, he may mean these multiplying sorrows/sorrels, ~ ink sorrows ~, are inky *personas* that plague the monarch and her ministers.

► In *Venus and Adonis*, the writer appears to digress at length on the cunning habits of hares (‘heirs’) to evade capture by predators. This is not a digression; rather, it tells of Oxford’s general strategy to avoid detection by revealing his autobiographical matter under many false names (see *Introduction to Part II*, p.17.) Unfortunately, the “thousand doubles” mentioned there—aliases, allonyms, and pseudonyms—have no force to do what is most important to him—to properly name an heir to the Tudor Crown. Only by his true name can that be achieved. What the many *noms de plume* can do is raise the subject again and again. These are gentle reminders to Elizabeth R (Mom) that she should accept him as he ‘Morelly’ (morally) is (see 1.60).

59 Of one sore I an hundred make

(*Variorum 76*)

~ **Of one** [(*Latin*) *unus*; (*L*) *princeps*: ‘the first man, first person’] **sore** [(*L*) *ulcus*: ‘sore, an ulcer’, (*L*) *ulcus tangere*: ‘to touch upon a delicate subject’, *amor* (love), as a sore.] **I an hundred** [(*L*) *centum*: ‘a hundred’, *II* ‘An indefinite large number’; *allusion centum viri*: ~ one-hundred men ~, ‘a college..of judges chosen annually for civil suits, esp. those relating to inheritance’] **make** [(*L*) *facere*: ‘to do, make’]. ~

~ **Of one sore I a hundred Do.** ~

~ **Of Princely sore I a hundred make.** ~

60 by adding but one more L.

(*Variorum 77*)

~ **by** [(*Latin*) *modo*, **adding** [(*L*) *addo*, *addere*: *II. A* ‘To add to by way of increase, to augment’] **but** [(*L*) *modo*: *wp timesis, surname Mo + Do* /anagram Do-Mo = to do(r) + Moe (more)], *alt. tantum solum*] **one** [(*L*) *unus*; (*L*) *princeps*: ‘the first man, first person’] **more L** [(*Latin*) *morus, maurus*, (E) morell: ‘Of a horse, dark in color’; *etym. (Old Fr) morel*: ‘Of a horse: dark brown or black’, < this is our Oxford/‘Shakespeare’, a (h)Orse *Maurus* = (Tud’)orse Maur; Oxford has written the Roman numeral ‘L’ to represent 50, and avoided spelling the word Mor-ell, which would give away part of the riddle; finally, the spelling of L as ell hints at else, (*L*) *alius*: ‘another, other’]. ~

~ **by adding but One Maur ell.** ~

~ **by adding but one More L.** ~

► This Morell is the ultimate ‘Dark (H)Orse’. Out of ‘thin heir’, an unknown ‘tenuous heir’ is instantly at the front of the field.

► The idea of adding one name that causes ‘other’ identities to multiply is likely a restatement

of the theme found at *1 Henry IV II.4 150-271*, in which FALSTAFF figuratively fights off volumes of ‘men’—unbound or bound (in buckram of “Kendall green”)—all to avoid detection by the spies of Francis Walsingham (1532-90). We ask: Who started the rumor of multiple authors writing ‘Shakespeare’? Certainly Oxford himself. It’s was a ruse to avoid being racked (with pain!).

Once More, just HOLOFERNES’ apparent doggerel:

- 53 ~ *I more Sea-More dispose the lines, for it dis-eases.* ~
 54 ~ *The full-Fair Princess transfigured and troubled* ~
 ~ *an a’Morous Two-year Deor;* ~
 55 ~ *Somme’ say a Sore, but not a’More;* ~
 ~ *till now with ill-littered Vere-ing.* ~
 56 ~ *The Greys did howl: put alias to Sore,* ~
 ~ *then Red-heir Springs from tangle —* ~
 57 ~ *Two-d’Or sore, or Sorell else,* ~
 ~ *The people start to slander.* ~
 58 ~ *If Orse be sore, add ell to Sore,* ~
 ~ *makes fifty inky sorrows:* ~
 59 ~ *Of Princely sore I a hundred Do.* ~
 ~ *by adding but One Maur ell.* ~

Let me now try to repeal another ‘squirrelity’—another ‘shady tail’, or obscure limitation of heritability—with a ‘something more’ historical explanation for HOLOFERNES’ poetical account. Let’s say the PRINCESS of France killed a young Red Deer (the prey of Princes). DULL insists this Deor was a **pricket**—a buck of two years (*born 12 April, 1550*)—but HOLOFERNES, a ‘book-learned gentleman’, argues for greater age. He says “Some say” that it may be a fourth year buck (*born say, 31 July, 1548*) — a **Sore**. But it was not a **sore**: ‘a wound or injury’, at least not until it was made **sore** with “shooting”—as a ‘Green blade sprouts, or shoots forth’. The so-called Dogs (*canis*)—or did HOLOFERNES not speak clearly—was it Greys (*canus*)? who did yell: ‘put some alias to this **Sore**’, and straight-away a **Sorrel**, a buck in its third year, jumped—no, ‘did Spring’—from a thicket. It was a ‘delicate subject’, as you may guess, and the people began to ‘talk’.

Now, if this **Sore** (Deer / Deor) had been a **sore** (by adding an alias), or else fifty, might we discover fifty **sore**s of **sorrel**, (*rumex, spadix* : **sorrel, sorrel**)—fifty wounded eunuch deer. Yes, they were More, red-heir’d, and coincidentally, eunuchs (*spados*), gelded. What generative powers HOLOFERNES possessed! Like those of an historical English admiral who lost his head.

To think! Admiral Thomas was attainted, meaning he lost his lands, heritability, his title, and his head, and yet he had ‘children’ by the score. Under the influence of the Grey alias, one ell (else) became fifty, and one More ell reached a hundred. A fairly small legal problem with one unsanctioned child became one hundred ‘Reg-ing’ acts of political dissent, and each became a wound that should never be staunched. The Dudley and Cecil robbers, even the Queen herself, were beset on all sides by truth tellers. One might be that ‘bastard’ son of hers! *But all of them?*

NATHANIEL

- 62 A rare talent. (Variorum 78)
 ~ **A rare** [*wp Ar-are — ~ Two d’are ~, Tu-d’RR*] **talent** [(*L ingenium: II. A ‘Natural disposition, mode of thinking, bent, inclination’, (English) talent: 6 ‘A special natural ability or aptitude’*)]. ~
 ~ **A Tudor talon.** ~
 ~ **A Tudor Mode.** ~

DULL

63, 64 If a talent be a claw, look how he claws him with a talent. (Variorum 79-80)

~ **If a talent** [(L) *talentum*: ‘leaning, wish, desire’, (E) talent: 3 ‘An evil inclination, disposition, or passion, especially and usually anger..ill will’; DULL/Dudley understands the word in a malevolent sense.] **be a claw** [(E) talon < (L) *talo*: ‘ankle’, wp (L) *talio*: ‘a punishment similar and equal to the injury sustained, like for like, retaliation in kind’, *adv.* (L) *taliter*: ‘in such wise’ — (E) retaliation: 2a ‘repayment (in kind) for injury or insult’; *alt.* (L) *bracchium*: II *Transf.* ‘claws of crawfish’, ‘the Astrological sign of Cancer’; (L) *unguis*: I. 2 ‘a claw, talon, hoof’, (L) *ungula*: II *Transf. (poet.)* ‘a horse’, possibly referring to Dudley’s position in the royal household: Master of the Horse; therefore (E) horse, v. 6 ‘Of a stallion: to cover (a mare)’], **look** [(L) *intueor*: ‘to look towards’, wp ‘in Tu-d’or.] **how** [(L) *quomodo, ut, qui*] **he claws** [wp (L) *bracchium*: (as verb) *armare*] **him** [Seems to be referring to HOLOFERNES ‘himself’.] **with a talent** [(L) *talis*: ‘such a kind’; *alt.* playing on (E) talon, *alt. forms* (L) *talant, talent*]. ~

~ **If an ill-will be re-Taliate in Tudor, how he arms himself with such a kind.** ~

~ **If an ill-will be a Cancer in Tudor, how he arms him[self] with an ill-Will.** ~

► DULL / Dudley shows wit in his wordplay on (E) talon and claw. Perhaps it’s more ‘low cunning’ than wit; and yet wp (L) *talio, talis*, the intended ‘target wordplay’, is juridical language and apt to the discussion of ‘murdered’ De’Ors (Tudor-Seymours and Greys). Though a dull fellow, DULL is curiously astute in characterizing various crimes.

HOLOFERNES

65 This is a gift that I have, simple : simple, (Variorum 81)

~ **This is a gift** [(L) *donum*: ‘a gift, present’] **that I have** [(L) *habere*: II ‘to have, possess’], **simple** [(L) *simplex*: I ‘simple, plain, uncompounded’] : **simple** [(L) *merus*: I ‘pure, unmixed, unadulterated’, II *Trop.* ‘true, real, genuine’; wp (L) *merus* : *merus* = *Mer-Mer*, hence *Sea-Mor.*], ~

~ **This is a natural gift that I have, pure : Sey-mer,** ~

~ **This is a natural gift that I have, Mer-us : Su-Mer,** ~

66 a foolish extravagant spirit, full of forms, figures, shapes, (Variorum 82)

~ **a foolish** [(Latin) *morus*: ‘foolish, silly’, (L) *more*: ‘foolishly’, wp *surname* More, St Maur.] **extravagant** [(L) *immoderatus*: ‘without measure’, II *Trop.* ‘unrestrained, unbridled, excessive’; (E) extravagant: 1a ‘That wanders out of bounds; straying, roaming, vagrant’ < (L) *extra vagari*] **spirit** [(L) *animus, ingenium, natura*], **full** [wp (L) *refertus*: ‘stuffed, crammed (wp C-marred), filled full’, wp *refertus* = (L) *re*: ‘again’, ‘a repetition of an action’ + wp, *metonym* (L) *fer*, (Fr) *faire*, (E) fair: with various meanings as attributes of Tudor—(L) *facere*, (Fr) *faire*, (It) *fare*: ‘to do’, (L) *ferus*: ‘wild, untamed’, *fero*: ‘to bear, produce’, *ferio*: ‘to strike’, *ferox*: ‘bold, courageous, warlike’, *ferreus*: ‘made of iron’, etc. + *timesis tus*: reiterating the doubling or (L) *re-*, *prefix*; *alt.* (L) *satur*: ‘full of food, sated’, wp (L) *satyrus*: ‘A Satyr: II ‘of the *Satyri*, a kind of wood-deities resembling apes, with two goat’s feet, and very lascivious’] **of forms** [(L) *figura, forma, facies*, but here, likely (L) *species*: II ‘outward appearance, exterior’, II. B1 ‘seeming, semblance, pretense, cloak’, (L) *genus*: I ‘birth, descent, origin’], **figures** [(L) *figura*: II *Trop.* ‘quality, species, nature, manner’], **shapes** [(L) *forma, figura, species*; (L) *forma*, wp, *anagram*, ‘likely cognate with’ (Gr) *morphos*, (E) morph: ‘A variant form of animal or plant’; (Gr) *Morpho* was a metonym for Aphrodite.], ~

~ **a Mores measureless nature, fairly cramm’d with seemings, modes, forms,** ~

► We notice the character of the father, HOLOFERNES, is clearly evident in the son, MOTH— but also in MOTH’s godfather, NATHANIEL, and even in the writer’s allonym, ‘Shakespeare’. Ben Jonson reminds us that *Amor*, (a’Mor, a [St] Maur), the child of *Mars* (“god of war”, Thomas Seymour, St Maur) and *Venus* (*historic metonym* Elizabeth Regina), carries the (L) *genus*, the “race”, of the father and mother.

“Look how the father’s face

If (*L*) *pia mater* had been intended, it would have been a testament to ‘Shakespeare’s foresight. English physician John Charles Bucknill (1817-97) noted in his book *The Medical Knowledge of Shakespeare*, p.79:

“It is only...within a quite recent date that these views (regarding the *pia mater*), localizing thought in the grey substance of the convolutions, have been established or indeed suggested, and, therefore, the full truth of this expression [of Holofernes] must be accepted as only a happy accident.”

I don’t believe this was an accident, happy or otherwise. I suggest we can assume both (*Latin*) *piamater* and (*wordplay*) “primater” were intended by Oxford, the latter being more apt.

70 mellowing of occasion. But the gift is good in those in (Variorum 86)

~ **mellowing** [*L*] *maturescere*: ‘to become ripe’, *II B Transf.* ‘seasonably, opportunely, at the proper time’, hence (*L*) *mollire* (Vergil): ‘softening’ — *mollis*: ‘soft’ is an anagram of ~ Si-morr ~, and performs as an epithet, and further, as antithesis to the *dur*: ‘hard’ of Tu-dur; *alt. (Fr) mur*: ‘ripening’] of **occasion** [*L*] *occasio*: ‘opportunity, fit time, favorable moment’]. **But the gift** [likely referring to HOLOFERNES’ talent or faculty, (*Latin*) *ingenium*: ‘innate or natural quality’ *II* ‘disposition’, (*L*) *indoles*: ‘genius, natural ability’; *alt. (L) donum*: *I* ‘gift’, *II* ‘offering’; (*L*) *munus*: ‘a public show, spectacle’] **is good** [*L*] *merces*, *merx*: ‘goods, wares’, *anagram Merces /Sce-mer* — Seymour; perhaps (*L*) *merces*, as (E) *mercury* hints at metonymy and the god Mercury.] **in those in ~**

~ *softening of Opportunity. However, the genius is Mercy in those in ~*
~ *maturing of Opportunity. However, the genius is marketable in those in ~*

Bio. ➤ This passage explains the delay (*mora*), or interval, between the likely birthday of Oxford / Tudor-Seymour, 31 July, 1548 (see *Romeo and Juliet* 1.3 16-48), and that stated by William Cecil, 12 April, 1550. For a detailed review of Oxford’s *Mora* (delay), see *Troilus and Cressida* 1.1 1-31.

71 whom it is acute, and I am thankful for it. (Variorum 87)

~ **whom it is acute** [*wp* (E) pointed, (*L*) *res*: ‘a topic under consideration’, *wp Rex*: ‘king’; *alt. (Latin) acutus*: ‘sharpened, made pointed’, ‘impassioned’, (*L*) *sermo acer*: ‘pointed discourse’, of ‘natural sharpness’; (*L*) *acutum*: *IIB* ‘spur on, incite, stir up’], **and I am** [*L*] *sum*] **thankful** [*L*] *gratus*: *I* ‘beloved, dear, pleasing’, *II* ‘thankful, grateful’; (E) beloved, (*L*) *cupitus*: *wp Cupido*: ‘the god of love, Cupid’ — *Amor.*] **for it.** ~

~ *whom is sharp Semor, and I am Amor for it.* ~
~ *whom it is pointed and Sum ’Mor for it.* ~
~ *whom it is pointed, and I am grateful for it.* ~

Rhetoric ➤ A typical ‘signature’ is in the last line. Whatever other meaning may be found, he will often include obscure wordplay on the surname Tudor or Seymour if the character represents the writer’s true lineage, or the surname Vere if a character masks the writer’s *alter ego* de Vere.

NATHANIEL

72 Sir, I praise the Lord for you, and so may (Variorum 88)

~ **Sir** [*L*] *bone vir*, *vir optime*: ‘a man in good standing in the community’; (*L*) *dominus*: *II. B5* ‘In respectful greetings, like our Sir’, here playing on the same root for (E) sir and Lord, hence two ‘Do’ .], **I praise** [*L*] *laudo*: *I* ‘to praise, commend’, *II Transferred* ‘to adduce, name, cite a person as anything’] **the Lord** [*Latin*] *dominus*: ‘master, ruler, lord’, *wp* for (E) to do, dew, etc. — (*L*) *deus*] **for you** [*L*] *tu*], **and so may** [*pun (Fr) Somme[r]*: to summon, to call upon’; (*L*) *possum facere*: ‘able to do’; *alt. wp (L) fortasse*: ‘perhaps will do’, *wp (L) fort*: ‘strong’ especially relating to the royal line from Beaufort + (*L*) *as*, *asse*: ‘a unity’ > (*L*) *ex asse*: ‘sole heir’; possible homonym Somme(h)/St Maur] ~

~ *Domine, I name the Deus for Tu and So-Mau(r), ~*
~ *Domine, I name th’ deus for Tu, and So-Mau(r), ~*

73 my parishioners, for their sons are well tutored by you, (Variorum 89)

~ **my parishioners** [*wordplay* Parr + ish + ian + er: *surname* Parr: denoting the royal household of Katherine Parr, sixth wife of Henry VIII + (E) -ish, *suffix*: ‘Of the nature of, approaching the quality of, somewhat’ + -ian, *suffix, forming adjectives*: ‘belonging to a place, belonging to a class’ + -er, *suffix*: ‘serving to denote persons according to their occupation’, ‘in addition to places to express the sense ‘a native of’ (see note below); *I* ‘an inhabitant of a parish’; (E) parish < (L) *para*: ‘by the side of’ + (L) *ochia*: ‘house’, (L) *parochia*, *paroecia*: *II Transf.* ‘the place of jurisdiction of a parish’, (E) parish: 2 ‘A relatively large area..incorporating a township or cluster of townships under the control of a minster, (E) minster: ‘the church of a monastery’; (E) parson: ‘A vicar or any other beneficed member of the clergy of the Church of England, a rector’, (L) *rector*: ‘a governor, ruler, the helmsman of a ship’; likely playing on (Latin) *paries*: ‘a wall (cf. (L) *mur*)’ and *paroecia*.], **for** [(L) *for*: ‘to say, speak’] **their** [(L) *suus*: *wp* (L) *sus*: ‘a swine, hog, boar’] **sons** [(L) *filius*] **are** [*wp* *R(egius)*: ‘royal, regal’, as appended to the names of kings and queens of England.] **well** [*wp*, *homonym* (L) *vel*: ‘or’, common syllable Tudor and Seymour.] **tutored** [(L) *tutor*: ‘watcher, defender, protector’] **by** [(L) *ab*: *II. B2* a particle derived from *ap*, ‘To denote an agent from whom an action proceeds’, ‘by’, (Welsh) *ap*, *ab*: ‘son of; especially in patronymic’] **you** [(L) *Tu*: ‘you’], ~

~ *my Parr residents, for t’heir sons R ap Tudor, ~*

~ *my Parr home dwellers, for the heir’s sons R(egius) Or Tudor, ~*

~ *my Mur-sons, Say the Boar’s sons are ap Tudor, ~*

Bio. ➤ (E) Parish—Parishioner—is likely wordplay on the household of dowager queen Katherine Parr, sixth wife of Henry VIII, which included the writer’s family: his father, Admiral Thomas Seymour, his mother Princess Elizabeth Tudor, Queen Katherine Parr, Lady Jane Grey, and Kat Champenowne (married John Ashley in 1545), Princess Elizabeth’s governess since 1537.

➤ Characterizing NATHANIEL/John de Vere—16th Earl of Oxford—as a ‘parson’ might be a very inside jest, considering the loose lifestyle he led. On the other hand, during the reign of Queen Mary, Earl John was charged with prosecuting Protestants within the jurisdiction of Essex.

A supporter of the Crown Tudors against the power of John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, John de Vere was apparently a friend of Katherine Parr (until her death in September, 1548), and had served with Sir Thomas Seymour at the Sieges of Boulogne (1544-46), France. Although Oxford was not a frequenter of the Royal Court, he appears to have been a trusted ally, and this may help explain why he was chosen by Parr to lend cover for her daughter Mary, and the son of Parr’s husband by princess Elizabeth Tudor. John de Vere might give his name to both Seymour children who had otherwise lost their inheritance due to the Attainder of the Admiral. Hence John de Vere was, in a free sense, a sort of adopted godson to Katherine Parr—a Parr-son.

Bio. It is interesting that the dowager Duchess of Suffolk, Catherine Brandon (1519-80), was made guardian for Mary Seymour (1548-1624) following the death of Parr by ‘childbirth fever’, and the execution of Seymour. Brandon complained of the high cost of supporting Mary, and the girl disappeared after her 2nd birthday. I feel it likely she was ‘Vere-ied’ like her half brother Edward ‘Oxenford’, and raised as Mary ‘de Vere’. Mary married Peregrine Bertie (1555-1601), Baron Willoughby de Eresby, son of Catherine Brandon by Richard Bertie (1516-82), a wealthy English landowner. The estate of the dowager Duchess was settled in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, likely to give a title and extensive properties to Peregrine and Mary Bertie.

Related to the enigma of NATHANIEL’s ‘Parishioners’ is the jest in *1 Henry IV II.4* by which FALSTAFF (False Taff, a humorous mask for our Artist) fends off numbers of sword [(L) *ferrum*: ‘iron’] wielding men in “Kendal Greene”. Another transferred meaning of this (L) *ferrum* is “an iron stylus”—a pen (style), used for writing. Hence, “one hundred”, “misbegotten knaves”, “in Kendal Greene”, “bound and unbound” “in Buckram (Tu-’Doe-Mar) suits”—as FALSTAFF describes them—represent scores of mock suitors for our Poet’s cause, and their art. He defends his art against them, but they’re ‘All One’.

Kendal Castle is the supposed birthplace of Katherine Parr. “Kendal Greene”, would be the masking ‘colour’ given to sensitive identities by the Sudeley “Parishioners”. Green was the maiden name of Katherine Parr’s mother, and punningly translates (*Fr*) *vert* ... Vere. It’s neat. Oxford associates ideas etymologically, and it’s a delight if you can untwist them. We must counter rotate to discover what is rotted (*rotat*) or *verso* in the State of ~ *Dano-Marc* ~ .

74 and their daughters profit very greatly under you. (Variorum 90)

~ **and their** [(E) their is often played as ‘the heir’ = t’heir; here the case is weak.] **daughters** [(L) *filia*: ‘female offspring’ — though a step-parent, Katherine Parr was a warm, motherly, companion to young Elizabeth Tudor.] **profit** [(L) *proficere*: ‘advance’; *II. B* ‘increase, grow’; (L) *fructum ferre*: ‘bear fruit’; *alt.* (L) *capio, capere*: *I. A* ‘to take in hand, lay hold of seize’, *I. B1a* ‘To take possession, take captive, make prisoner’; *alt.* (L) *proficere*: *II. Trop.* ‘to go forward, advance, gain ground’] **very** [*wp*, *surname* Vere, de Vere] **greatly** [(E) great, *greaten*: ‘to increase in size’, ‘(of a woman) to swell with pregnancy’; *alt.* (L) *magnopere*, *wp* (L) *magnus, amplus*: ‘more’] **under** [(L) *sub*] **you** [(L) *Tu*]. ~
 ~ **and their daughters bear fruit Vere-y More-ly under you.** ~
 ~ *and their daughters Çom-mer’cify Vere-y More-ly under you.* ~

75 You are a good member of the commonwealth. (Variorum 91)

~ **You** [(L) *Tu*] **are** [*wp R(egius)*: ‘royal, regal’] **a good** [(L) *merces*: ‘goods, wares’, (E) goods, (*Latin*) *merces*, *anagram* Sce-mer/Sommer, Seymour, (E) wares, Veres.] **member** [*wp* (L) *civis*, ~ Mer-vis ~, likely a play on “good” as both Sea/Sey + *vis/vir*, (L) *vis*: ‘force, military forces’, ‘men’, *vires* = Vere.] **of the commonwealth** [(L) *respublica, civitas*, *wp* (L) *respublica* = ~ *public maters* ~ (‘public mothers’)]. ~
 ~ **Tu-[d]ar, a Mercery Sey-Mor of the Respublica.** ~
 ~ *Tu-[d]ar, a Mercery Sey-Mor of the public Maters.* ~

Bio. ► If I follow ‘Mr. Shakespeare’, John de Vere, whose Earldom was slated for extinction or severe entailment under Protector Somerset, now experiences a metamorphosis and may become, by the agency of Robert Dudley and William Cecil, the ‘father’ of the elected king—‘Edward de Vere’. As such, this young Edward may succeed a ‘Virgin Queen’. We learn circumspectly from *The Taming of he Shrew Ind.2 93-4*, that this particular de Vere is a false name among many ~ more such names and *Vires* / Which ne-Vere VVere nor no *Vir* E.Vere saw. ~ . — see: *Part IV, this essay pp. The Taming of the Shrew Induction II 89-94*

Bio. ► Oxford’s foster father from 1554-62 was Sir Thomas Smith (1513-77), Secretary of State under Edward VI. He is the author of a treatise on government: *De Republica Anglorum, and the Manner of Government or Policy of the Realm of England*.

De Republica Anglorum was first published in 1583 with margin notes by an uncredited individual. This annotator appears to have been someone who knew Smith well, and knew English law and England’s system of governance as well or better than Smith. He was also someone who had an advanced knowledge of European languages and their etymologies, had access to Smith’s manuscript, and the means of seeing *De Republica* through publication.

My opinion: It was likely Smith’s foster child, Edward Oxenford (Tudor-Seymour), whose interests, as evinced in ‘Shakespeare’, so closely match those of his foster father. Sir Thomas Smith, was just the right man to tutor princess Elizabeth’s precocious child.

— see *De Republica Anglorum*, Sir Thomas Smith, Introduction by ed. L. Alston, Christ’s College, Cambridge), p. xlv-lviii, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1906.

HOLOFERNES

76 *Me hercle*, if their sons be ingenuous, they (Variorum 92)

~ **Me hercle** [(L) *hercules, hercule or hercle*; also with a prefixed *me, me hercule, mehercle*, an asseveration—‘An oath’, may refer to the strangulation of the Nemean Lion (Tudor?), the first of the twelve Labors of Hercules; *alt. wp* Me’rciless! *anagram* Si-mour’less! (L) *Juppiter! II. C Transf.* (E) ‘My

heavens! Good heavens! as an exclamation of surprise', hence (*L caelum*: 'heaven', *wordplay, metonym* ~ Sae-mur ~; in myth, *Caelus* coupled with *Terra*.), **if their** [(E) their is often played as 'the heir' = t'heir; here the case is weak.] **sons** [(*L filius*)] **be** [(*L sum*)] **ingenuous** [(*L ingenuus*: II B1 'Worthy of a freeman, upright, frank, ingenuous'; *alt. (L) ingenium*: II B2a 'A man of genius, a clever ingenious person', *alt. wp (L) ingenuus*: II 'Free-born, born of free parents', i.e. they are not (*Latin*) *verna*: 'a slave born in his master's home', hence ~ ne Vere ~; *alt. wp (L) ingigno*: I 'to instill by birth or nature, to implant, engender'; *wp (L) in-*, *prefix*: 'un-, in-, not' + (*L) gigno*: 'to beget, bear'], **they** ~

~ **My Hercules! if t'heir sons be Frank, they** ~

~ **Merciless! If heiring sons be not begotten, they** ~

- The Furness *Variorum* (p.146) debates whether the word is ingenuous or ingenious. For our purposes, the writer's intent is (E) ingenuous: 4a 'Honorably straightforward; open, frank'. The supra-text is concerned with discovering the true father of whom HOLOFERNES terms "a certain pupil of mine" (LLL IV.2 149, Var. 170), so questions of ones ingenuous (*verus*), Vere, nature are foremost on his mind. We know the true identity of that lad by listening attentively to words. "Certain" is (*L ratus, rato*: 'certainly, surely', playing on (*L muris, mus*: 'a mouse, rat, ermine', and (*Medieval Latin*) *rattus*: 'rat'. (*L muris* is an unabashed emblem and anagram of Simur, Seamure, Seymour, St Maur. Any mention in 'Shakespeare' of a mouse, rat, or weasel, refers to the Seymour family. Likewise (E) pupil: I *Civil Law* 'an orphan who is a minor and consequently a ward', from (*L pupillus*: 'an orphan boy', 'a ward', indicates a specific orphan descending from HOLOFERNES — who has previously been shown to be a 'Ram' backwards, i.e. a Mar (see Part II: The St Maur Succeeds, LLL V.1 42-55, pp. 22-31, *this essay*). Hence we see how cleverly Oxford produces proofs or syllogisms indicating the historic identity of his characters.

77 shall want no instruction; if their daughters be capable, (Variorum 93)

~ **shall** [(English) shall: 3b 'In stating a necessary condition: = 'will have to' ..(if something else is to happen)'] **want** [(E) want: 6 'A condition of needing or requiring something'] **no instruction** [(*Latin*) *institutio*: IC 'Instruction, education']; **if their** [*wordplay* (E) the heir = t'heir] **daughters** [(*L filia*)] **be capable** [(*L aptus, aptatus*: 'suitable, fit, accommodated', *wp (Welsh) ap Tudors, Tudu(h)s*, (*Welsh*) *ap*: 'son (of), especially in a patronymic'], ~

~ **shall require no instruction; if t'heir daughters be ap Tu-ta's** ~

- Princess Elizabeth's mother, Ann Boleyn, was beheaded for supposed indiscretions with younger men while married to king Henry VIII. Often thought to be 'convenient charges' to rid the ruler of a wife apt to bear daughters, it would not be unreasonable for Ann to have thought to experiment with virile men-about-court, perhaps red-haired and handsome, in order to bring about a result pleasing to Henry. To have had the opportunity for such an encounter sounds implausible and would have been reckless for all. However, with her marriage to the King at stake, she might venture coupling with someone she could truly trust ... a brother perhaps. An interesting conjecture might consider the effect of her mother's death in Elizabeth's willingness to flirt with Thomas Seymour.

- At *Hamlet* 1.2 137-57, HAMLET chides (in soliloquy) his mother's transfer of affections to CLAUDIUS (cludlius/dudlius), likely referring to a 'composite Dudley', with traits of both John (1504-53) and his son Robert (1532-88). Historian David Starkey frames it thus:

"In January [1550] Mary [Tudor] told the imperial ambassador that John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, was 'the most unstable man in England' and that the conspiracy against Somerset [Protector Edward Seymour] 'had envy and ambition as its only motives'. By May she was involved in a hare-brained scheme, once again, to flee abroad. Meanwhile, Elizabeth and Warwick were getting on famously—or, if some rumours were to be believed, infamously.

In November 1550 the imperial ambassador reported the worst of the rumours: Warwick was to divorce his wife and marry Elizabeth, ‘with whom he is said to have had several secret and intimate personal communications’. There seems to have been nothing in the story.”

— Starkey, David. *Elizabeth, The Struggle for the Throne*, 2001; p.101.

Personally, I doubt Elizabeth was sexually involved with that ‘Satyr’, John Dudley (Earl of Warwick, and later Duke of Northumberland). More likely, their “intimate communications” had more to do with the disposition and protection of Elizabeth’s son. Warwick was angling for assets. Elizabeth’s son had excellent potential. Warwick would later choose to marry his son Guildford to Lady Jane Grey; he then altered the king’s ‘Devise for the Succession’ to favor the Grey family above the Crown Tudors, and thereby win big should king Edward VI die ... unless NATHANIEL—John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford, and others—stepped in to stand for Princess Mary.

78 I will put it to them. But, *vir sapit qui pauca loquitur*. (Variorum 94)

~ **I will** [*wp, surname (L) mos, moris, mores*: ‘the self-will’, identifying himself, HOLOFERNES, as ‘Will’/More, St Maur] **put** [(*Latin*) *inpono, immitto, intromitto*: ‘to put or place into’] **it** [*euphemism*, probably intending (*L*) *virga*: ‘a slender green branch, a switch, rod’, here *II. E* ‘*Genitalium, = membrum virile*’, hence (*L*) *penis*] **to them. But, vir** [(English) man] **sapit** [*wp* (E) prudent, wise, (*L*) *sapio*: *II. 2* ‘to be sensible, prudent, wise’, playing on (E) -wise, *suffix*: ‘forming adverbs (also adj.) with the sense ‘in the manner of — —, as ‘foodwise, leasewise’, hence ‘wise’ is ‘custom’ — (*L*) *mores*.] **qui** [(E) who] **pauca** [(E) little, (*L*) *paucus*: ‘few, little’] **loquitur** [(E) speak, say, (*L*) *loquor*: ‘to speak, talk, say’]. ~

~ **I, ‘Maur’, put Virga to them. But a Wise Vere says little.** ~

~ **I ‘Maur’, put Virga to them. But a Vere is Wise who says little.** ~

► The idea of “putting it to them” appears to allude to the story of Jacob and Laban, *Genesis 30* and *31*, and the profitable coloring of livestock. Laban, the Aramean, sheltered Jacob far from the wrath of Esau. Laban’s daughter Rachel caught Jacob’s eye, and he labored fourteen years to deserve her. Laban had been well served by Jacob and allowed him to name his own wages, which he did—the varied colored stock to be born in the future among Laban’s flocks. But Laban deceitfully removed such varicolored animals from his herd so there might be none to beget like-colored young. Jacob, under God’s direction, ‘pealed’ shoots, of poplar, hazel, and chestnut trees, and placed them before the sheep and cattle at their watering place. These green shoots, (*L*) *virga* have transferred meaning as, (*L*) *genitalium = membrum virile*. By God’s intent, this caused the animals to bear ‘spotted’ offspring, to which Jacob was entitled. This bears some relation to the story of Oxford’s birth (see *Merchant of Venice 1.3 68-87*), and the ‘particolored’ nature of his identity. The same theme will explode from HOLOFERNES at *line 145*, below:

“Sir, tell me not of the father; / I do fear colorable colors.” (LLL IV.2 145)

Bio. ► ~ **But a Vere is Wise who says little.** ~ The sudden death of John de Vere may have been due to his ignoring this admonition. The 16th Earl signed an indenture for the marriage of Edward ‘de Vere’ (Tudor-Seymour), then almost 14 years of age, to one of the sisters of Henry Hastings (Earl of Huntingdon), upon reaching his eighteenth year. This document was signed on the 1st July, 1562—John was dead, a month later. The marriage of a potential heir to the throne would have been the business of the Queen, Dudley, and Cecil. Robert Dudley (Earl of Leicester) organized the entail *and*, four weeks later, Earl John’s last will and testament (28 July, 1562). As Alan Nelson noted: “It is clear [John de Vere] saw death coming.” (*Monstrous Adversary*, p.30).

The signing witnesses to this contract included Sir John Wentworth, High Sheriff of Essex and Hertford, two of Margery Golding’s brothers, Thomas and Henry, and Robert Christmas, then in the service of Robert Dudley. By the following year (1563) only Dudley’s representative, Robert Christmas, received a grant of administration for John de Vere’s will; the others, it appears had been forced aside. Ultimately, Robert Dudley was the principal beneficiary in the disposition of Oxford estates during the following decade.

Interestingly, John Wentworth had custody (1566) of Lady Katherine Grey Seymour, sister of Lady/Queen Jane Grey-Dudley, suggesting Crown interests and Dudley interests were at odds during this time and perhaps always. No doubt, Wentworth was carefully chosen by the Queen to guard Lady Katherine, who followed her sister Jane in the ‘Devise for the Succession’ of 1553. Though ostensibly by Edward VI, it was written under the ‘guidance’ of Leicester’s father, John Dudley (Duke of Northumberland).

I suggest the Golding family, Margery and her brothers, originally in the service of Edward Seymour (Duke of Somerset) were not wholeheartedly dedicated to John Dudley or his future successor, Robert. They may have foreseen that Leicester would take more than the lion’s share upon the demise of John de Vere.

Article 5: “Master Person, quasi Pierce One?” (LLL IV. 2 80-100)

~ *Master Person, almost One Transfigured?* ~ (E) pierce, (L) transfigere

79 A soul feminine saluteth us. (Variorum 95)

~ **A soul** [(Latin) *animus*: I ‘the rational soul in man (in opposition to the body, *corpus*, and to the physical life, *anima*’, (L) *anima*: ‘breath, wind’, *syn.* (L) *aer*: ‘air’, ‘weather’] **feminine** [wp (L) *muliebris*, *mulierarius*: ~ Muri-er-ar’ias ~ , ~ Muri-Two-d’ar ~, wordplay, allowing the substitution of r for l.]

saluteth [(L) *salutare*: ‘To keep safe, to preserve’] **us**. ~

~ *An fool Muri-er-ar’ias preserves us*. ~

~ *A fool feminine saluteth us*. ~

► “Soul”, spelled with a ‘long S’: ‘*foul*’, hints at fool, (L) *moria*, pointing to a “More Marriage” (see *Hamlet* III.1 147). Perhaps JAQUENETTA masks for Oxford’s ‘foolish’ wife Anne, as the PRINCESS OF FRANCE masks for Princess Elizabeth, the ‘wife’ of Thomas Seymour.

JAQUENETTA

► The significance of the name JAQUENETTA is likely tied to (L) *jacio*: II. A ‘to throw, cast, hurl’, *adulteria*: ‘to lay to one’s charge’ and injury (adultery) to someone. This suggests she represents the agency of Oxford’s further subjection by marriage. Hence, she might mask for Anne Cecil (1556-88), Countess of Oxford—likely mixed with Elizabeth *Regina*—but there is wordplay that strongly hints at his adulterous affair with Ann Vavasour (1562-1650). Lines 83 & 84 identify COSTARD as a mask for a “vassal”/vessel of Edward Tudor-Seymour—a lesser/Leices’er ‘ship’ for Oxford.

80, 81 God give you good morrow, *Master Person*. (Variorum 97)

~ **God** [wp, homonym (Latin) *deus, divus*: ‘God’, *pl.* (E) ‘the gods’, (L) *di, divi, numina, caelestes*: ‘heavenly beings’, (L) *caelestis*: ‘the gods’, < (L) *Caelus*: ‘heavens’, *meton.* Seymour] **give** [(L) *do, dare*: ‘to give’, *timesis, active particle* (L) *facere*, (Italian) *fare*, (Fr) *faire*: ‘to do’] **you** [(L) *tu*, hence ~ Tu-do ~.] **good** [(L) *merces, merx*: ‘goods, wares’] **morrow** [(L) *insequens dies*, allying (L) *dies*: ‘day’ and *deus*: ‘god’], **Master** [(Latin) *pater familias*: (English) *master*: *Id* ‘The male head of a house or household’] **Person** [wp (L) *persona*: ‘a mask’, ‘a masked person’; (E) *parson*: *etym.* (OFr) *persone*, < (Latin) *persona*: I ‘A mask’, II. B ‘the part or character which any one plays in the world’; *alt.* (E) *parson*: (E) *rector*, (L) *rector*: ‘a guider, director, ruler, master’; in addition, there is likely wordplay on ‘Purse-son’, (E) *purse*: v. ‘to keep secret, to confine + (E) son—see l.81 in which wordplay declines into (E) pierce, (L) *transfigo*: ‘to pierce through, transfix’, and (L) *transfiguro*: I ‘to transform, metamorphose’, II *Trop. B1* (with *se*), ‘to pretend to be’; *alt.* (L) *homo*: ‘man’, hence (L) *vir*: ‘man’, *homonym* Vere; in the next lines, we’ll find play between ‘Person’, ‘Parson’, and the *First Folio* sets “Parson” (l.89) to suggest this emphasized word as]. ~

~ *Tudors give you Sea-mour O, Father Persona*. ~

~ *Tu Do(h)s do tu Mer-Moro, Father Mask*. ~

► JAQUENETTA addresses the Vere *alter ego* NATHANIEL, and wishes him that which he wishes for himself—the full status of More: ‘Good More-O’, *Merx-moro*, or *Seamore*.

Rhetoric ► Oxford / ‘Shakespeare’ takes the opportunity of salutations, introductions, and pleasantries, to identify the historical person presented in the character. There is ne’ver a wasted word—our Tutor is a Master of poetic density.

HOLOFERNES (Nathaniel, F1)

82 Master Person, *quasi* Person? And if one should (Variorum 98)

Master Person, *quasi* pierce one? And if one should

~ **Master** [(*Latin*) *pater familias*: (English) master: *Id* ‘The male head of a house or household’]

Person [(E) parson: *etym.* (*OFr*) *persone*, < (*Latin*) *persona*: I ‘A mask’; *alt.* (*L*) *homo*: ‘man’, hence (*L*) *vir*: ‘man’], **quasi** [(*L*) *quasi*: ‘as if, as it were’, *II Transf.* ‘about, nearly, almost’] **pierce** [(*L*) *transfigo*: ‘to pierce through’, (*L*) *transfiguro*: ‘to metamorphose’] **one** [(*L*) *unus*: ‘one’; (*L*) *princeps*: *II. E* ‘A prince, a ruler, sovereign’]? **And if** [(*L*) *si, timesis* The first syllable of Seymour.] **one** [(*L*) *princeps*: *II. E* ‘A prince, a ruler, sovereign’] **should** [(*L*) *oportet*: ‘ought, should’, *wp, anagram* To-porte, two-door, Tudor.] ~

~ **Father Per se only, as it VVere, to transfigure One? And if a Prince should** ~

► JAQUENETTA has addressed (ambiguously) the “Master Person”, which HOLOFERNES clearly needs to etymologize; he divides the word into (E) perce: *16th century form* (< *Latin*) *per se*: *1a* ‘O perse’, (O per se O ?), ‘a unique or incomparable person or thing’, *i.e.* ~ there are not two such individuals, are there? ~ + *wp ona*, (*L*) *una, unus*: *IB3* ‘one, alone, sole’. COSTARD confuses the question at *l.83*, by replying to HOLOFERNES as “Master Schoolmaster”. The “Person”/Parson refers to NATHANIEL. Both NATHANIEL and HOLOFERNES are called ‘Master’, referring to (*L*) *pater familias*—‘the Father of a House’—as that is the central question of the scene.

Oxford-Seymour Theory posits that HOLOFERNES and NATHANIEL represent individuals that may both address MOTH/MOTE as ‘child’, so that word must be interpreted as figurative in at least one instance. It appears HOLOFERNES (St Maur) is the biological father, and NATHANIEL (de Vere), the godfather.

► In some cases my assignment of passages to characters disagrees with that given in the *First Folio*. There are obvious inconsistencies and modern editors have already altered assignments in most printings. I have allowed *epitheton* to help decide who speaks, and content should bear out this arrangement. Notes have been made in this text at each variance from the *First Folio* (1623).

Rhetoric ► HOLOFERNES here muses that in transfiguring the identification of Edward Tudor-Seymour to Edward de Vere, ‘Authority’ has altered the identification of John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford, as well. Earl John ‘pears’ (< appears, by *aphesis*: ‘loss of short unaccented vowel at the beginning of a word’) to have fathered a son. But “Person”, ~ according to the son ~, which is the one “perst”, (*L*) *transfigo*: to have been run through—‘pierced’? And who did the deed? Who did the One?

83 be pierced, which is the one? (Variorum 99)

~ **be** [(*Latin*) *sum*: ‘to be’] **pierced** [(*L*) *transfigo*: ‘to pierce through’, *wordplay* (*L*) *transfiguro*: ‘to transfigure, metamorphose’; *alt. wp* (E) per-said], **which** [(*L*) *quis*; likely wordplay (*wp*) (E) witch.] **is the one** [(*L*) *princeps*: *II. E* ‘A prince, a ruler, sovereign’]? ~

~ **be metamorphosed, which is the Prince?** ~

~ **be per-said, which is the One?** ~

COSTARD

Rhetoric ► The name COSTARD refers to a small vessel—(English) *costard n.2* ‘a small sort of a barrel’; (E) *costrel*, (*Middle French*) *costerel*: ‘a small vessel for storing wine, ale, water, etc.’ (*OED*), (E) *costret*: ‘a small vessel for carrying liquids’. This places COSTARD/CLOWN as ‘containing a liquid’—‘Sea-maur’, referring to (*L*) *liquidus, liquidus moles*: ‘the sea’, ~ the Sea *Môr* .

Predictably, ‘vessel’ is double-entendre and a transitive pun on (*Latin*) *ratis*: 1 ‘a vessel made of logs fastened together’, and (*L*) *ratis* puns on (*Medieval Latin*) *rattus*: ‘a rat, mouse’, otherwise named (*L*) *muris* or *mus*: ‘mouse, rat, ermine, weasel’; (*L*) *muris* is the idea the author seeks — *Muris* / *anagram* Simur / Seymour / St Maur. This is the way Oxford’s mind works.

Now, this COSTARD “vessel”, (*Mod.Fr*) *vaisseau* < (*Latin*) *vascellum*: ‘a small vase, ship’, is evidently a shallow (E) *vassal*: 1a ‘In the feudal system, one holding lands from a superior on conditions of homage and allegiance’ (see *LLL* 1.1 244; KING). DULL enforces this condition.

Further, we know from *LLL* 1.2 114, ARMADO has called COSTARD a “rational hind”, much to the consternation of *Variorum* commenters. (E) Rational, (*L*) *rationalis*: ‘receiver of revenue, treasurer’ describes the role of the assigned name ‘de Vere’. A fraction of the portion due to the Queen’s son, Tudor-Seymour, is received by the writer’s ‘de Vere’ identity; that’s all he gets. He nonetheless retains royal blood, as a ‘rat, mouse, or ermine’ — a (*L*) *mus*, *muris*, or *anagram* Si-mur — thus (*L*) *rattus* holds the root of his *rat*-ional character.

COSTARD is also a “hind”, certainly not *n.1* ‘a female of the red deer’, but rather *n.2* ‘a servant; in later use a farm servant, an agricultural labourer’. This refers to the writer’s beastly Ox-like servitude, (*L*) *exarare*—‘to plow’, *wp* ~ out of Two-d’R ~ ; he is a veritable Vere-na, (*L*) *verna*: ‘a slave born in the master’s house’. So COSTARD represents an impure, contaminated, foul (*foedus*) rat—not so bad a thing as it sounds, but not great—(*Welsh*) *Mawr*. Take note of this example; we often find necessary information a character’s identity in disjunct passages throughout a play.

Another idea, closely related to the name COSTARD, is ~ co-starred ~ , creating a sense of having a joint fate, or (*L*) *costatum*: *co*: ‘of a joint subject’ + *statum*: *I. A* ‘a mode or way of standing’, *II. Trop.* ‘condition, state, position’, hence ~ a joint condition’ ~ .

► There is abundant counsel throughout ‘Shakespeare’ demonstrating the associations and progressions he makes with words while skirting direct mention of his proper name. I find no better example than *Act I, scene 1, 1-36* of *Romeo and Juliet* in which SAMPSON and GREGORY weave among synonyms and homonyms; and all their words are apt to both an apparent text and the evident supra-text. This is an element of etymological wordplay that originated, according to Classicists, at least as early as Homer. It was a major rhetorical feature of Roman writers by the late Republic and beyond, notably Varro, Vergil and Ovid. Some have thought there must be political secrets imbedded within those works as the impetus for such attentive constructions (see Frederick Ahl; *Metaformations*, pp.64-99). The same should be suspected of enigmatic Shakespeare. ‘Therefore, read him **again** and **again**: And if you do not like him, surely you are in some manifest danger, not to understand him.’ (John Heminge, Henry Condell, *First Folio*). Each example of wordplay is a linguistic ‘proof’, towards “Well proved wit” (*LLL* IV.3 5).

A perfect example can be found in the lines of COSTARD at *LLL* III.1 132-138. The First Quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (1598) seems to err in spelling ‘remuneration’ as ‘remuration’ (see I.135). This is no accident. Lewis and Short’s *A Latin Dictionary*, shows alternate spellings for (*L*) *munia*: ‘official duties, functions’—they are (*L*) *moenia*, **muris**, *munus*, and *immunis*. The intricate jest is that COSTARD (merely a ‘vessel’) takes his ‘reward, or recompense’ for ‘duties and functions’ in the form of metamorphosis—a re-**Mur**’ation. He morphs from a St Maur to ‘de Vere’. There will be some discussion between COSTARD and MOTH on “carnation ribbon”, *wp* (*L*) *carnatio*: ‘fleshy’ + (E) ribbon, (*L*) *redimiculum*: *Trop.* ‘bond, fetters’, to be purchased with “three farthings” — by ‘Three Faire Things’, i.e. ~ Three *Fare Res/Rex* ~ , or Three Tудо(r) Monarchs (III.1 142-46). “Three farthings worth of silk” (146) is ~Three Faire Kings Value of St Maur Self—(*Fr*) *soie*: ‘silk’ = *wp* (*Fr*) *soi*: ‘self’. “Value” plays on (*L*) *aestimare*—[*ae*]: *wp* ~ plural ~ + St Mare.

84

Marry, Master Schoolmaster, he that is likest

(Variorum 100)

~ **Marry** [(English) marry: 2a ‘In asseverative phrases’, ‘to affirm solemnly, assert emphatically’, hence, to affirm that which follows; even interjections, such as “marry” have full significance in Oxford/ ‘Shakespeare’], **Master** [(*Latin*) *pater familias*: (English) *master*: 1d ‘male head of house or household’; *alt.* (*L*) *dominus* = (*L*) *do* + *minus*, 2 *minor*: ‘less, smaller, inferior’, hence ‘lesser’ as wordplay on lesser/

Leiceser/Leicester (Robert Dudley)] **Schoolmaster** [(Latin) *magister*: I ‘A master, superior, leader, conductor’, I. B2 ‘An educator of children, a tutor’], **he that is likest** [(E) likest: superlative of (E) like: I. Ia ‘similar, resembling’] ~

~ *Maur-y, Father Tutor, he that is Most-like* ~

Bio. ➤ Once More, the name ‘Edward de Vere’ is a creation, probably by Edward Seymour (1500-52), (Lord Protector Somerset), and Queen Katherine Parr (1512-48), and perhaps with William Cecil as technical mastermind. The ‘person’ of the Princess’ son is like COSTARD, a vassal owing allegiance and obedience to his Monarch or *de facto* Regents. COSTARD’s problem “with the manner”/manour: ‘the stolen goods’ (i.e. JAQUENETTA, see LLL 1.1 197-298), undoubtedly reflects Oxford’s affair with Ann Vavasour (circa 1579-81). As he is a vassal, she is (E) vavasour < (Latin) *vavassor*: ‘a feudal tenant ranking immediately below a baron’—she is “a true girl, and therefore welcome (*wp comme or*) the sour cup of prosperity.” (1.1 297)

Oxford’s offense closely parallels that of his mother and father. A twice in a lifetime Opportunity then presented itself to the coercive forces of Dudley, Cecil, and clients. The plan, apparently, was to spare Princess Elizabeth from political attainder including death, but her child, who later called himself ‘Shakespeare’, suffered many of the effects of his father’s sentence. Still he managed to keep his head. The Princess was, for the most part, shielded from shame.

85 to a hogshead. (Variorum 101)

~ **to a hogshead** [(E) hogshead: I ‘A large cask..for storing liquids’, also called an (E) ox-head: 3 ‘a hogshead, or perhaps some other measure of liquid quantity’. In answer to “which is the Prince?” (1.82) ... ~ why, the one that most resembles the head of a Boar or Ox. ~]. ~

~ *to a Boars-head.* ~

Bio. ➤ Oxford-Seymour Theory posits that the central question of Oxford’s life is “Who’s their?”—Who’s t’heir, ~ Who’s the Heir ~ (*Hamlet* 1.1 1). Is the heir of Queen Elizabeth to be her [unknown] son, the *Morio*—the Edward St Maur ‘Fool’? Or will the Crown be settled upon Cecil’s son-in-law, Edward de Vere; the two of them exist in the same body but have different ethics. Or will it go to the king of Scotland. If we miss the complexity of the situation, we miss the character of Elizabethan polity and the power of the Cecils. Only ‘Shakespeare’ can fill us in on the details.

➤ COSTARD supports the candidacy of ‘de Vere’ for position of “Master”. This allies him with the political camp of William Cecil, Oxford’s father-in-law. COSTARD represents the fruit, the pale green (pale & green as emblems of Tudor) Costard, sold by costermongers, or Costard mongers.

HOLOFERNES

86 Of piercing a Hogshead, a good luster of conceit (Variorum 102)

~ **Of piercing** [(Latin) *transfigo*: ‘to pierce through’, *wp* (L) *transfiguro*: ‘to metamorphose’] **a**

Hogshead [(E) hogshead: I ‘A large cask..for storing liquids’, also called an (E) ox-head: 3 ‘a hogshead, or perhaps some other measure of liquid quantity’, likely wordplay = Ed. Oxenford—name (OE) Ead: ‘prosperity, fortune’], **a good** [(L) *commodus*: I ‘a due or proper measure’, II ‘suitable, convenient, opportune’, (L) *merx, merces*: ‘goods, wares’, *adj.* (E) *mercery*:] **luster** [(L) *nitor*: II *Trop.* ‘of speech, splendor, elegance, grace of style’; (L) *splendor*: I ‘brilliance’, II *Trop.* ‘honor, dignity, excellence’] **of conceit** [(L) *conceptum*: I. B1b *metonym* (Ovid) ‘of a woman, to marry, wed’; (E) conceit: 10a ‘A fanciful or ingenious action’] ~

~ *Of transfiguring a Boar’s ’Ead, a Mercery Night, or of marriage* ~

Rhetoric ➤ Note from *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, edited by Hardin Craig and David Bevington, 1973, publ. Scott, Foresman and Company, p.114, (ll.85, 86, 89):

“**pers-on, pierced, piercing.** The pronunciation of the root syllables was probably identical. These are sometimes taken as allusions to Nashe’s *Pierce Penniless, His Supplication to the Devil*, a fantastic satire in which the author, in the character of Pierce, comments on the vices

of the times; also to [Gabriel] Harvey's answer, *Pierce's Supererogation*. In the latter Pierce is referred to as "the hogges-head of witt"; cf. 1.89".

— (E) pierce = (L) *tranfigere* + (E) penniless = (L) *sine assem*— ~ Transfigured, without unity ~ (L) *as*: II. A1 'a copper coin', originally unstamped and weighed by the pound. Literally, (L) *as* meant 'unity, a unit', ~ a single thing ~, hence ~ without a single thing ~. Inheritances were divided by the same system used to divide weights of copper (pennies). Thus (L) *haeres ex asse* denoted the 'sole heir'—the heir of all; the heir of 'the unit'.

From an abundance of indirect or surreptitious allusions to a transfigured writer, we can be fairly certain that a number of contemporary writers were aware of another identity for the person who was nominally Edward 'de Vere'. From that number we must subtract the names used by that Author ('Shakespeare') as allonyms or pseudonyms.

Furness comments:

"According to some among us who take upon themselves the mystery of things; as though they were God's spies, these plays of Shakespeare are crowded to suffocation with covert allusions to an alien authorship. Now the titles of Bacon's Essayes always adopt the following form: 'Of Negotiating', 'Of Discourse', etc." (*Var. p.148*) The sober minded Furness can only approach the subject facetiously, yet there it stands ... Shakespeare's work is more than "crowded to suffocation", it is one vast testament to alien authorship. Anyone who finds no mystery in his words is a fool or a liar.

87 in a turf of earth, fire enough for a flint, pearl enough (*Variorum 103*)

~ **in a turf** [= grass, (E) lawn, (L) *gramen*: wp Greyman, (L) *Graii*: 'Greeks', of the Grey Tudors, descending from Mary Tudor and Charles Brandon, 1st Duke of Suffolk (*2nd creation, 1514*), through their daughter Frances, who married Henry Grey, 1st Duke of Suffolk (*3rd creation, 1551*), 3rd Marquess of Dorset — *alt.* (L) *caespes*: I. B metonym 'hut, hovel, shed', wp (Welsh) *tŷ*: 'house, home', and figurative (English) house: 10b 'a family including ancestors and descendants, esp. noble, royal'] **of earth** [(L) *terra*, *orbis*: wp *bis*: 'twice, two' + *orum*, *aurum*, (Fr) *or*: 'gold', hence Two-d'Or, Tudor.], **fire** [(L) *ardor*: II. B '(of passions or feelings) heat, ardor, impatience, ardent desire' Trop.] **enough** [(Latin) *satis*: 'sufficient, equal to'] **for a flint** [(L) *silex*: 'hard stone', 'to denote hard-heartedness'; (E) *lb* 'As a type of anything hard or unyielding'—the sacred stone of Jove in the temple of *Juppiter Fereetrius* in Rome.], **pearl** [(Latin) *margarita*: '(As a term of endearment) pearl, treasure', hence 'dear'—de'Or?] **enough** [(L) *satis*: 'sufficient, equal to'; (Italian) *bastare*: 'enough, sufficient', wp (E) bastard] ~

~ **in a Grey-man Tŷ d'Or, Ardor sufficient for a hard heart, De'Or bastard** ~

~ **in a Tŷ d'Or, bastard Ardor for a hard heart, bastard Treasure** ~

Rhetoric ► Shakespeare's figurative lineages can take some time to absorb, but the reader may keep it simple by classifying the *Grai-Grey* (Greek) Tudors as 'bad', and the Crown Line (Trojan) from Henry VIII, as 'good'. By the false name 'de Vere', Edward Tudor-Seymour would become a client of the 'bad' Greeks. If he accepts the crown by election he must work in the interests of Grey-Dudley masters and take direction from them, just as you see LAERTES (a 'Greek') manipulated by CLAUDIUS (< (Greek) *kleís*, (Latin) *clavus*, referring to (L) *claudo*: II 'to imprison, hide, confine'), as we see in *Hamlet*. The "Clowd-capt Towres" / 'Cloud Captors' (*The Tempest IV.1 152*) of the Greek *forces*, (L) *vires*, *vis*, is the basis of Oxford's etymological wordplay.

► Allusions to Jove, (L) *Jovis*, or *Juppiter*, as principal god of the Romans relates to wordplay on (E) do, to do, as a supposed etymological link to (L) *deus* the Tudors. This is reinforced at 1.76, "mehercle": ~ By Hercules! ~, a demigod, or ~ By Juppiter! ~ (111) "thunder", as wrath of Jove.

88 for a swine — 'tis pretty, it is well. (*Variorum 104*)

~ **for a swine** [(L) *porcus*: 'a hog, pig'; expression "*ne mittatis margaritas ante porcos*", ~ do not cast your pearls before swine ~, (L) *verres*: 'boar'] — **'tis** [wp (E) -ty, suffix: 'forming nouns of quality or condition'; (Welsh) *tŷ*: 'house, home', also fig. (as) (E) house: 10b 'a family including ancestors and

descendants, esp. noble, royal'] **pretty** [(L) *bellus*: '(Of persons) pretty, handsome, charming pleasant', likely playing on (L) *bellum*: 'war', wp (L) *Mars*: II. A *Transf.* 'War, battle, conflict'; (L) *venustus*:], **it is well** [wp (L) *vel*: 'or'; wordplay/soundplay is likely here — (E) pretty plays on (L) *pretium*: I 'money', II *Transf.* 'worth, value, price', and (E) well plays on (L) *vel*: 'or', thus (E) ore: 3 'Metal, esp. precious metal (perhaps with the added sense 'gold' by *paranomasia*—'words that sound alike, a pun'—with the heraldic *or*, (L) *aurum, orum*, or (Fr) *or*.]. ~

~ **for a Vere — the House is Venus't, Tÿ d'Or.** ~

~ **for a Vere — it is Lovely, Tÿ d'Or.** ~

~ **for a Verre — 'Tÿs valued, it is Or.** ~

JAQUENETTA

89 Good Master Parson, be so good as read me (Variorum 105)

~ **Good** [(Latin) *merces, merx*: 'goods, wares'] **Master** [(Latin) *pater familias*: (English) *master*: I'd 'The male head of a house or household'; alt. (L) *dominus* = wordplay (L) *do* + *minus*, 2 *minor*: 'lesser, inferior'; (Fr) *maître*, *master*: 'leader, commander'] **Parson** [(E) *parson*: etym. (L) *persona*: 'A mask', wp (E) *parson*: 'A vicar or any other beneficed member of the clergy of the Church of England; a minister or preacher of any Christian denomination', (L) *sacerdos*: 'a priest', wp (E) *person*, (L) *homo*: 'man', hence (L) *vir*: 'man', *homonym Vere*.], **be** [(L) *sum*] **so** [(L) *hoc modo*; wp (L) *modo, modus*: II. B 'A way, manner, mode, method', hence (Latin) *more*, playing on (Welsh) *mor*: 'so', probably hinting at *surname St More /St Maur*.] **good** [(Latin) *merces, merx*: 'goods, wares',] **as read** [(L) *lego, legere*: II. B2 'to read or peruse a writing'; (L) *evolvere, evolere*: II. B *Trop.* 'to unfold, disclose, narrate'] **me** ~

~ **Mercery Commander Person, be So Maur as [to] disclose me** ~

~ **Lesser Seymour Lord, be St Maur as disclose me** ~

90 this Letter, it was given me by Costard, and sent me (Variorum 106)

~ **this Letter** [(Latin) *litterae*: 'an epistle', wp (L) *littera*: 'a letter of the alphabet'; (English) *letter*: n.2 'A person who, or occasionally a thing which, hinders or impedes; a hinderer'—probably denoting Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester/'Letter'.], **it was given** [(L) *dare, do*: wp active particle and infinitive (E) to do, Tundo(h) /Tudor.] **me by Costard** [(E) *costard*: 'a small vessel—(English) *costard* n.2 'a small sort of a barrel'; (E) *costrel*, (Middle French) *costerel*: 'a small vessel for storing wine, water, etc.' (OED), (E) *costret*: 'a small vessel for carrying liquids'; alt. 'A large apple with prominent ribs or ridges; often described as having a pale green or red-flushed skin', < (L) *costa*: I 'a rib', II *Transf.* 'a side, a wall', hence (E) *mure*: 'a wall', *surname Mure, St Maur*.], **and sent** [(L) *mittere, praemittere*: 'to send forward'] **me** ~

~ **this Lei[ces]ter, it was awarded me by Vessel, and forwarded me** ~

~ **this Hindrance, it was a'warded me by Costa, and forwarded me** ~

Rhetoric ► The name COSTARD, in addition to the principal meaning described on p.54, may also allude to the biblical account of the creation of Eve from Adam's rib (*Genesis 2:21*), as Oxford, by his mother's account, was "none of woman born". (*Macbeth IV.1 102*)

91 from Don Armatho: I beseech you read it. (Variorum 107)

~ **from Don** [(Spanish) *don, doña*: 'is used before a person's name as a mark of respect for someone of superior social standing or an older person', likely declining as *wordplay* from (Latin) *do, dare*, as a particle of Tu-do'r, perhaps as past participle ('done')] **Armatho** [(L) *armatus*: 'armed'; alt. wp, non-rhotic A(h)mato, (L) *amatio*: 'love, caressing, fondling']; **I beseech** [wp, *timesis* (Latin) *oro, orare*: II. B 'To pray, beg, beseech'] **you** [wp, *timesis* (L) *tu*, hence *Tu* + *or'are*, ~ Tudor ~] **read** [(L) *evolvere*: II. A *Trop.* 'to unroll, i.e. to clear up', II. B 'to unfold, disclose'] **it.** ~

~ **from Done Arm'ed: I pray you unfold it.** ~

~ **from Done Armatus: I Tu-d'Or unfold it.** ~

HOLOFERNES (NATHANIEL in *First Folio*, 1623)

92 *Facile precor gelida quando pecas omnia sub umbra* (Variorum 108)

~ **Facile** [(L): *a* ‘easily, without difficulty’, *b* ‘To add intensity to an expression which already signifies a high degree: certainly, beyond dispute’] **precor** [(Latin) *precor*, (E): *I* ‘To ask, beg, entreat, pray, supplicate, request, invoke, call upon, beseech; to sue, say, or speak as a suppliant’, *II* ‘to hail, salute, or address one with a wish’] **gelida** [(L) *gelida*, (E): (of water) ‘cold as ice’, *adv.* (L) *gelide*, (E) ‘coldly, faintly, indolently’] **quando** [(L) *quando*: 2 ‘since, because, seeing that’] **pecas** [*wp* (L) *pecco*, *peccatum*: ‘to transgress, to commit a fault, to sin’, I. B In particular, ‘of sexual sin’, *II Transf.* ‘to fail, miscarry’ (L) *pecu*: ‘cattle’] **omnia** [(L) *omnia*, (E): ‘all’, ~ *totus* ~] **sub** [(L) *sub*, (English) ‘under, beneath’] **umbra** [(L) *umbra*, (E) *I. B4* ‘A shade, shady place, that which gives a shade or shadow’] ~

~ **How easy to entreat coldly when All sinners beneath the shade** ~

~ I easily entreat faintly when Tudor sinners in shadow ~

~ How easy to sue faintly when all cattle beneath the shade ~

93 *ruminat, and so forth. Ah good old Mantuan.* (Variorum 109)

~ **ruminat** [(L) *ruminat*, (E) *II Trop.* ‘a thinking over, revolving in the mind, ruminat’; (L) *v. ruminor*: *II Trop.* ‘to think over, to muse or ruminat upon’, (E) *muse*, *wp surname* (L) *Mus* (*wp Muris* / *Si-Mor*)], **and so** [*wp* (Welsh) *mor*: ‘so’, *by timesis*, *surname* (Welsh) *môr*: ‘sea’, ~ *So-mor* ~, (L) *hoc modo*: ‘in this manner’ — (L) *more*] **forth** [(L) *foras*, ‘often rendered by compound verb: ‘*e-*, *ex-*, or *pro-*’]. **Ah, good** [*wp* (L) *merx*, *merces*: ‘goods, wares’, (L) *merces*: *anagram* S(c)emer/Seymour] **old** [*wp*, *timesis*, *surnames* (L) *vetus*, *vetustus*, combining particles of Ve(re) and Tu(s)] **Mantuan** [*wp*, *timesis*, *surnames* (E) *man*, (L) *vir* + *timesis*, *surname* tu(dor) + -an, *suffix*: *etym.* ‘of or belonging to’; *II* ‘of or belonging to Mantua (city, birth place of Virgil) or to Virgil’, *meton.* Mantuan = Virgilian.]. ~

~ **Muse, and more so. Ah, Mercy, en-During Man-Tu-an.** ~

Rhetoric ► If we are meant to discover certain deficiencies in the poetic sensibilities of NATHANIEL (as compared to HOLOFERNES) confusion by the former over the true genius of Mantua—*i.e.* Virgil rather than Baptista Spagnolo (Mantuanus)—would be evidence. Both wrote eclogues, but Virgil wrote that towering epic of the Latin tongue, the *Aeneid*. Perhaps we are meant to see beyond the pleasant pastorals of Spagnolo, to the politically subversive *Aeneid*. And so, the reader should watch for poets called ‘Mantuanus’; that is, to carefully keep watch over an Ox(ford) lest he invade a neighbors corn field (see: Mantuanus, *Eclogue 1*). Nonetheless, Spagnolo evidently had admirers as seen in a letter from Guilhelmus Lamp to Ortuinus Gratius (*c. 1517*): ~ “Baptista of Mantua, who in twice as much, is better than Virgil” ~. It may be that Oxford was very familiar with Spagnolo’s Art, and an admirer as well. Otherwise, I suggest that Edward Tudor-Seymour is the great poet, while his rival and *alter ego*, Edward de Vere, has a lesser (Leices’er) claim.

(See: Mustard, Wilfred P., “On the Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus”, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assoc.*, Vol 40, 1909, pp.151-83.)

Furness comments: “Sir Nathaniel’s Latin may have been intentionally made slipshod as a characteristic.” The likelihood of an intended pun should be considered. In “ruminat” is the notion of turning ideas over in one’s mind — to ‘Murate’, Room-inate, “as it vVere”.

► Andrew Lang (1844-1912) commented on the mention of ‘Mantuan’: “Holofernes has this essential mark of the pedant, that he loves his learning less for its own sake than because he meets other people to whom it is caviar.” (Variorum 1.109, p.150)

This judgement continues to the present. However, knowing the beheaded General represents the writer’s father, who is elsewhere presented as KING HAMLET, should have us reconsider. As I’ve noted, HOLOFERNES could easily be a lively portrait when seen in a different light.

94 *I may speak of thee as the traveler doth of Venice:* (Variorum 110)

~ **I may** [(L) *fortasse*: ‘perhaps’, *Ib* ‘it may be that, perhaps’, hence wordplay (?) on (L) *heres ex asse*: ‘sole heir’ — (L) *fortis*, (Fr) *fort*: ‘strong’, *timesis*, *surname* (Beau)fort (as the royal line to Tudor) +

(ME) asse: ‘she ass’, hence ~ ‘a fool’ ~, (L) morio.] **speak** [(L) for: ‘to say, speak’] **of thee** [(L) tu] **as** [(L) ut, anagram (L) tu] **the traveler** [(L) viator: ‘a wayfarer, traveller’, (L) vector: ‘one that bears, carries, or conveys anything’, i.e. related to the Earls of Warwick, hence Northumberland and Leicester as ‘Bears’, (E) conveyor: 3 ‘One who transfers property’] **doth** [3rd sing. (E) does, v. do, wp, timesis ‘to do(r), Tudor.] **of Venice** [(L) Venetia: ‘the country of the Veneti’, likely here and elsewhere as ‘land of Venus’, or ‘House of Venus’, [(Welsh) tŷ: ‘house’]—*Othello, The Moor of Venice* = ~ Two-d’Or, The Maur of Venus ~]: ~

~ **I Will, perhaps, Say of thee as the Bear[er] Does of Venus:** ~

~ **I Will, perhaps, Say of thee as the conveyor Does of Venus:** ~

- In ‘Shakespeare’, ‘The Bear’ is a consistent epithet for male members of the Dudley family.

95 *Vemchie, Vencha; que non te vnde, que non te perreche.* (Variorum III)

~ *Vemchie* [wp (Mid. English) wenchel: ‘A child of either sex’; also, a servant or slave; also, a common woman’], *Vencha* [(E) wench, (ME) wenche: 1a ‘A girl, maid, young woman; a female child’]; *Que* [(Italian) Chi: ‘who’] *non* [(It) non: ‘(does) not’] *te* [(It) te: ‘you’] *vnde* [(L) unde: ‘from which place, whence’, ‘which, where, what, wordplay (E) wound, forms (ME) wund, wnde: 1a ‘a hurt, injury’], *que* [(L) chi: ‘that’] *non te perreche* [? < (L) perrectus, perrecta < (L) pergo: ‘to proceed’, hence ‘succeed, follow’].

~ **Woman-child, that knows not from whence, knows not to where you proceed.** ~

~ **Woman-child, who does not wound you, does not proceed from you.** ~

~ Venus, Venus, who does not wound you, does not succeed you. ~

Rhetoric ► Since the significance of these lines has found so much disagreement in the *Variorum*, I might as well throw in two cents worth. The line shown above is as found in the *First Folio*. Lewis Theobald (1688-1744) noted an “Italian proverb beneath this gibberish”; he was, no doubt, correct. The lines have been emended in most modern editions of ‘Shakespeare’, as shown below. I suggest, however, the Artist has used (rhetorical) *barbarismus* to say something acute concerning the Elizabethan ‘Venus’, i.e. of Elizabeth the Queen, and of himself. As such, it resembles barbarisms of the LORDS and SOLDIERS who interrogate PARROLES (*All’s Well That Ends Well IV 3*); these lines contain important information if we can ‘delve them to their root’. The printers could not have botched so many words without the Editor’s say so. Particularly “Vemchie, Vencha” must represent something that might be confused with “Venezia”. But perhaps the V is intended to be taken for the sound of (E) W, as it is in Latin. Accounting for the variability of Middle English spellings we might substitute ‘Wenchel, Wenche’ = ~ Child, Woman ~ or ‘Woman-child’, or even ‘Venus, Venus’ as the hidden meaning behind the apparent “Venezia, Venezia”. Similarly “vnde” might sound like ‘wound’. And “perreche” is a slight corruption of (L) *perrecte*, < *pergo*: ‘to proceed’. So, rather than a gratuitous *non-sequitur*, the verse may offer an indirect apology for revealing a truth. If the PRINCESS has killed a *pricket* (the writer)—a second year De’Or (deer)—and seen her HOLOFERNES beheaded, well perhaps she too may suffer a little for a greater good.

- Lewis Theobald corrected ‘Shakespeare’; first note his Italian, then his (free) English:

(It) “*Vinegia, Vinegia, qui non te vede, non te pregia*”

(E) “*Venice, Venice, he who has never seen thee, hast thee not in esteem.*”

George Steevens (1736-1800), an early *Variorum*-like commenter, offered his (free) translations:

(It) “*Venetia, Venetia, chi non te vedi, ei non te pregia...*”

(E) “*Venice, Venice, none thee unseen can prize...*”

But the punch, unmentioned by ‘Shakespeare’, may be the point of the Bard’s musing:

(It) “*Ma chi t’ha troppo veduto, te dispregia.*”

(E) “*[But] Who thee has seen too much, will thee despise.*”

From Shakespeare’s characterization of Venus in “*Venus and Adonis*”, we gather Oxford saw

too much of the Queen (*Venus*)—and, as Chaucer says: ~ familiarity breeds contempt ~.

- 96 Old Mantuan, old Mantuan! Who understandeth thee not, (Variorum 112)
 ~ **Old** [(*Latin antiquus*: I ‘old, ancient’, II *Transf.* ‘past, gone by, former’)] **Mantuan** [*wp, timesis, surname Man*: (*L vir* + *timesis, surname Tu*: Tu(dor) + -an, *suffix*: ‘belonging to’; Mantuan likely pertains to (*L vir*: ‘a man’, ‘a man of courage’, (*L vis, vires (plural)*: ‘force, power, virtue’)], **old Mantuan! Who** [(*L quis, quid*; *wp (L) uter*: ‘whichsoever (of two)’, ~ whosoever ~] **understandeth** [(*L intelligere, comprehendere*; (*L amplecti*: ‘to grasp with the intellect’, II. A *Trop.* ‘To embrace in mind or knowledge’, playing on (*L amplius*: ‘more’)] **thee** [(*L tu*] **not**, ~
 ~ **Vere Vir’tu-an, Vieux Vere’tu-an! Who comprehends thee not**, ~
 ~ **Bygone Vere’Tu-an, past Man’Tu-an! He who More’s Tu’ton**, ~

Rhetoric ► Whether “Old Mantuan” is Spagnolo or Virgil, the question of hidden meaning prevails. (see Pashalis, Michael; *Virgil’s Aeneid, Semantic Relations and Proper Names*, 1997, Clarendon Press).

- 97 loves thee not. Ut, re, sol, la, mi, fa. Under pardon, Sir (Variorum 113)
 ~ **loves** [*wp (Latin) amor, surname a’ More*, hence a tautology.] **thee** [(*L tu*] **not** [*anagram ’ton, (French) tutor, tu-to(h)*]. **Ut, re, sol, la, mi, fa** [*wp, anagram Mi la sol re Tu-fa* = ~ *I am the sole prince Tu-do(r)* ~]. **Under** [(*L hac condicione*: ‘under this condition’)] **pardon** [(*L venia*: I ‘indulgence, kindness, mercy, grace, favor’], ~
 ~ **a’Mores thee not. How so a King, my son of Tu-do(r)? By pardon, Sir**, ~
 ~ **a’Mores thee not. How [should he be] King, my Son of Tудо[r]? By pardon, Sir!** ~

Rhetoric ► The *Variorum* for *Love’s Labor’s Lost* notes the following from British antiquarian Francis Douce (1757-1834) which would agree with reports of Oxford’s excellence in music (see p.151):

“Nathaniel’s notes do not seem to have been selected haphazard”. “These six notes form, with the tonic, the most harmonious intervals, and in the same order, indicated by Bacon, in his *Sylva Sylvarum*.” “The Concords in Music which are Perfect, or Semiperfect, between the Unison and the Diapason, are the Fifth, which is the most Perfect; the Third next; and the Sixth, which is more harsh ...”

This reference to the *solfege* system appears to secure this passage to HOLOFERNES. The *Variorum* notes another instance in ‘Shakespeare’ spoken by EDMUND in *King Lear* 1.2 137 — “*Fa, Sol, La, Me*”, ~ *Make Son of Me* ~ ; this interpretation answers to the complaint against his father, who openly and too lightly raises the subject of EDMUND’s bastardy in public. And I would add the significant example by HORTENSIO (read by BIANCA) in *The Taming of the Shrew* III.1 72-77. Music theorist Guido of Arezzo (c.991-1033) devised the solfege—*Ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la, etc.* based on a melody used for the *Hymnus in Jonnem*—Hymn to St John (the Baptist)—thought to have been written by Paul the Deacon (c.720’s-98). The same melody had been used for Horace’s *Ode 4.11*, which describes a courtier who aspires to a Lady beyond his reach. Admiral Thomas Seymour, as HOLOFERNES, seems to fit the scheme well—and he would take an interest in things beheaded.

It was Oxford’s mother (not father, as in *Lear*) who in Royal Court called Oxford “bastard”.

► ~ **On condition of pardon**, Sir, what are the contents? ~ Rather than a disjointed or incoherent question, the contents—the soul—follows from the assertion found playfully arranged within the musical notes (see above). If the Queen will pardon the writer (for *her* transgression!) he may be the sole Prince Tudor.

- 98 what are the contents? or rather, as Horace says in his: (Variorum 114)
 ~ **what are** [*wp (E) are/R(egius)*, affixed to the Christian names of royals to indicate (*Latin regius, rex, regina.*)] **the contents** [(*L contentum, pl. contenta*: 1a ‘That which is contained’)]? **or rather** [*wp (L)*

vel: I. 2 ‘or rather’, (L) *vel* (*pron.* ~ (E) *well* ~, metonym for Tu-d’Or.), repeated to produce Two-d’Or, eg. *All’s Well That Ends Well* = ~ Tout’ Or That Ends Or ~; alt. “or rather” might yield two possibilities: (Fr) *or*: ‘gold’/Tud’or, or (E) *rother*: ‘an ox’], as **Horace** [Horatius Flaccus (65-8 BC), ‘the famous Augustan poet.’] **says in his** [*i.e.* ‘contents’, probably referring to the Satires of Horace.]: ~

~ *what is contained? Or, Rother? — as Horace says in his*: ~

- “or rather” or “Or, Rother?” By etymological wordplay, the second choice reveals the nature of a soul turned from gold to ox—Tud’Or to Oxford—a restatement of his of-told tale.

99 “What my soul verses.” (should be NATHANIEL) (*Variorum 114*)

~ “**What my soul** [(Latin) *animus*: I ‘The rational soul in man’, II. A1 ‘the reason, intellect, mind’] **verses** [(L) *verto, versus*: ‘to turn, turn about’, ‘to turn—*i.e.* alter, change, transform; alt. (L) *versus*: I ‘a furrow’, a row of earth/terra overturned; II. B ‘a line of writing, a verse’, hence, as (OED) v.1 ‘To compose or make verses; to versify’; (E) verses, a noun as annotated in most volumes, may be seen as a verb by *amphiboly*: ‘grammatical ambiguity’; alt. (L) *verso, verto*: ‘to turn, wind’, I. B ‘to turn, twist, bend’, (L) *versabilis*: ‘changeable, mutable, versatile’]” ~

~ **What! my Soul turns.** ~

~ *What my sol transforms?* ~

- ~ *What my soul varies.* ~ , ~ *What my sol versus.* ~ , ~ *What my sol Vere-ies.* ~ , ~ *What my Son Vere-ies?* ~ , *What, my Son transforms?* ~ , ~ **What, does my Son transform?** ~ A metamorphosis! A *vVere*-itable meta-*Maur*’phosis!

Rhetoric ► HOLOFERNES interjects a comment from Horace that says more than it seems. This device, *Parenthesis* or *Interjectio*, is used by Oxford /‘Shakespeare’ as an ‘aside’, expressing a relevant idea but one whose importance may not be immediately recognized. Read it again and again.

NATHANIEL (HOLOFERNES in F1)

100 Ay, sir, and very learned. (*Variorum 115*)

~ **Ay** [*wp* (Latin) *vero*: ‘in truth, truly, surely’, alt. (English) I, (L) *ego*: ‘personal pronoun’], **sir** [*wp*, *surname* (L) *bone vir*], **and very** [*wp*, *surname* Vere;] **learned** [(L) *eruditus*: anagram ~ *id est* Tudur ~; alt. (L) *discere, ediscere*: ‘to learn by heart, to commit to memory’]. ~

~ **Vere-ily, good Vir, and Ver’e Memmor-ized.** ~

~ *Vere-ily, good Vir, and Vere that is Tudur.* ~

Bio. ► NATHANIEL (characterizing 16th Earl of Oxford) appreciates that BEROWNE (Tudor-Seymour) was brought up as the child of ‘de Vere’, and that he is thus ‘very learned’/*Vere eruditus*—else ~ **Vere, id est Tudur** ~. This does not mean he was truly the child of John and Margery de Vere. This ties several characters together as iterations of the same historical person—the writer.

HOLOFERNES

101 Let me hear a staff, a stanze, a verse. *Lege domine.* (*Variorum 116-17*)

~ **Let** [(Latin) *sino, sinere*: ‘to allow, permit’] **me hear** [(L) *audire*: ‘to understand by hearing’; (L) *accipio, accipere*: I ‘to take to oneself’, *Ib* ‘to take possession of’; *wp* (E) *heir*] **a staff** [(OED) *staff*: 19a ‘A line of verse’, 19b ‘A stanza or set of lines’; 3b ‘A spear, lance, or similar armed weapon’], **a stanze** [(English) *stanza*: ‘A group of lines of verse’; (Italian) *stanza*: ‘In Italy, an apartment..room’, (E) *room*: 6b ‘A holding of moorland’], **a verse** [*wp* (L) *aversio*: *rhetoric* ‘a turning away, from the theme before them (to another)’—this will be named “Apostrophas” in line 118; alt. (E) *verse*: 1a ‘A succession of words arranged according..to rules of prosody; one of the lines of a poem’]. **Lege** [I. (L) *lego*: II ‘to appoint by a last will or testament, to leave or bequeath as a legacy’; 2. (L) *lego, legere*: I ‘to bring together, to gather, collect’; I. 5 ‘to take to oneself unjustly, to carry off, steal, purloin’; II *Trop.* ‘to read or peruse’] **domine** [(L) *dominus*: ‘a master, possessor, ruler, lord, owner’]. ~

~ *Allow me to heir a Spear, a Moor, a'Verse. Bequeath to one, my lord.* ~
 ~ *Allow me to heir a Spear, a Moor [self] averse. Gather them, my lord.* ~
 ~ *Allow me to heir a Spear, a Moor, a Vere. Read, my lord.* ~

Rhetoric ► HOLOFERNES / Th. St Maur emphasizes by *synonymia*; but as with *hendiadys*, in which alternatives also amplify an idea, options may signify subtle shades of meaning with dramatically different consequences. HOLOFERNES is intent on hearing of an heir—a Speare, Maur, or Vere. The words are ambiguous; we understand that a single choice may be made among the three, or the heir may be all three at once. He seems to be aware that NATHANIEL may take more than is his due. In the relationship of sons to fathers, we discover the question of “colorable colors” or ~ colorable collars ~, and HOLOFERNES will speak of it once more, near the end at *IV. 2 145*.

Article 6: BEROWNE's *Aversio*. (*LLL IV.2 101-142*)

~ *By way of Succession, the Writer's meaning hath Miscarried.* ~ (*IV.2 136*)

NATHANIEL [*Reads BEROWNE's poem — refer to Latin or French?*][*Oxford to Elizabeth /Rosaline*]

102 “If Love make me forsworn, how shall I swear to love? (*Variorum 118*)

~ “**If** [*wp, timesis (Latin) si*, will join (English) love, (*L amor*, to produce *Si a' Mor*, ~ *Sea-Mor* ~; (*L caritas*: ‘dear’—both meanings become essential metonyms in ‘Shakespeare’ for surnames Seymour and Tudor. < (*French) si*] **love** [(*L amor*, (*Fr amour*] **make** [(*L facio, facere*: ‘to do, to make’, *Tudo(r)*; *alt. (Fr) faire*: ‘to do’] **me forsworn** [(*L abiurare*: ‘to renounce an oath; forswear’, *wp (E) forswear* = (*L for*: ‘to say’ + wear: *homonym (L) Ver, vir*, (*E were*: ‘man’; < (*Fr) parjure*: ‘forsworn’, *wp, etym. (Fr) par*: ‘By, through, out of, from’ + (*Fr) juré, (L) jus, juris*: ‘right, law, justice’, hence ‘by right’], **how** [(*L quomodo; anagram ut: timesis Tu*; < (*Fr) comment, comme*] **shall** [< (*Fr) devoir*: ‘to be obliged to, to have to’, expressing ‘compulsion, duty’, (*Fr) vouloir*: ‘to will’, (*L mos, moris, more*: ‘manner, custom, way’, ‘self-will’, expressing desire.] **I swear** [(*L iurare, affirmare, adfirmare*, (*E affirm*: 5 ‘To swear (an oath, etc.)’, *wp (E) affirm* = ~ towards *Dure* ~, hence *Tu-dur*. < (*Fr) prêter serment, faire serment*: ‘to make an oath’, *wp (Fr) faire*: ‘to do(r)’ + *anagram serment*: *Sr Ment /St Maur*.] **to love** [*wp (L) amor*]?” ~

< (*L*) ~ *If a' More Does make me for 's vVere, how shall I en'Dure a' More?* ~

< (*L*) ~ *Si a' More Does make me for 's-vVere, how de' Voir Too Dure to a' More?* ~

< (*Fr*) ~ *Si a' Mour by law make me for 's-vVere, how shall I Say Maur to a' Mour?* ~

Rhetoric ► Watch for **Apostrophe** — **Aversio**. There is aversion to a Vere, but we will not discover this fully until l.129, when HOLOFERNES reads the superscript.

► The name Berowne likely alludes to two distinct uses of (*E*) rowne: *n. 1* ‘A secret, a mystery’, *3* ‘Counsel..of a private or secret nature’, and (*E*) rowne, round: ‘something circular in form’; ‘a ring, a ring-shaped object’. (*L orbis, wp, anagram bis*: ‘twice, two’ + *or*: (*L aurum, orum*, also (*E or*: ‘ring’, ‘globe’, ‘earth’, is a frequent metonym for Tudor. BASSANIO (Oxford) at *Merchant of Venice V.1* asks PORTIA (Elizabeth R): [If you] “would conceive for what I gave the ring”—
 ~ [If you] “would acknowledge [my birth] for what I gave Tudor ...” ~

► BEROWNE's love for ROSALINE is natural familial love. It represents the writer's affinity / *a'Mour*, towards his bloodline. His blood descends through *Amor, Amos 'Venus' (euphemism'Love')* and is an historic metonym for Queen Elizabeth and thus the Tudors. The ‘Line of the Rose’ is another iteration of the kinship between the fictional PRINCESS and her Pricket. This also supports MOTE, the page of ARMADO, as ‘the earth (*Terra*) that clings to roots’. As plant roots cling to their earth, so too does the child in ADRIANO de ARMADO cling to his Rosaline. BEROWNE has chosen the question of swearing an oath, forswearing, vows, and *fidelis*, as the subject of his poem. This has a historical basis. It was hoped by Catholic recusants in Louvain, Flanders, that Oxford/BEROWNE would lend support for the overthrow of Leicester and Burghley overlords in

London. He left for the Low Countries about 30 June, 1574 and returned to England 28 July. On returning, he assured the Queen of his faithfulness to her—that he was reconnoitering the expatriate force and testing their strength, and never considering treason. See Alan H. Nelson's *Monstrous Adversary*, pp.108-16, for his ill-characterized account of Oxford, "one of the next heirs apparent" (111), and his 'flight' to Louvain.

The name Elizabeth means in Hebrew something like 'God is my Oath', or 'God has sworn'. It appears that 'Shakespeare' / Oxford has raised the question of the truthfulness of her name—whether it is Elizabeth herself, and not the *filis de Lis* (*fidelis*), who is unfaithful.

Rhetoric ► BEROWNE's sonnet is modeled on the Alexandrine verses of the French *Pléiade* poets, having a strict hexameter structure with a caesura, or break, at about the middle of each metrical line.

Rhetoric ► Which of the above solutions yields more apt meaning—that out of Latin, or of French? There is no doubt of the "race of Shakespeare's mind" ("To the..AUTHOR", Ben Jonson, *First Folio*, II.66-7)—the (*L*) *cursus* and *genus* of his mind. The course of his thoughts leans to royal succession; the proper genus is always St Maur, but there is some altered significance in choosing one reference language or the other. Let's continue in this manner through BEROWNE's poem before deciding.

As an afterthought, (*L*) *cursus* combines the actual course of his mind which is of cur and sus: (E) *cur*: 'a dog, always depreciative', thus (*L*) *canis*: *IA* 'a dog', *IB1* 'a shameless, vile person', *IB2* 'a follower, dog, creature'—Oxford's epithet for the Grey family, *cf.* (*L*) *canus*: 'white', *cani*: 'grey hairs', *wp* *heirs*); and (*L*) *sus*: 'a swine, pig, boar', emblem of Oxford family. Hence, though the 16th Earl of Oxford was a strong supporter of the Tudors, he was somehow subdued by the Grey-Dudley faction, and forced at times, like Oxford/'Shakespeare', to perform in their interests.

103 Ah, never faith could hold if not to beauty vowed! (Variorum 119)

~ **Ah** [(*L*) *interjection* 'ah, aha', used in various senses as we do in English; likewise for French.], **never** [*wp* (E) *never*, ne: *negative particle* 'not' + ever: 'in every case, at all times', *wp* *surname* E. Vere; (*L*) *nunquam*, *minime vero*; (*Fr*) *jamais*] **faith** [(*L*) *fides*—*wp* (*Fr*) *filis de*: 'son of', (*L*) *fidelis*: *II* 'strong, firm, durable', 'faithful, sincere'; (*Fr*) *foi*, *fidélité*] **could** [(*L*) *possum*, (*Fr*) *pouvoir*] **hold** [(*L*) *durare*: 'to endure', (*Fr*) *durer*, *endurer*] **if** [(*L*) *si*, (*Fr*) *si*] **not to beauty** [*metonym* (*L*) *venustas*, *meton.* (*Fr*) *beauté*: (person and attribute), signifying Venus as Elizabeth Tudor and the House of Beaufort.] **vowed** [(*Fr*) *væu*, *vouer*, *wp* *dévouer*: ~ *devorer*: 'to swallow or eat up voraciously'; (*L*) *devovere*: 'to vow, devote', *wp* (*L*) *consumo*: 'to eat up, consume', *wp* (*L*) *con*: 'together with, in union' + *summa*: *II* 'the sum, height, completion, perfection', *worplay* ~ Summer ~ St Maur]! ~

~ **Ah, no Vere son of Liz could en'Dure if not to Beau-Ty de'Ve're'd!** ~

Rhetoric ► This transitive pun, (*Fr*) *filis de* < (*L*) *fides*, suggests Latin and French are at play together. The English words hold, beauty, and vowed play a little better with French analogues, though we may refer to either language for explanation. BEROWNE's conclusion examines his self interest; he rationalizes the awkward position into which he has been thrown.

104 Though to myself forsworn, to thee I'll faithful prove; (Variorum 120)

~ **Though** [(*French*) *quoique*, *bien que*; (*L*) *quamvis*: 'Ever so, ever so much', 'however much'] **to myself forsworn** [(*Fr*) *parjure*: 'forsworn', *wp*, *etym.* (*Fr*) *par*: 'By, through, out of, from' + (*Fr*) *juré*, (*L*) *jus*, *juris*: 'right, law, justice', hence 'by right' (*L*) *abiurare*: 'to renounce an oath; forswear', *wordplay* (E) forswear = (*L*) *for*: 'to say' + wear: *homonym* (*L*) *Ver*, *vir*, (E) were: 'man'], **to thee** [(*Fr*) *tu*; hence ~ twice *Tu* ~ = Tu-deux; *wp* (*L*) *duo*] **I'll faithful** [(*L*) *fidelis*: ~ (*Fr*) *filis de Lis* ~, *wp* 'child of Liz'; (*Fr*) *fidèle*] **prove** [(*Fr*) *prouver*, *démontrer*, *vérifier*—*démontrer* likely puns on (*MFr*) *monstrer*: 'to manifest, show' (*manifest*), (*Fr*) *prétendre*: 'to claim'—a (E) *pretender*: 'a claimant'; (*L*) *probo*, *probare*: 'to show a thing to be good, serviceable, right' *wp* (*L*) *ostendo*, *ostendere*: *II. A* 'to show, disclose, manifest']; ~

~ [How] **E.Vere so of myself say Vere, to you I'll de Monstr-ate a child of Liz,** ~

~ **Though E.Vere so of myself say Vere, tu-deux I'll claim [to be] a child of Liz,** ~

~ **Though E.Vere so of myself say Vere, to you I'll pretend a child of Liz,** ~

Rhetoric ► BEROWNE's poetic speech sounds, at times, like artistic conceit, but he means what he says.
Bio. To uphold the 'Line of the Rose', he must forswear or renounce his own identity. It's an act of self-sacrifice meant to shield ROSALINE—his Queen and mother; yet he has reserved the right to preserve his name in obscure testimonials. As a voice of the Writer, he notes in the following line that ROSALINE does not feel the same sense of obligation towards him.

Rhetoric ► The L in "Love" (*l.101*) is capitalized in the *First Folio*. Words that are so printed usually indicate a surname or title hiding as a more general proper noun—the 'idea' of Love, for example. So 'Love'—(*Fr*) *amour* / a'Maur—is the likely substitution for the writer himself. Several other words in each verse can be found rooted in the poets name, and I have capitalized them.

105 Those thoughts to me were Oaks, to thee like Osiers bowed. (*Variorum* 121-22)

~ **Those** [(*L*) *haec*; (*Fr*) *ces*, *wp*, *timesis*, *surname* Sey(mour)] **thoughts** [(*Fr*) *rêverie*: 'musing', 'a thoughtful abstraction'; (*L*) *mens*: 'thought, plan, purpose, design';] **to me were** [*wp*, *surname* Vere, *v* *pron.* as *w* (*Latin*), hence *VVere*] **oaks** [(*Fr*) *chêne*: 'Oak', *fig.* 'a sturdy man'; (*L*) *quercus*: 'oak tree, sacred to Jupiter'—as an emblem of Tu-*dur*, (*OED*) *oak*: 2a 'the wood..of the oak; frequently..with reference to hardness, durability'], **to thee** [*wp* (*L*) *duo*, (*Fr*) *tu*; hence ~ twice *Tu* ~ = Tu-deux.] **like** [(*L*) *similis*, *wp* SiMir'is (?)] **osiers** [(*L*) *vimen*: *wp*, *v* *pron.* as *w*, hence ~ women ~, 'osier, a pliant twig', (*Fr*) *osier*] **bowed** [(*Fr*) *tordu*, *wp*, *anagram* *Tudor*: 'twisted, distorted'; (*Fr*) *virer*: 'to turn, twist, turn about', *cf.* (*L*) *verso*, *versare*: 'to turn, twist'; *alt.* (*L*) *flectere*, *flecto*: 'to bend, bow', *I. B2a* 'to bend (in opinion or will)']. ~
 ~ **Those re-Veries to me VVere Dure, Tu-deux like women Tordu**, ~
 ~ **Those men to me VVere en-Dur'ing, to you like Tudor women**. ~

Bio. ► I suspect Oxford means no slight against women—only One particular ~ *femme tordu* ~ , ~ Woman bending ~ , *alt.*, *anagram* ~ *une matrone tordu* ~ : ~ A Tudor Mother ~ ; *alt.* 'inflecting'—(*L*) *inflectare*: 'to twist, pervert'; the perfect wordplay of (*Fr*) *tordu* and (*Fr*) *virer* is lost with alternate interpretations. Another example of what seems a general depreciation but that is in fact leveled at the same mother is a comment by the EARL OF WESTMORLAND in *1 King Henry IV* *l.1* 44-6:

“Such beastly shameless transformation,
 By those Welshwomen done as may not be
 Without much shame retold or spoken of.”

Oxford/'Shakespeare' speaks of mutilation to the bodies of English soldiers by Welsh women following the battle of Homildon Hill (1402). His sly, double-edged, jest aims at the transformation of his own identity by Princess Elizabeth Tudor and her Cecil advisor. The shame to which he alludes might belong to the Princess, for behaviors that led to pregnancy—or to the false life led by her son (and herself) thereafter.

106 Study, his bias, leaves and makes his book thine eyes, (*Variorum* 123)

~ **Study** [(*French*) *étude*: 'study', (*Latin*) *intueor*: 'to examine closely', *wp* in Tu-d'or, ~ 's Tudy ~, (*Fr*) *étude*, *wp* a' Tude(h); (*L*) *inquiero*: 'to seek after, inquire into'] **his bias** [(*Fr*) *inclinaison*: 'slope, pitch', foreshadows *LLL* IV. 3 1-18 (see *Part I*, this essay) and the discussion of *pitch*; (*Latin*) *inclinatio*, (*E*) *bias*: 2a 'the curving course taken by a bowl (game of bowls) when rolled', likely refers to the eccentricity of the bowl, *i.e.* not concentric with *metonym Orbis*: 'circle, ring, globe', 'earth, *Terra*' = ~ Or-twice ~, Two-d'Or; *wp* (*L*) *bi*: 'two'+ *as*: 'unity', 'measure', *i.e.* ~ two entities ~ , ~ two measures ~ , two sums ~ ; (*Fr*) *porté*: 'inclined, prone, disposed', *wp*, *surname*, *timesis* (*Fr*) *porte*: 'door', Bi-d'or, Two-dor, (*Fr*) *pente*: *fig.* 'propensity, bent', *wp* (*E*) *pent*: 'Shut up within narrow limits, closely confined'] **leaves** [(*L*) *discedo*, *discedere*: I 'To part, divide, separate', II 'to depart from'] **and makes** [(*L*) *facere*, (*Italian*) *fare*, (*Fr*) *faire*: 'to do, to make'] **his book** [(*Latin*) *liber*: II. B 'a book, work, treatise', *wp* de Vere] **thine eyes** [(*L*) *oculus*: I. 4 'An eye, bud, bourgeon', offspring.], ~

~ **A' Tude[h], his Two-door, departs and makes his l'Vere thine buds**, ~

~ *And Tude[h], his inclination, parts and makes his l'Vere thine buds, ~*

Rhetoric ► “Bias” likely refers to irregular birth, with wordplay on (L) *bi*: ‘two, twice’ + (L) *as, asse*: ‘unity, a unit’, ‘portion’, hence, of inheritance: ~ two portions ~, ~ a double heir ~; *i.e.* Oxford’s birth was not ‘concentric’ with ‘The Ring’ (Tudor). Likewise, he exists as two measures, two entities, or ‘two sums’.

107 Where all those pleasures live, that art would comprehend. (Variorum 124-25)

~ **Where** [(Latin) *ubi*: ‘where from’, (French) *où*, *wp*, metonym (Fr) *ou*: ‘or’; (E) wherein, (L) *ubi*, in quo] **all** [(L) *omnis, totus*, (Fr) *tout + or = Toutor*, Tudor] **those pleasures** [(Latin) *voluptas, gaudium, delectatio, laetitia, iucunditas*; (Fr) *plaisir, agrément, gré*: ‘Will, wish; liking, pleasure’ (Grey?)] **live** [(L) *vivere*, *wp de Vere*, *wp (Fr) vivre: surname Vere*] **that art** [(Latin) *versutus: II* ‘cunning, crafty, wily, sly, deceitful’, (E) *versute*: ‘cunning, crafty, wily’, (French) *astuce*: ‘craft, art, cunning’, (Fr) *ruse*: ‘guile, craft, cunning’; trick, wile’] **would comprehend** [(L) *comprehendere, complecti*: (L) *com*: ‘with, together with’ + (L) *plecto: I* ‘to plait, braid, interweave’ *II. A Trop*. ‘to seize upon, enfold’, *II. B* ‘to understand’]. ~

~ *VV[h]ere Tudor-Greys veer, that Ver-suit guile would seize upon. ~*

~ *VVere Tudor-Greys Vere that cunning would interweave. ~*

Rhetoric ► Play between the (L) *vere*, *pron. were*, and the (Fr) *ver*, with *v* as in English.

108 If knowledge be the mark, to know thee shall suffice: (Variorum 126)

~ **If** [(Latin) *si*] **knowledge** [(L) *scientia*: ‘knowledge, as opposed to belief; learning, erudition’; (Fr) *connaissance: wp* (E) *con: v.I* ‘to acknowledge or express’ + (E) *nascence*: ‘birth’, hence ~ to express or acknowledge birth’ ~] **be** [(L) *sum*, (Fr) *être, faire*, etc.] **the mark** [(L) *scopus*: ‘a goal, target’; *alt. (L) nota: I. B8* ‘distinguishing mark, distinctive feature’, *I. B10* ‘a brand’, (L) *signum*: ‘token, sign’; (Mid. Fr) *marc*: ‘the main point’, ‘the material, what is essential’], **to know** [(Fr) *connaître*: ‘to know’, ‘to be acquainted with (someone)’, ‘to distinguish, recognize’, *wp (Fr) connaître, connu*: ‘known’ + *naître*: ‘to be born,] **thee** [(L) *tu*, (Fr) *tu*] **shall** [(Fr) *vouloir*: ‘to will’, (L) *mos, moris, more*: ‘manner, custom, way’, ‘self-will’, expressing desire.] **suffice** [(L) *sufficere*: ‘to be sufficient, meet the need, satisfy’; (Fr) *satisfaire*: ‘persuade, convince’]: ~

~ *If acknowledged birth be the Mark, to learn birth of Tu’ More satisfies: ~*

Rhetoric ► It is ROSALINE—the line of the Rose—manifest in the writer’s mother, Elizabeth R, who may convince the reader that we’ve found the heir to Tudor. He is BEROWNE: (E) *be-*, *prefix*: ‘all about, throughout’ + *rowne*: (ME—1500’s) = ‘round’, playing on the (L) *orbis*: ‘round, circular, ring-shaped’. This is the same (L) *Orbis*: Two-d’Or, that BASSANIO gave away unwillingly to Balthasar (PORTIA), ‘a doctor of laws’ from Padua (*Merchant of Venice IV.2, V.1*):

BASSANIO

“If you did know to whom I gave the **ring**,

If you did know for whom I gave the **ring**,

And would conceive for what I gave the **ring**,

And how unwillingly I left the **ring**

When nought would be accepted but the **ring** ...”

you did, *wp (L) facere*: ‘to do’

ring, (L) *orbis: bis*: ‘twice’ + Or, Tudor

gave, *wp (L) do, dano*: ‘to give’

conceive, (L) *concipio*: ‘become pregnant’

unwillingly, *wp ~ without Will ~, (L) More*

would < *will*, *wp (L) mos, moris* > Simor

Why, it’s a Vere-itable study in Tudor-Seymour! “Would” plays on the (L) *voluntas*: ‘will, desire, inclination’ and (L) *moris*: ‘the will, humor’, ‘manners, morals’. “Know” plays on (L) *certo*: ‘with certainty, surely’, playing on (L) *rato*: ‘certainly, surely’, and *rattus*: ‘a rat’, playing on (L) *muris*: ‘a rat, mouse, weasel, ermine’.

109 Well learnèd is that tongue that well can thee commend, (Variorum 127)

~ **Well** [*wp, timesis (L) vel*: ‘or’, as both epithet and metonym for Tudor and Seymour; repeated in 1.108 indicates Two-d’Or; *wp, timesis (Fr) or*: ‘But, now, well’] **learnèd** [(L) *eruditus*: e-, *prefix*: ‘without’ + *rudis*: ‘unformed, rough’, = ~ without roughness ~, ‘polished’; (Fr) *érudit*] **is that tongue** [(L) *lingua*:

‘tongue’, ‘language’, (Fr) *langue*: ‘tongue’, ‘language’; likely wordplay (Fr) *langue* and (Fr) *long, longue*: ‘long, drawn out, tedious’] **that well** [wp (Latin) *vel*: ‘or’, wp (L) *oro, oratio*: ‘speech’; (Fr) *or*: ‘well’, (Fr) *oratoire, éloquence*] **can thee** [(L) *tu*; (Fr) *tu*] **commend** [(L) *commendare*: ‘to commit for preservation, protection’; (Fr) *confier*: ‘to entrust, commit’, ‘place confidence in’], ~

~ *Or-Tudu’d is that langue, that Or can Two preserve*, ~

~ *Or Tutor’d is that language, that Or can Tu’ protect*, ~

► Apparently the writer wishes to recognize the difficulty of his double tongue, yet to state the necessity of protecting the Rose Line as well.

110 All ignorant that soul that sees thee without wonder; (Variorum 128)

~ **All** [wp, metonym, surname (Latin) *totus*; (Fr) *tout, tout (de)* = Tudor.] **ignorant** [(Fr) *ignorant*, wp (Fr) [à l’] *insu*: ‘unknown’, possibly punning on (Fr) *souillard*: ‘a dirty person, a pig (boar? (Fr) *verres*’); (L) *ignorans*: *ig*: ‘not, without’ + *nosco*: II. A ‘to know, recognize’, hence ‘not knowing, unaware’;] **that soul** [(L) *anima*: I ‘air, a current of air’, ~ a current heir ~, (L) *animus*: I ‘the rational soul in man’; (French) *âme*: ‘soul, spirit’, wp (Fr) *aime, aimer*: ‘to love’] **that sees** [(Latin) *intueri, in timesis in que tueri, tueor*: to see, to look upon’, hence ‘to look to, to protect’, (L) *videre*; (Fr) *voir*: pres. conditional *verrait*: wp (Fr) *verrat*: ‘boar’] **thee** [(Fr) *tu*] **without** [(L) *sine*; (Fr) *sans*] **wonder** [(L) *miratio, admiratio*: ‘wonder, admiration’, wp *Mir-ratio*; (Fr) *étonnement*: ‘astonishment’, (French) *merveille*: ‘marvel’]; ~

~ *Tudor unknown, the current heir that Tudor St Mer veils*; ~

~ *Tudor unknown, that current heir that protects in Tud’or St Maur veils*; ~

Rhetoric ► “Wonder”, here and elsewhere is a metonym for ~ First of Tudors ~, a ~ One-d’Or ~ and second to none. ROSALINE is the ‘First’ — (L) *Princeps*: ‘a Prince’. She causes astonishment. She is literally a *Mar-Vel* — (L) *mare*: ‘the sea’ + (L) *vel*: ‘or’, as emblem of (L) *orum, aurum*: ‘gold’. Such is her lineage, again suggesting she has married into the Seymour/St Maur family.

111 Which is to me some praise, that I thy parts admire. (Variorum 129)

~ **Which is to me some** [wp, *timesis*, surname Som, Seym] **praise** [(L) *amplio (amplus)*: ‘to make glorious’, (Latin) *amplius*: ‘to extend, enlarge, increase, amplify’, ‘more’; (French) *glorifier*: ‘to glorify, to honour’], **that I thy** [(L) *tuus*] **parts** [(L) *pars*, wp, surname Parrs, Katherine Parr’s] **admire** [(E) *mire*, *maur*: ‘ant’, (E) *admire*: ad-, prefix: ‘to, towards’ + (E) *mire*, *maur*: wp *mire*: ‘an ant’, perhaps with wordplay on (E) *aunt*, referring to the dowager Queen affectionately, or as a bawd (see *OED aunt*: n.1 3 ‘a female procurer, the madame of a brothel’)]. ~

~ *Which is to me Som-more, that I ad-Maur thy Parr-aunts*. ~

► Yes, the simple explanation for words seems obvious enough; and why should we look deeper? But the simple platitudes cannot catch the conscience of the Queen. Only by oblique comments of great personal significance can the Author hope to gain her attention.

112 Thy eye Jove’s lightning bears, thy voice his dreadful thunder, (Variorum 130-31)

~ **Thy eye** [(Latin) *oculus*: I ‘an eye’, I. B2 ‘A luminary, the sun and stars’, hence ~ son ~, I. B4 ‘Of plants, an eye, bud, bourgeon’, II. A ‘A principal ornament’, II. B ‘The eye of the soul, the mind’s eye’; (French) *œil*: ‘eye’, ‘bud, bourgeon’, (E) *bud*: 3b ‘a child..as a term of endearment’] **Jove’s** [(L) *Juppiter*: ‘son of Saturn, chief god among the Romans’; (Fr) *dieu*: ‘god’, wp, *timesis* d’or, d’o(h), second syllable of Tudor.] **lightning** [(L) *fulmen*: II *Trop.*, alluding to ‘fiery flashings of the eye’, I ‘a thunderbolt, destructive power’, the *Fulgur Fulmen* of *Juppiter*; (Fr) *éclairer*: ‘illumination’] **bears** [(L) *fero*: II. B7 ‘Of speech, to report, relate, make known, assert’, *alt.* ‘to bear, produce’, I. 4 ‘bear offspring’, II. A ‘to bear, carry’; (Fr) *porter*: ‘to carry, to convey’], **thy voice** [(L) *vox, vocis sonus* — *sonus*: ‘sound’, wp ~ son is ~; (Fr) *voix*: ‘voice’, ‘sound’, (Fr) *publier*: ‘to publish, make public’] **his dreadful** [(L) *dirus*: ‘portentous’, portending Tudor; (Latin) *terribilis*: ‘demanding reverence, venerable’; (Fr) *affreux*: ‘frightful, fearful’, wp ~ causing

fear ~ — Fair, (Fr) *faire*: ‘to do(r)’] **thunder** [(Latin) *tonitrus, fragor, sonitus*: ‘sound’; (Fr) *tonnerre, wp* (Old French) *ton heir*: ~ your heir ~], ~

~ **Thy son Jove’s ard’Or reports, thy son, your Port-ending heir, ~**

► The power of *Juppiter Feretrius* is invoked for the honor called (L) *spolia opima*: ‘rich spoils’ — seizing the arms and armor of an enemy king as a trophy of war. BEROWNE would have the lady ROSALINE claim arms armorial including the writer’s surname and thus his identity. Her voice, which is otherwise “music and sweet fire”, can turn to “dreadful thunder”; he proves his own descent by the same quality; but she holds the key. Why should she not use her ‘rich *terra*’ (Tudor Earls of Richmond) for the great purpose he suggests. The Queen must acknowledge her son if the ‘benign’ government of the Tudor Monarchy is to survive. That it was benign is, of course, disputed by many.

► *Feretrius* was an epithet and surname for Juppiter as ‘the subduer of enemies’, a facet of Jove’s power. In a transferred sense, // (L) *feretrius* denotes ‘of amor’. Jove was invoked to witness oaths (~ By Jove! ~), as the one sworn in this verse, and his name is played upon by our Tudor writer as *Deus Fere*, something like ~ Fair Dew’ ~ .

113 Which, not to anger bent, is music and sweet fire. (Variorum 132)

~ **Which** [(L) *venefica*: // ‘a sorceress, witch’, likely playing on Elizabeth’s descent from a known witch (Anne Boleyn), and herself capable of transforming things — her son for example; (L) *veneficium*: ‘poisoning’; (Fr) *sorcière*], **not to anger** [(L) *ira*: ‘rage’, ‘fury’, hence wp (L) *fūror*: ‘rage, madness, fury’ and (L) *fūrōr*: ‘to take away by stealth, remove secretly’, ‘to personate’; (Fr) *colère, wp* (Fr) *collier*: ‘a collar’, ‘draught-harness’ used for horse and oxen, (Fr) *emportement*: ‘fit of passion (anger, rage)’] **bent** [(Latin) *inclinatio*: ‘leaning, inclining’, (L) *ingenium*: ‘a natural quality, nature’; (Fr) *tourner*: ‘to turn, turn round’, ‘to turn, change’], **is music** [(L) *musica*: wp, anagram (L) *mus, muris*: ‘mouse, rat, ermine’ — *muris*: Simur /Seymour; (French) *musique*] **and sweet** [wp (English) *suite*: ‘a succession or series of things’; wp, anagram (L) *mulseus*: ‘sweet as honey’, Se-muur; alt. (E) *suit*: 5 ‘The pursuit of an object or quest; the action of following a person’, hence related to (Latin) *sequor*: ‘to follow’, *secta*: ‘to follow, adhere’; (Fr) *suite*: ‘those that follow, succession’] **fire** [(L) *ardor, (Fr) ardeur; (L) fieri*: ‘to become’ < (L) *facere*: ‘to make, to do(r), Tudor.]. ~

~ **Which, not to personation turned, is St Maur and suite Tudor. ~**

~ **Which, not to collar turned, is Seymour and suite Tudor. ~**

~ **Witch, not to emport’ment porté, is St Maur and suite Tudor. ~**

114 Celestial as thou art, Oh pardon love this wrong, (Variorum 133)

~ **Celestial** [(Latin) *caelestis*: wp (L) *caelo*: ‘the sky, heaven’; (L) *caelum*: ‘the heavens’ refers to *Caelum*, wp Cae-mul, Sae-mur, as the Titan father of our Writer (*Oceanus*), and whose mother is figured as *Terra*: wp Tud’arr (see theoi.com—Oke’anus); alt. ? (Fr) *céleste* + Leicest’, i.e. Leicester, Robert Dudley, as Master of the ’Orse (Tu-’orse and Seym-’orse);] **as thou art** [wp Tu-tar, Tudor.], **Oh [] pardon** [(L) *condonare*: ; (Fr) *pardon*: ‘forgiveness’, (French) *Law grâce*: ‘grace, mercy’, anagram Cy-mer, Seymour.] **love** [(Latin) *amor, (French) amour, wp a’ Mour, a’ Maur, St Maur, Seymour*] **this wrong** [(L) *male*: ‘hurt, harm, injury’, wp (E) *male*: ‘the sex..which can beget, but not bear, offspring = (L) *vir*, hence wp, surname Vere; (E) *mar*: ‘a fault’ — (E) *fault*: 2 ‘something wrongly done’ — (E) *wrong*: 5a ‘fault’; wp (Fr) *mal*: as for (L) *male* above, (Fr) *envers*: ‘wrong side’], ~

~ **Sea-Leicest’ial as Tu-t’are, Oh pardon a’Mour this Mar, ~**

~ **Se-a’Mure as Tudor, O pardon a’Mour this Vir. ~**

► Again, the question of authenticity arises. The surname Vere, (L) *verus*, is not genuine when applied to Edward Tudor-St Maur. The name Vere serves to enslave—to make *verna*—a man who could otherwise do great good if master of himself; but if he serves his Leicester and Cecil overlords, he will do harm to many subjects of the Crown.

► (?) Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, was given the position Master of the Horse in the Queen's household. This puts him very close to Elizabeth who, by threats to her unacknowledged child and herself, was Dudley's greatest asset. In *Hamlet* he is characterized as CLAUDIUS, who reveals Dudley coercion of the *Dano-Marci* crown—the Tudor-St Maur crown. (*Hamlet* IV.7 11-16):

~ *The queen, his mother*
Survives only by his personation, and for myself — ...
She is so-Maur'ied to my to my Vere and heir
That, as the St Maur moves not but in his Tudor, (E) **star**, (L) *astrum*, wp St Maur
I could do nothing but by her. ~ (E) **sphere**, (L) *orbis*, wp bis-Or, Two-d'Or, Tudor

115 That sings heaven's praise with such an earthly tongue. (Variorum 134)

~ **That sings** [(L) *canere, cantare*; (Fr) *chanter*, here (Fr) *psaume*: v. 'to chant, read, sing psalms', wp, timesis Some'(r), St Maur] **heaven's** [(L) *caelum*: wp, metonym Cea-mul, Seymour; (Fr) *ciel, cieux*] **praise** [(L) *psalmus*, (Fr) *psalme*, (E) *psalm*: etymology 'usual rendering (Hebrew) *mizmōr*: 'song of praise', wp Same-Mor, St Maur; (Fr) *louange, éloge*: 'eulogy, encomium, praise'] **with such** [(L) *talis*: 'such, of such a kind', (L) *similis*: II 'great, good, beautiful'; (Fr) *pareil*: 'like, equal, similar'] **an earthly** [(L) *terrestris*: 'belonging to the earth', hence (L) *terra*: wp ~ two-d'RR, wp (L) *orbis*: ~ twice-d'Or ~; (Fr) *terrestre*: 'terrestrial, earthly'; alt. wp, surname (Fr) *mortel*: 'mortal', 'earthling'] **tongue** [(L) *lingua*: 'tongue', II *Transf.* 'a tongue, speech, language'; (Fr) *langue*: 'tongue, language']. ~
 ~ **That Psalms St Maur's eulogy with like Tudor tongue.** ~
 ~ **That Psalms with Si-mir-ish Two-d'Or tongue.** ~

Rhetoric ► (Fr) *psaume*, in a word, expresses the phrase 'sings heaven's praise'. (Fr) *psaume* and (E) *psalm* and are cognates—they were 'born together'. *Psalm* and *psaume* pun on (Fr) *saint* (IPA -sn), and *somme*/'Sommer as forms of St Maur/Seymour.

HOLOFERNES

116 You find not the *apostrophas*, and so miss the accent. (Variorum 135)

~ **You find** [(L) *invenire*: 'to come upon, to light upon', 'effect', II. A *Trop.* 'discover'] **not the apostrophas** [(L) *apostrophe*: 'a turning away'—(L) *aversio*: playing on the overturning of the writer's true identity in favor of Vere.], **and so** [(L) *hoc modo*: 'in this manner'] **miss** [(L) *desiderare*: 'to greatly wish for, to desire'] **the accent** [(L) *vox, sonus*: wp 'son']. ~
 ~ **You discover not the a'Vere-scion, and so de-sire the Son.** ~

Rhetoric ► *Apostrophe* is also called *Aversio*, a name that suggests movement 'turning away' from something; and this is the movement of Oxford/'Shakespeare'. His theme is always the turning away from an inferior E.Ver towards the superior More. Hopefully, a careful examination of Oxford's wordplay will help restore the importance of his "*apostrophas*".

117 Let me supervise the cangenet. (Variorum 136)

~ **Let me** [(Latin) *permittere, concedere*] **supervise** [(L) *procurare, advigilare*: 'to keep guard over', 'to be vigilant', ~ O'Vere see ~] **the cangenet** [wp (L) *can(is)*: 'dog', confused with (L) *can(us)*: 'grey', 'hoary white' + (MFr) *genet*, (L) *genista*: 'Common Broom', etym. 'yellow flowered shrubs', from which the surname Plantagenet arose; "cangenet" denotes the (L) *Graii* (pron. Grey) 'Greek Tudors', the Suffolk-Grey line of the Tudor descendants of Plantagenet, notably Queen Jane Grey-Dudley and her Dudley in-laws.]. ~

~ **Allow me to O'Vere-see the Grey Genista.** ~

Bio. ► "Cangenet" is often corrected as (E) canzonet: 'a short song' or "little, short songs to three voices" (Th. Morley, 1593, *OED*) < (It) *canzonetta*; but that, of course, misses the wordplay entirely. *Rhetoric* Plantagenet was the royal family of England from the accession of Henry II (1154) to the fall of Richard III (1485). They were supplanted by the Tudors, who traced their bloodline from Edward III

through Lady Margaret Beaufort (1443-1509) mother of Henry VII. The “Cangenets”, by wordplay dog-genets (*Canis-Genetta*), are the cadet branch of Tudor called the Suffolk, or Grey Tudors, descending from Mary Tudor, younger sister of Henry VIII. They are ‘canine mousers’, ever pursuing the *Muris*, the *Mus*, the Mouse ([St] Maur).

Rhetoric ► In answer to the question posed at *l.101*: ~ Which language, Latin or French, better serves as a reference for BEROWNE’s polysemy, Alexandrian wordplay, and rhetorical reinforcement ~, it seems that French is more useful, though Latin quickly returns with HOLOFERNES.

HOLOFERNES (cont.) (NATHANIEL in *First Folio*, however the ‘pedantry’ suggests HOLOFERNES)

117 (cont.)

Here are only (Variorum 137)

~ **Here** [wp (*Latin*) *heres* = (E) heirs] **are** [wp *R(egius)*, as

appended to given names to indicate the Ruler.] **only** [wp (E) *onely*, only: 2a ‘Alone of its, his, her..kind’]

~ **Heirs R Onely** ~

118 numbers ratified; but, for the elegancy, facility, and (Variorum 138)

~ **numbers** [(L) *summa*: ‘total number’, (E) *sum*: ‘total of numbers’, wp, *timesis* *Sum*, *Som*, *Sey* + *More* = *Seymour*.] **ratified** [wp (L) *mus*, *muris*: ‘mouse, rat, weasel, ermine’, wp, *surname* *Maur*s + -(i)fy, *suffix*: (L) *facere*: ‘to make, do’]; **but** [(L) *tantum solum*: ‘alone, nothing more’], **for the elegancy** [(L) *venustas*, (E) *venust* (*Venus*): ‘loveliness, grace, beauty’, (L) *munditia*: ‘neatness, terseness’, wp *mundus*: *II Transf.* ‘the world, earth’, thus wp, *anagram* (L) *orbis*: *bis*: ‘twice’ + (E) *or*: *homonym* (*French*) *or*: ‘gold’ — *Two-d’Or*.], **facility** [(L) *facilitas*: ‘easiness, ease’, *II* ‘fluency of expression’, *II. B* ‘willingness, good-nature, affability’, (L) *fluentia*: ‘fluency’], **and** ~

~ **Sums’ Mour Done; but for the Beauty and fluid nature, and** ~

~ *Sum-Mour made; but Onely, for the Venust and Mercery-nature, and* ~

Rhetoric ► HOLOFERNES appears to allude to the biblical *Book of Numbers*, and the “murmured” complaint of the children of Israel against Moses and Aaron (14:1). At line 136, we find BEROWNE’s poem referred to as a “paper”, (L) *libellus*, evidently the “subdued expression of discontent” disguised as a profession of a *More* (*amor*). Hence the (L) *murmur* is the ‘growling, grumbling’ of a *‘Mare-Mure’*, or ~ *Sea-Mure* ~; it is *Numbers* ‘rat-ified’ < (E) rat = (L) *muris*.

119 golden cadence of poesy, *caret* : Ovidius Naso (Variorum 139)

~ **golden** [(L) *aureus*: ‘of gold, golden’, (E) *aurific*: ‘gold-making’, wp *Tu-d’aur*; (*Fr*) *D’or*, wp *second syllable* *Tu-d’or*, *Tudor*.] **cadence** [(L) *cadentia*, *cadere*: ‘to fall’, referring to 1a ‘the flow of verses or periods; rhythm, rhythmical construction, measure’ — measure, *anagram* *Sea-mure*, thus *surnames* “golden cadence” = *Tudor Seymour*.] **of poesy** [(L) *poesis*], **caret** [(L) *careo*: 3rd pers. sing. *Present Active Indic.* ~ it lacks ~, ~ it is lacking ~; further wordplay is (L) *caret* : (E) *carrot*: (E) *n.l more*: ‘an edible root, as a carrot or parsnip’ — see *Timon of Athens* IV.3 23: “Earth, yield me roots”, Earth, (L) *orbis*, *terra*, wp ~ *Twod’or* ~ + yield, (L) *ferre*, *dare*, *do* + me, (L) *mihi* + roots, (L) *radices*, *alt.* (E) *mores*: ‘carrots’]; **Ovidius Naso** [Roman poet (43 BC—c.17 AD), author of *Metamorphoses*, apparently one of Oxford’s favorite authors.] ~

~ **Golden Measure of Maur poetry, it lacks : Ovidius Naso** ~

~ *Aurific Sea-mure of Maur poetry : Ovidius Naso* ~

Rhetoric ► Ovidius Naso ranks among the greatest writers of Roman antiquity. He was banished by Emperor Augustus in 8 AD to Tomis, Scythia Minor (now Constanta, Romania) for what he called his “*carmen et error*”: ~ song and mistake ~, *i.e.* for ‘verses, and for wandering from the right way’. Oxford follows Ovid, figuratively banished ~ For Poetry and Heir’ Or ~. Ovid was among a group of influential Romans “who conspired ... to restore the right of Imperial succession to Agrippa Postumus, grandson of Augustus” (see “*Exile of Ovid*”, *Wiki*). Among other theories for his exile, this one best agrees with the themes of ‘Shakespeare’ and the question of Elizabeth’s successor.

Oxford apparently received a Latin edition of the *Metamorphoses* from his mother (Elizabeth R) and, in the tradition of Tudors, translated or ‘Englished’ it as a gift for the Queen. This is now called the Arthur Golding translation (1565-67). If you’re familiar with this work, you’ll recognize it as youthful and playful, unlikely to be the work of a Puritan moralist. ‘Arthur Golding’ (1536-1606) dedicated the first four books of the *Metamorphoses* to Robert (Dudley), Earl of Leicester, and posted them from Cecil House, London (Dec. 1564), while Edward ‘Oxenford’ was living there as a ward of state. The following year (1565), Golding appears to have occupied himself translating eight books of Julius Caesar’s *Gallic War*, and 1567 saw the publication of his translation of John Calvin’s “treatise on offenses”, “quite withdrawn from the pure doctrine of the Gospell”. The remaining eleven books of *Metamorphoses* also appeared in 1567. Several, including Richard Waugaman of Georgetown University, have suggested young ‘Shakespeare’ is the principal, or perhaps sole, ‘Englisher’ of *Metamorphoses*.

— see Golding, Louis T. & Adams, Joseph Q.; *An Elizabethan Puritan*, 1937, pp. 149-63

‘His Published Works’.

— see Waugaman, Richard M. M.D. “Did Edward de Vere translate Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*”, *OXFORDIAN*, Vol.20, 2018.

At *Titus Andronicus* IV.1 29-42, LAVINIA is found to be ‘stumping’ through the pages of a book LUCIUS, grandson of TITUS, has let fall to the ground. TITUS asks what book it is that interests LAVINIA so, and LUCIUS answers:

Grandsire, ’tis Ovid’s *Metamorphosis*,
My mother gave it me.

I guess YOUNG LUCIUS masks for young Oxford; his mother is Elizabeth R—see the short essay on characters of *Titus Andronicus*, (p.126). Seemingly inconsequential detail in ‘Shakespeare’ is verisimilitude; however, we have sufficient evidence to posit all his work is composed in a manner better called ‘Vere-similitude’—containing direct biographical elements.

Rhetoric ► The name Ovid—likely pronounced in Latin ~ Ah-wid ~, or thereabouts—seems to make a pleasing pun on the (L) *mus/muris*, *anagram* Si-mur/Seymour root often played upon by Oxford. (L) *mus*: ‘mouse, rat, ermine’ shares a root with (L) *Musa*: ‘Muse’, ‘genius, wit, taste’. Hence, both Oxford and Ovid may say: “I am a Wit” and be not far from a playful truth.

120 was the man. And why indeed Naso but (Variorum 139)

~ **was the man** [(L) *vir* or *homo*? It may be worth questioning the identity of Ovid: was he really who we have assumed he was, or was he in some way analogous to ‘de Vere’/*Vir* (‘the man’) — a false name hiding something more? Was he Metamorphic? or did he discover something More elsewhere?].

And why indeed [(L) *vere*: II C ‘truly, in fact’; *alt. (Latin) syngrapha*: ‘a written agreement to pay, a bond’; (E) deed: ‘that which is done’] **Naso** [‘Roman family name’, ‘especially Publius Ovidius Naso, the poet’; (L) *nasus*: ‘the nose’, I. B ‘The nose as the seat of quick smell; and also the feature by which anger or scorn is expressed’] **but** ~

~ **was the Vir. And why Verily ‘Nose’, but** ~

Bio. ► The bond in question would likely be an Act of Royal Succession, such as the Device for the Succession (1543) of Henry VIII, and that (1553) of his son, Edward VI. The latter is thought to have been drawn from the dying youth by the coercion of Lord President John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland. When king Edward’s health was clearly failing in early ’53, Northumberland married his son Guildford to Lady Jane Grey, first in the line of Edward VI’s ‘Device’, literally putting his children’s necks, and his own, on the chopping block if the scheme failed — and this was not the first such scheme. The intimate placement of both Lady Elizabeth and Lady Jane in the household of Admiral Thomas Seymour and Queen Katherine Parr, must have brought the dangers of succession close to home for the young heiresses.

Bio. ► The thought that Elizabeth enthusiastically sought marriage with Robert Dudley, “the son and grandson of executed [political] traitors, would have been unpopular and divisive” (*The History of*

Parliament online; “*The Royal Succession Under Elizabeth*”), and is nearly absurd. Robert, who would become Earl of Leicester, was just twenty years of age at the death of Edward VI, and ‘eager as HOTSPUR’ in pursuing the capture of Princess Mary in August of 1553. Had he not been delayed by his father’s hesitation, the accession of the Suffolk-Grey Tudors with Queen Jane might have seen long term success. If anyone came close to denying the throne to Elizabeth, it was Robert.

The Act of Treason (1571) changed the wording of Henry VIII’s Devises for the Succession. (See Streitz, Paul; *Oxford, Son of Queen Elizabeth*, 2001, pp 100-02).

Rhetoric ➤ It appears Oxford discovered something hidden in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (?), that may give the reason for the Poet’s banishment from Rome to Tomis in AD 8—perhaps having to do with arrangements for succession in the event of Emperor Augustus’ death. Ovid said his crime was “nothing illegal, but worse than murder” (*Wiki*). See Thibault, John C.; *The Mystery of Ovid’s Exile*; 1964.

121 for smelling out the odoriferous flowers of fancy, (Variorum 140)

~ **for smelling out** [(L) *odoratio*: ‘a smelling’, the sense of smell; 2a ‘To search or find out by, or as by, the sense of smell’] **the odoriferous** [*wp* (L) *odor*: I. B1 ‘A pleasant odor, perfume; essences’, II. *Trop.* ‘a scent, inkling, hint, presentiment, suggestion’ + *wp* (L) *ferreus*: ‘mad of iron’, referring to (Welsh) *tŷ*: ‘house’, ~ house of ~ + *dur*: ‘steel’, *fig.* ‘hard, cruel’ (GPC), hence ~ hints of the ‘House of Steel’ ~; *wp fer o’ d’Or*, ~ Fair o-D’or ~, ~ those *d’Or ferré* ~] **flowers** [(Latin) *flos*: I. ‘a blossom, flower’, I. B2a ‘the prime or best part..of anything’, II. *Trop.* ‘the crown, ornament..of anything’] **of fancy** [(L) *somnialis*, (English) *somnial*: I. ‘Of or relating to dreams’ < (L) *somnium*: I. ‘a dream’, II. A ‘a dream, an idle whim or fancy, stuff, nonsense’, *alt.* (L) *inventio, excogitatio*], ~

~ **for finding out the blossom fair, o’ d’Or Somnial**, ~

~ **for finding out the Crown Fair O’ d’Or of Invention**, ~

Rhetoric ➤ Oxford / Tudor-Seymour is the ‘o-d’Or i-Ferrous’ flower that may be ‘nosed’ by his invention. This is the same Invention noted in the brief dedication to *The Rape of Lucrece*; it indicates the systematic search for the discovery of proofs for ... Something. What that ~ *aliquid* ~ is might be revealed in his wordplay. Again, “The play’s the thing”; the wordplay discovers his Matter/Mater.

122 the jerks of invention? Imitari is nothing: (Variorum 141)

~ **the jerks** [(L) *motus subitus = motus*: ‘a moving, motion’, II. B1 ‘a political movement, sudden rising, tumult’ + *subitus*: ‘that has come on suddenly or unexpectedly’, hence ~ Sudden Tumult ~, likely *timesis* on syllables Tu (Tudor) and Mult (*comparative* (L) *plus*: ‘more’), hence Tu’More.] **of invention** [(L) *inventio*: I. ‘an invention’, II. *Rhetoric* (E) Invention: ‘discovery’, ‘the finding out and selection of topics to be treated, or arguments to be used’, “the first of the five traditional parts of rhetorical theory.”] **Imitari** [(L) *imitor*: II. ‘to imitate, copy after, to resemble, counterfeit’] **is nothing** [(L) *nihil, nulla res = nulla*: ‘no one, nobody’ (*nemo*) + *res*: ‘matter’, perhaps pun (L) *mater*: ‘mother’]: ~

~ **the sudden Tu-Mult of discovery? A counterfeit is Nobody**: ~

123 so doth the Hound his master, the Ape his keeper, (Variorum 142)

~ **so** [*wp, synecdoche* (L) *hoc modo*: ‘in this manner’, as an abbreviation of Moe-d’Or, More-d’Or.] **doth** [*wp, anagram surname* th’do, Tu-d’or.] **the Hound** [(L) *canis venaticus*: ‘hunting dog’, ~ a dog of the chase ~, *wp canis*: ‘dog’, *wordplay* (L) *canus*: ‘hoary white, grey’ — Grey, again, naming the Grey-Dudley contenders for the Crown.] **his master** [(L) *dominus, wp do + minus* (*parvus*), (L) *minor*: ‘lesser, smaller, inferior’ — lesser, hence Leicester.], **the Ape** [*wp* (L) *apis, apes*: ‘the bee’, *wordplay*(?) (E) to be, *wp timesis or pun* (L) *sum*, variously (L) *simus, sumus*: ‘flat-nosed’ > *simia, simian*: ‘ape-like’, *wp St Maur* (?)] **his keeper** [(L) *custos*: ‘keeper, overseer’, 1 *tutor* (*tueor*): ‘a watcher, defender’, 2 ‘to guard, keep’]

~ **Too do’th the pursuing Grey his Leics’er-Tu-’Dor, the St. Maur his Tudor**, ~

124 the tired Horse his rider. But, Damosella virgin, (Variorum 143)

~ **the tired** [*wp, pun (L) taedet*: ‘offended, tired, weary of’ = Tyde, Tude + (ME) orse: ‘horse’, hence Tÿ-de’ors, Tudors; combining ‘tyred’ and ‘horse’ ~ Tÿ-Rd’ Ors ~ playing at something like the ‘House Royal of Ors’, or ‘quality of Ors’.] **Horse** [(ME) ors, orse] **his rider** [(L) *eques*: ‘a horseman’, denoting (L) *equites*: ‘the order of knights..who held a middle rank between the Senate and Plebs’, (L) *vector*: ‘horseman’, likely referring to Leicester as ‘Master of the Horse’, hence depreciating Leicester as of lesser standing, secondary.]. **But, Damosella** [(Fr) *demoiselle*: ‘a young, unmarried lady’, (It) *damigella*: ‘mistress’, *wp (L) dama, damma*: ‘a general name for beasts of the deer kind; a fallow deer, buck, doe, etc.’, *wp, metonym Deer/Dear* = (E) *deor, d’or*, ~ (Tu)-d’or ~ + (L) *sellaria (sella)*: II. ‘a public courtesan’, hence a “Damosella virgin” is ~ a Virgin Courtesan ~ (a Virgin prostitute, a Virgin Courtesan de’ Or), something of a contradiction in terms.] **virgin** [(L) *virgo*: I. ‘a maid, maiden, virgin’, ‘a young woman’, II. *E adj.* ‘unmarried’;], ~

~ *the Tÿde ’Ors his horseman. But De’or woman, ~*

Bio. ➤ The assumption of virginity is generous and polite. If JAQUENETTA is a humorous mask for a facet of Princess Elizabeth (conflated with Anne Vavasour?), HOLOFERNES (Thomas Seymour) would be in a position to know intimate details of the young lady’s life. The State matter of Seymour’s relationship (1547-49) with Elizabeth, was recorded from investigations by Sir Thomas Smith (1513-77), Sir Robert Tyrwhitt (1504-72), and suggested by Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ in several surreptitious allusions in the Canon. The Queen’s conscience might be arrested by similarities between Anne Vavasour and herself.

125 was this directed to you? (Variorum 144)
~ **was this directed** [(Latin) *intendere*: II. B1 ‘to direct towards anything’] **to you** [(L) *Tu*] ? ~
~ *was this intended for you?* ~

Bio. ➤ This question pertains. If lines ‘catch the conscience of the Queen’, are they so intended?

JAQUENETTA “My love is most immaculate white and red” (LLL 1.2 87, ARMADO)—Vavasour or **Elizabeth**?

126 Ay, sir, from one Monsieur *Berowne*, one of the (Variorum 145)
~ **Ay** [(L) *vero*: ‘[*verus*] to speak the truth’; this may secure NATHANIEL as the speaker above, ll.116-124], **sir** [(L) *bone vir*: ‘good man’], **from one** [*wp (L) unus, princeps*: II ‘the first man’] **Monsieur** [(E) ‘my lord’, with various French meanings, including a form of address for younger brothers of Princes.] **Berowne** [see note at l.101], **one** [(L) *uter*: ‘one among two’, ~ one or the other ~ used loosely] hence *wp, anagram ~ Tuter ~, Tudor*] **of the** ~

~ *Vero, Mercery Sir, from my princely Lord Berowne, one among the ~*

Rhetoric ➤ In the First Folio there are a number of apparent errors in attributing lines to speakers. Some may be printers errors, or writer’s errors, and some may not be errors at all. Here, the problem stems from JAQUENETTA’s previous comment (l.91) that this same poem came to her from DON ARMADO, and now she says BEROWNE. Through the centuries, various solutions have been proposed. I suggest two possibilities: a) our humble milkmaid (a facet of Queen Elizabeth?) can’t remember from one minute to the next whether she is to call the poet DON ADRIANO DE ARMADO, or call him BEROWNE, these representing Edward de Vere or Edward Tudor-Seymour respectively. Alternately, b) JAQUENETTA might have some small element of Anne Cecil who, likewise, can’t remember who her husband really is or was.

127 strange Queen’s Lords. (Variorum 146)
~ **strange** [(L) *alieno*: ‘to make one person or thing another’, ‘alienate, estrange, render averse, set at variance’, , (L) *peregrinus*: ‘that comes from foreign parts, strange’, likely playing on the French (or English) Princess’ ~ Strange/Strong ~ descent from the Beaufort line from John of Gaunt (1340-99), third surviving son of Edward III), through great-granddaughter Margaret Beaufort (c.1441-1509), mother of Henry VII — Oxford aligns a French-Navarrese fiction with English history.] **Queen’s** [*i.e.* Princess’; (OED) 6 ‘Applied to a female whose authority or pre-eminence is comparable to that of a queen’; there is no queen

regnant appearing in this play, though on the death of the French King (*see* MARCADE, V.2 710-11) the PRINCESS is thenceforth called QUEEN. There were never queen monarchs of France as this was forbidden under Salic Law (*see* *Henry V* 1.2 38-9). This is further evidence of allegorical structure, and that the true subject is the United Kingdom] **Lords** [(Fr) *seigneur, maître*, (E) lord;]. ~

~ *alienating Queen's Lords.* ~

~ *estranging Queen's Lords.* ~

~ *Lords devoting themselves to the foreign Princess.* ~

Bio. ► MARCADE certainly represents Lord Protector Edward Seymour (1500-52), Earl of Hertford, who, upon the death of Henry VIII, immediately rode to Hertford Castle and escorted young Edward VI to Enfield Manor House, Enfield (London), where his sister Elizabeth was staying. When the siblings were together, Seymour broke the news of their father's death (Starkey p.59). The name MARCADE, ~ Maur-Sey'd ~, ~ de Sey'Mar ~ is a manipulation of the surname C-Mar + -ade, *suffix*: 'forming nouns denoting an action or activity..and frequently, by extension, a body concerned with this'.

Bio. ► English royalty often claimed titles to regions of France or Spain. John of Gaunt, for example, was granted the Kingdom Of Castile; he did not assert the claim. Richard II invested him with the Duchy of Aquitaine, the governance of which he left to stewards (seneschals). So we see that there is some justification for confusing English and French territories and their rulers, at least for literary purposes. Queen Elizabeth I was styled 'Queen of France'—a claim she too did not pursue—a practice which continued among English monarchs until 1802. The coats of arms of England's kings and queens displayed the French *fleurs de lys* until that time. The circumstances of *Love's Labor's Lost* continue to parallel incidents in the life of Princess Elizabeth Tudor. We are safe considering it to be allegorical history, even as *The Taming of the Shrew* notes: we witness "a kind of history" (*Induction 2* 138).

NATHANIEL (NATHANIEL in *First Folio*, corrected to HOLOFERNES in modern editions)

128 I will overglance the superscript: (Variorum 147)

~ **I will** [If intending 'the future tense, render with Latin future'; *worplay* (Latin) *mos, moris, mores*: 'the will'] **overglance** [(E) over + glance, *wp* O'Ver, playing on the writer's false surname, and indicating repetition (E) twice, two, *wp* Tu—(L) *idem*: 'the same' + (E) glance, (L) *aspicere*: 'to look at, see', *alt.* (L) *intueri, intueor*: 'to look at, upon', *wp* ~ (E) in Tu-d'Or ~] **the superscript** [(L) *inscriptio*: 'an inscription, title']: ~

~ **I will See once More the inscription:** ~

~ *I'll en-Tudeor once More the title:* ~

129 'To the snow-white hand of the most beauteous Lady Rosaline.' (Variorum 148)

~ **'To the snow** [(Latin) *niveus*: 'white as snow', hence the true Rosaline—the line (lineage) of the Tudor Rose from Henry VIII—is (L) *pellucidus*, (E) pellucid: 'allowing the passage of light; translucent', 'clear, obvious'; opposed to (L) *canus*: 'grey', *cf.* (L) *obscurus*: I 'dark', II *Trop.* 'obscure, indistinct, unintelligible'] **hand** [(L) *manus*: II. A *Transf.* 'The hand as the instrument used in fight; hence personal valor, bravery'. This is the "apostrophas" mentioned at IV. 2 118—the poem addresses the poet himself. HOLOFERNES spots it immediately, but NATHANIEL must read again. BEROWNE offers himself to ROSALINE (Tudor Rose) as the "hand", (L) *manus*: II. A2 'the force', II. B 'the hand of an artist', II. C 'a hand, handwriting; work, workmanship', compare with 1.131 below.] **of the most** [(L) *summus*: 'highest, topmost', *wp* St Mus, Sum-mur, Summer, St Maur.] **beauteous** [(L) *venustas*: 'loveliness, grace, charm' [Venus]; *surname* Beaufort, as Beauty = (Welsh) ~ *Tŷ-harddedd* ~ *Tŷ-dur*, or ~ House of Beau ~, Beau + fort, likely suggesting Tudor/Tudur, perhaps tying Beauty and strength to Tudor.] **Lady** [(L) *femina, mulier*: 'a woman, whether married or not', (L) *era, hera*: I 'the mistress of a house', II. *Metonym* 'a female ruler or governor'; *wp* (E) heiress, (L) *hera, era*: representing Elizabeth Regina Anglia (?); (E)

lady: *1a* ‘A female head of household’, *4a* ‘a polite form of address to a woman’] **Rosaline** [The true Rosaline—the line (lineage) of the Tudor Rose from Henry VIII (*see above, this line*).] ~

~ **‘To the clear instrument of the Tÿ-dur Sum-mus heiress Rosaline.’** ~

Rhetoric ► Here are epithets most sweet / suite and suited. BEROWNE does not address his poem to the hand of ROSALINE; rather, he addresses the poem as *Aversio*—turning the subject from ROSALINE to himself. A ‘Vere’ is averse to being called a Vere when it is not *verus* (true):

(*L*) **aversio**: *rhetoric* ‘a figure by which the orator turns the attention of his hearers from the theme before them—a kind of **apostrophe**’ (*see “apostrophas”, 1.118*).

The reader is meant to solve this puzzle to understand BEROWNE’s problem, and BEROWNE’s problem is, I think, the writer’s problem. If we pay heed to *Sonnet 76*, this is the direction in which we are sent. We find ourselves in the position of guileless NATHANIEL/John de Vere. Even with the help of HOLOFERNES we may miss the *aversio*, or “*apostrophas*” and so miss the “accent”, stress, or emphasis, intended by the Lord of “Ne-ver”/Navarre.

Bio. ► Again we see the spectre of Lady Jane Grey (1537-54), (*L*) *canus*, her Suffolk-Tudor family, and Dudley ‘hangers-on’; they are ‘Night’. The contrast between the lucid Crown Tudors, and the obscure, gray/Grey Suffolk-Tudors centers on the the bright Apollo-like figure of Oxford.

We remind ourselves that both Ladies, Elizabeth and Jane, were in the household of Sir Thomas Seymour and former Queen Katherine Parr. It is a homely tale.

130 I will look again on the intellect of the Letter, (*Variorum 149*)

~ **I will** [*wp, surname (Latin) mos, moris*: ‘the will’] **look** [*wp, anagram (L) intueor*: *II. A Trop.* ‘to regard, contemplate, consider’] **again** [*wp, anagram (L) rursum*: ~ Sum-ur ~] **on the intellect** [(*Latin ingenium*: *II. A* ‘Natural disposition, temper, inclination’) **of the Letter** [(*L litterae, epistula*: *I* ‘a written communication’, *II* ‘an imperial letter or reply, stating an emperor’s will as law’), ~

~ ***I Will in Tu-d’or Sum-More, on the disposition of the Epistle,*** ~

~ ***I Will look Sum-More on the disposition of the Letter,*** ~

131 for the nomination of the party writing to the person written unto: (*Variorum 150-1*)

~ **for the nomination** [(*L nominatio*: *rhetoric II. A* ‘a figure of speech, whereby a thing which has no name, or an unsuitable one, receives an appropriate name’) **of the party** [(*L partes*: ‘a number of persons with a common aim’; *wp (L) partus*: *II* ‘the young or offspring of any creature’) **writing** [(*Latin scribere*] **to the person** [(*L persona*: *I* ‘A mask’, *II Transf.* ‘a character, part’) **written** [(*L scribere*] **unto** [*wp (E) unto*, hence ~ un Tu ~]: ~

~ ***for the proper name of the faction writing, to the persona written un-Tu.*** ~

~ ***for the suitable name of the scion writing, to the persona written un-Tu.*** ~

132 ‘Your ladyship’s in all desired employment, Berowne.’ (*Variorum 152*)

~ **‘Your** [*wp (English) y-*, *prefix: 1b* Adjectives and allied substantives denoting quality or condition’ + our, or: *wp (L aurum, orum*: ‘gold’, the gold element of Tud’Or, and Seym’our.] **ladyship’s** [(English) ‘the state of condition of being a lady’, (*Latin matrona*: ‘a married woman, wife, matron’, *II. C* ‘an appellation of Juno’, (*Greek Hera*, *myth* ‘wife of Roman god Zeus’, hence (*Latin era, hera*: *II Metonym* ‘female ruler or governor’) **in all** [(*L totus, (French) tout, wp Tout-d’a(h), tout de, Tudor.*] **desired** [*wp (L desiderare*: *de*: ‘away from’, ‘departure, removal’ + *sideratio*: ‘a grouping or configuration of stars’ = *desidus*: ~ de starred ~, hence, departure from (*L astrum, anagram St Maur, alt. wp (E) de*: + *sired*: *i.e.* removal from the Sire (father).] **employment** [(*L usus*: ‘use, exercise’, *I.2* wear, a wearing away’, playing on Latin pronunciation of *surname* Vere, and punning on (*L ursus*: ‘bear’ = Dudley as Earl of Warwick, hence linking the surname Vere with the Dudley faction; (*L usurpo, usurpation*: *I* ‘to make use of; to employ’, *II. B* ‘to get possession of, to acquire’; reinforcement for “hand” as ‘apostrophas’ (*see above*)], **Berowne.**’ ~

~ *'Th' Or Ladyship's in Tout d' [or] de-Sired usurping, Berowne.'* ~
 ~ *Y' ore Ladyship's in Tu-da' de St Maur usurpation, Berowne.* ~

HOLOFERNES

(HOLOFERNES in *First Folio*)

133 Sir Nathaniel, this Berowne is one of the votaries (Variorum 153)

~ **Sir Nathaniel, this Berowne is one of the votaries** [(Latin) *cultor*: II. A Trop 'a fosterer, supporter', II. B 'reverencer'] ~

~ *Sir Nathaniel, this Berowne is one of the supporters* ~

► "Sir *Holofernes*" is printed in the First Folio, rather than 'Sir Nathaniel'. As mentioned before, the confusion between HOLOFERNES and NATHANIEL appears to be intentional because of difficulty discovering who is the father of MOTH/MOTE. Even that question is not evident, but implied in various forms of address to the seniors and juveniles. Likewise, there is an historical question: who is the father of the writer? Both John de Vere/NATHANIEL and Thomas Seymour/HOLOFERNES were knights: de Vere by Queen Mary, and Seymour by Henry VIII. Hence, both are to be addressed as 'Sir' (again, an artifact of the true history) though the play doesn't make the point (see note in *Variorum LLL IV. 2 1*).

134 with the king; and here he hath framed a (Variorum 154)

~ **with** [(Latin) *cum*] **the king** [(L) *rex*]; **and here** [(L) *hic*] **he hath framed** [(L) *ingere*: II. A Trop. 'form, fashion', likely with idea of (L) *mos, moris*, and (English) measure.] ~

~ *with the king; and here he hath fashioned* ~

~ *with the king; and here he hath measured* ~

135 a letter to a sequent of the stranger queen's, (Variorum 155)

~ **a letter** [(Latin) *littera, epistula*; possible wordplay (*wp*) on the (E) litter: 3*b* 'straw, or litter' for stabled animals, 4 'Odds and ends; a state of confusion; a disorderly accumulation of things'; likely wordplay (L) *litora*: 'of or belonging to the sea-shore'] **to a sequent** [(L) *sequens*: II. A Trop. 'that which follows, succeeds'; (E) sequent: 1*b* 'That follows or is subsequent in..serial order'; (L) *ordo*: I. B 'right order, regular succession', *wp* Ord'or, Two-d'Or.] **of the stranger** [(L) *externus*: 'outward, external', II 'foreign, of or belonging to another country'] **queen's** [(L) *regina*], ~

~ *a letter to a successor of the Seeming Queen's*, ~

~ *a letter to a successor of the apparent Queen's*, ~

136 which accidentally, or by the way of progression, (Variorum 156)

~ **which** [(Latin) *qui*; *wp* (L) *uter*: 'which of two' — Tuter, Tudor.] **accidentally** [(L) *forte*: 'by chance, by accident, accidentally', *wp, surname* ~ As a property of the Beaufort line ~, hence by: y pron. as in (French) *tu* or (German) *über* (Wheelock) + (L) *forte* = *sur.* (Fr) *Beau* + *fort*, that gives 'right' to Tudor.], **or** [*wp* (L) *orum, aurum, (Fr) or*: 'gold'] **by** [*wp* (L) *bi-*, *comb. form*: 'twice, doubly, two', combines with "or" just prior.] **the way** [(L) *via*: II Trop. 'a way, mode, manner, fashion', *wp, surname* Vere, de Vere.] **of progression** [(L) *progressio*: 'progression, going forward, growth, increase, advancement', progression: 3 'A sequence of quantities between successive terms'; I. B 'a pier, mole', hence *metonym, surname* More.], ~

~ *Tudor (Beau)forte, Or-bi the Via of succession*, ~

~ *Which (By) forte, 'Or-bi the Vere of succession*, ~

► As shown above, this is indeed the subject of BEROWNE's *rhetorical* a'Vere-sio (*aversio*, 'apostrophas').

137 hath miscarried. Trip and go, my sweet; deliver this paper (Variorum 157)

~ **hath miscarried** [(Latin) *abortus*: 'an abortion, miscarriage', (L) *abortus*, (English) abort: 1*a* 'to expel an embryo or fetus from the uterus']. **Trip** [(L) *error, wp* heir-Or, ~ heir (Tud)Or ~, (L) *peccatum*:

‘sin’; (*Latin*) *omasum*: ‘bullock’s tripe’, ~ stomach or pride of an Ox ~, *wp* (E) *tripe/trip.*] **and go** [(*L*) *meo, meare*: ‘to go, pass’], **my sweet** [(*L*) *dulcis*, (*French*) *doux*: ‘sweet’, *wp* (*Fr*) *faire*: ‘to do’, hence Do as root of To-do(r).]; **deliver** [(*Latin*) *dedo, dedere*: ‘to surrender, deliver, consign’, *wp* de Do’, de d’Or as counterpoint of de Vere (noting proper origin); (*L*) *partum edere*: ‘to bear offspring’] **this paper** [(*Latin*) *libellus*: *II. B8* ‘A written accusation or complaint’] ~

~ ***hath aborted. Heir and More, my Doe; bear this libel*** ~

138 into the royal hand of the king: it may concern much. (*Variorum 158*)

~ **into** [(*Latin*) *in*: *II. A* ‘into, or to a place’] **the royal** [(*L*) *regius, regalis*] **hand** [(*L*) *manus*: *II. B* ‘Of the hand of an artist’, *II. C* ‘handwriting, workmanship’] **of the king** [(*L*) *rex*]: **it may concern** [(*Latin*) *refero (res fero)*: ‘it matters, imports, concerns’, *wp* ~ Fair concerns ~, or ‘Tudor matters’, etc.] **much** [(*L*) *multus*: ‘much, great’, (*Welsh*) *mawr*; *comparative form* (*L*) *plus*: ‘more’]. ~

~ ***in the royal script of the king: it may re-Fair More.*** ~

139 Stay not thy compliment; I forgive thy duty: adieu. (*Variorum 159*)

~ **Stay** [(*L*) *moror*: *I* ‘to delay, tarry, stay’, *wp* *surname* More.] **not thy compliment** [*wp* (*L*) *complementum*: ‘that which completes or makes perfect; completion, consummation’ — (*L*) *salutare*: ‘welfare’, *wp* (*Latin*) *vel*: ‘or’ + (*L*) *facere*, (*It*) *fare*, (*Fr*) *faire*: ‘to do(r)’, *alt.* (*L*) *absolvo*: ‘to set free’, ‘in judicial language, the letter A(*bsolvo*): ‘to absolve from a charge, to acquit’; *wp* (E) *complement*: *Ib* ‘Of two (or more) things: mutually complementing or completing each other’s deficiencies’, *Ia* ‘perfecting’]; **I forgive** [(*L*) *condonare*: *I. 2 Trop.* ‘pardon’, (E) *condone*] **thy duty** [*wp*, *anagram* (E) *duty / ty-du*, ~ *Tÿ-du(r)* ~ Tudur; (*L*) *munus*: ‘office, function’, *wp?* (*L*) *muris*: ‘mouse, rat, ermine’ — *wordplay, surname* Mure, More.]: **adieu** [*wp* (*L*) *ad deus*: ‘to god’ or ~ a *dur* ~ ‘from dure’; (*French*) *adieu, dire adieu à*: ‘to give up, renounce’]. ~

~ ***Moor not thy Tudor; I condone your Tÿ-du(r): adieu.*** ~

~ ***Delay not thy acquittal; I pardon thy Tÿ-du(r): a Dure.*** ~

- Wordplay on (E) *compliment*, (E) *complement*, again directs us toward some analogue of the Elizabeth Tudor/Thomas Seymour affair, and the Anne Vavasour/Edward Tudor-Seymour affair. In both cases the complement to the female protagonist was a male of the St Maur type — Seymours father & son.

JAQUENETTA

140 Good Costard, go with me. Sir, God save your life. (*Variorum 160-1*)

~ **Good** [(*French*) *bon*, *wp* (E) *bone*] **Costard** [(*Anglo-Norman*) *costard*: *costa*: ‘rib’ + *-ard*, *suffix*: *etym.* ‘used in French as a masculine formative’, (*Fr*) *côte*, (*L*) *costa*: ‘rib’, likely alluding ‘to the biblical account of the creation of Eve from Adam’s rib (*Genesis 2:21*)’, or the ‘virgin birth’ of Oxford.], **go** [(*Fr*) *aller*: ‘to go, proceed, progress’, ‘to act (in a certain way), to suit, to be adapted to’] **with** [(*Fr*) *avec*] **me** [(*Fr*) *moi*]. **Sir** [(*Fr*) *monsieur, Sir*], **God** [(*Fr*) *Dieu*] **save** [(*Fr*) *sauver*] **your** [(*Fr*) *votre*] **life** [(*Fr*) *vie*, *wp?* *surname* Vere]. ~

~ ***Maur Vessel, suit me well. Sir (NATHANIEL), Dieu save your life.*** ~

~ ***A’ Maur’alis vessel ...***

COSTARD

141 Have with thee, my girl. (*Variorum 162*)

~ **Have with thee** [(*English*) *have*: *imperative* ‘Let’s go’, (also) ‘Let’s be off’; *wp* (E) *have*, (*Fr*) *avoir*, 2nd sing. *tu as*, *Tud’as*], **my girl** [(*Fr*) *fille*: ‘girl, unmarried woman’]. ~

~ ***Tu d’as, my girl.*** ~

~ ***Let’s be off, my girl.*** ~ [*Exit with Jaquenetta and Costard*]

► This line may touch lightly on Oxford's plan, reported by Henry Howard, to flee his marital troubles, and a lack of acknowledgement by Mater. He intended to cross to Spain with a pregnant Anne Vavasour (her second by Edward) and £15,000. (see Nelson, p.231-32)

Article 7: "I do fear colourable colours." (LLL V.1 144-160)

~ *I suspect misrepresentation of character.* ~

NATHANIEL

142 Sir, you have done this in the fear of God, (Variorum 163)

~ **Sir** [(Latin) *bone vir*, suggesting conflict between two fathers Vere and Bone (Merces/Se'Mer).], **you** [(L) *tu*] **have done** [(L) *facere*, (It) *fare*, (Fr) *faire*: 'to do', past part. (E) done] **this in the fear** [(L) *metus*, *timor*, *vereri* — each of these Latin words might play on the surnames Tudor, St Maur, or Vere; NATHANIEL leans towards 'Vere' words, as here, whereas HOLOFERNES prefers 'More' words; thus the small disagreement on (E) fear.] **of God** [*wp* (L) *deus*, (Fr) *dieu*, playing on 2nd syllable of (non-rhotic) Tu-d'a(h), Tu-dieu, Tudor.] ~

~ *Mercery Sir, Tu-d'O[r] this in Vere of Dieu,* ~

143 Very religiously; and, as a certain father saith — (Variorum 164)

~ **Very** [*wp*, surname Vere] **religiously** [(Latin) *sancte*: 'religiously, solemnly', likely wordplay (L) *solum*: 'earth, land', hence NATHANIEL sees benefits to the lands of the Earldom of Oxford, while HOLOFERNES is concerned for the welfare of the nation; *wp* (L) *sanctus*: 'saintly', alluding to the surname St Maur, Seymour.]; **and, as a certain** [(L) *certus*: 'fixed, settled, purposed', (L) *certo*: 'surely, of a truth', hence a 'verity'.] **father** [(L) *impositor*: 'one who applies a name to a thing', *wp* (L) *compater* 'godfather', *impostor*: 'a deceiver, impostor'] **saith** — ~

~ *Vere'y Solumly; and, as a truthful father saith* — ~

~ *Vere'y Tudor'ly; and, as a Vere father saith* — ~

► Again, Oxford/'Shakespeare' has a biological father, Thomas Seymour, and a godfather; John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford, who gives his surname to Princess Elizabeth's child to spare legal and political taint to the young mother. Like Alexander the Great, played by NATHANIEL in the 'Nine-Worthies' Earl John was "the world's commander"—the conqueror of (L) *Orbis*, a *metonym* signifying ~ Two-d'Or ~ the Tudor monarchy (see LLL V.2 557-59). In the view of our Writer, John was gulled into the scheme; he would have to die to make way for his god-son.

HOLOFERNES

144 Sir, tell not me of the father; I do fear (Variorum 165)

~ **Sir** [(Latin) *bone vir*], **tell** [(L) *referre*: II. B2 'to bring up for reconsideration', 'report, relate, recount'] **not me of the father** [(L) *pater*]; **I do** [(L) *facere*] **fear** [(L) *metus*, *timor*, *vereri*—each of these Latin words might play on the surnames Tudor, St Maur, and Vere, each with different significance to the writer and to England; (Latin) *vereor*: 'to feel awe, revere; to fear, be afraid'] ~

~ *Good Vere, report not to me of the father; I Doe' re-vere* ~

~ *Good Vir, report not to me of the father; I Do' re-fear* ~

145 colorable colors. But to return to the verses — (Variorum 166)

~ **colorable** [(English) colorable: 2a 'Intended to deceive or to conceal a true purpose; fraudulent', 1a 'Having an appearance of truth; plausible', 1b *Chiefly Law* 'Capable of being presented as true or valid; having at least a *prima facie* appearance of justice or legality'; *wp* (L) *co-*, prefix: < (L) *cum*: 'together, in common', 'joint-ly', 'equal-ly', mutually' + *lor*, *wp* l'Or: + -able, suffix: 'forming adjectives denoting capacity for or capability of', hence ~ Two-d'Or able ~ ; (E) taintable, taint: < (Fr) *teint* < (L) *tingere*: 'to dye, stain'] **colors** [(L) *color*: II. B2 'an artful concealment of a fault'; (E) colors: *Heraldry* 'the colors used

as tinctures in coats of arms’, (E) coat of arms: ‘the central element of the full achievement, which in its whole consists of a shield, supporters, a crest, and a motto; it is unique to an individual, family, or organization’]. **But to return** [(L) *restituere*: ‘to restore, rebuild, revive’] **to the verses** [(Latin) *versus*: ‘poetry’] — ~

~ *fraudulent names. But to repair to the Veres* — ~

~ *attain’t able names, except to restore the Veres* — ~

~ *stainable Tudors, but to return to the Veres* — ~

► “colourable colors”: An identity that has been, or may be, changed; alluding to a coat of arms. Oxfordians tend to think questions of true fatherhood refer to the writer’s refusal to acknowledge his first daughter, Elizabeth (1575-1627), later Countess of Derby (*m.* 1595 to William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby). Perhaps, but that would be a secondary concern. The primary matter, as we see here, is his own parentage—not Golding-de Vere (NATHANIEL), but Tudor-Seymour (HOLOFERNES). Oxford’s doubt of his part in conceiving Elizabeth may not have been genuine, but a kind of theatrical retribution against William Cecil for having altered Oxford’s parentage, and thereby denying him descent through the royal line. In effect, Oxford might say to Cecil: ~ I didn’t father your granddaughter. That was the doing of your creation, Edward ‘de Vere’. ~ After all, this was of national importance, the thing for which “Three great ones of the city ... Off-capped” (*Othello* 1.1 8-10). Those who “off-capped”—those who were beheaded—were 1) Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour (Oxford’s father), Edward Seymour, Regent for Edward VI (Oxford’s uncle), and John Dudley, Lord President and 2nd Regent for Edward VI.

There is an important communication between Robert Dudley and Francis Walsingham (1536-90, *principal secretary to Queen Elizabeth from 1573*) that does not identify “the Moor”, but we know from *Othello* that “the Moor of Venice” (*the Maur of Venus*) identifies as ‘Turk’. ‘Turk’ is the nickname given to Oxford in lieu of naming him Moor/Maur.

In a letter dated July 30, 1581, Robert Dudley, a ‘Favorite’ of the Queen, wrote to Francis Walsingham on a matter not clearly specified. I suspect a comment within the letter refers to Edward Oxenford, our ‘Shakespeare’:

“Sir, I received your letter by your brother-in-law, Mr. Sembard, perceiving that you found yourself somewhat distempered by your watching and posting, which I easily believe, and am heartily sorry for. I imparted your letter to her Majesty, who expressed very great favor with many gracious words towards you; and perusing your postscript, she willed me to say thus to you, that she doth know **her Moor** cannot change his colour, no more shall it be found that she will alter her old wont, which is, always to hold both ears and eyes open for her good servants, and that it shall be indeed observed, not of the common sort of Princes, but ‘*nella fede della Reyna d’Ingellaterra*.’”

Calendar of the Cecil Papers in Hatfield House, Vol.2 1572-82

The Queen’s ‘Moor’ has been thought to refer to Francis Walsingham himself; but we believe the individual who ‘cannot change his colour’ is the man who only lately had been imprisoned in the Tower of London for impregnating Anne Vavasour, one of the Queen’s Ladies-in-Waiting. An equality between ‘The Moor’ and a ‘Turk’, an historical nickname given by the Queen to Oxford, is confirmed at *Othello*, V.2 352-6, when OTHELLO unites the Moor and Turk in death. The two names were nearly synonymous; we suggest ‘Moor’ was not used by the Queen because it truly was her son’s surname—St. Maur.

So the concerns of NATHANIEL/de Vere are different than those of HOLOFERNES/St Maur. De Vere wished to have his Earldom of Oxford revived. Unfortunately, he had no male heir. The only way to rebuild what seemed destined to become an extinct title, was to create a new Earl from a different lineage. So the question at the heart of this scene is whether the Tudor Monarchy will be sustained by the correct identification of Edward Tudor-St Maur, or will the Earldom of Oxford continue by fraudulent name of Edward ‘de Vere’.

~ **did they please you, Sir** [(L) *placere*, wp, ~ (L) *placent tibi* 'Do mine ~ = ~ (E) Does it please (you) to be Leicesten'd? ~, or ~ (E) It pleases Tu'Do(h) to lessen (Leices-t'n) **Nathaniel** [Alluding again to biblical Nathaniel, of whom Jesus said: "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile!", hence Vere/'True'.]? ~

~ *It pleases Tu-Do so, Nathaniel?* ~

~ *Does it please to be Leicesten'd, Nathaniel?* ~

NATHANIEL

147 **Marvelous well for the pen.** (Variorum 168)

~ **Marvelous** [(Latin) *mirus*: 'wonderful, astonishing, marvellous', wp, anagram Su-mir, Sommer, Seymour; (L) *mirandus*: 'wonderful, strange, singular', as MIRANDA, daughter of PROSPERO (*Tempest*).] **well** [(L) *vel*, \underline{v} pron. as \underline{w} in Latin.] **for the pen** [(L) *calamus*: II. A1 'a reed pen', II. B2 'a scion, graft']. ~

~ *Su'More d'Or for the scion.* ~

HOLOFERNES

148 **I do dine today at the father's of a certain** (Variorum 169)

~ **I do** [(L) *facere*, (Fr) *faire*] **dine** [(L) *consumo*, *consumere*: 'to eat, consume, devour'] **today** [wp (E) today — Tu-da(h), Tudor; (Latin) *hodie*, *hoc die*] **at the fathers** [(L) *pater*, *parens*, *genitor*] **of a certain** [(L) *rato*, *ratus*: 'certainly, surely', with transitive pun (L) *rattus* — (L) *mus*, *muris*, wp, surname Simur, Seymour; *alt.* (L) *certus*: II 'An epithet of all those objects whose existence or reality is fixed, determined', II. A1 'Of things whose external qualities..are invariable'] ~

~ *I Do con-Sume Tu-da(h) at the fathers of a Mure* ~

~ *I Do con-Sume Tu-da(h) at the father's of a Sey-Mure* ~

~ *I Do con-Sume Tu-da(h) at the fathers of an in-Vere'able* ~

149 **Pupil of mine, where if (being repast) it shall please you** (Variorum 170)

~ **Pupil** [wp (L) *pupillus*: 'an orphan boy; also a ward (cf. *tutor*, *tutela*)] **of mine** [(L) *meus*], **where** [(Latin) *ubi*, wp, anagram bi-u, hence ~ by you ~] **if** [(Latin) *si*, wp, *timesis* Sey, sea] **(being repast)** [wp? (L) *resumere*: 'to take up again, take back', (L) *re Sumere* (?)] **it shall please** [(L) *velle*, wp (L) *vel*: 'or, if you will'] **you** [(L) *tu*] ~

~ *Orphan boy of mine where, if re-Sumer'd, it shall Tu-(d)or,* ~

➤ (E) certain is (L) *ratus*, *rato*: 'certainly, surely', playing on (L) *muris*, *mus*: 'a mouse, rat, ermine', and (Medieval Latin) *rattus*: 'rat'. (L) *muris* is an unabashed emblem and anagram of Simur, Seamure, Seymour, St Maur. Any mention in 'Shakespeare' of a mouse, rat, or weasel, refers to the Seymour family. Likewise (E) pupil: I *Civil Law* 'an orphan who is a minor and consequently a ward', from (L) *pupillus*: 'an orphan boy', 'a ward', indicates a specific orphan descending from HOLOFERNES (see IV.2 76).

Can the 'Orphan' be re-St Maur'd or not, that is the question. In truth, Oxford never left the 'loving' care of his mother or her surrogates.

150 **to gratify the table with a Grace, I will, on my privilege** (Variorum 171)

~ **to gratify** [(Latin) *gratificare*: 'to do a favor for a person'] **the table** [(L) *mensa*: I 'a dining table', II. B *Transf.* 'The guests at table', hence (L) *hospes*: 'guest', *hostis*: 'host'] **with a Grace** [(L) *lepor*, *lepos*: I 'charm', II. A 'pleasantness, grace, amiability' — wordplay (L) *lepus*: 'hare', wp (E) heir], **I will** [wp, surname (E) Will = (L) *More*, *mos*, *moris*: 'a measuring or guiding rule of life', 'manner, custom, way, fashion, wont'], **on my privilege** [(Latin) *jus*, *juris* (*iuris*): 'right, law, justice'] ~

~ *to favor the host with an Heir, I More, by my right* ~

151 **I have with the parents of the foresaid Child or Pupil,** (Variorum 172)

~ is the Chance of de Vere. ~

► Happenstance—the (L) *occasio*, ‘the hap or favorable moment’ of life—was an avenue for continuing the direct line of the de Vere Earls of Oxford, or continuing the Crown Tudors. Hence Edward Tudor-Seymour could have been a boon to one family or another, de Vere or Tudor. The de Vere name would have contributed a worthy (though to us, of unknown provenance) heritage to the Beaufort-Tudors of Henry VIII, had the accession of Oxford been successfully managed by Cecil ... ~ for Oxford was likely, had he been put on the throne, to have proved most royal. ~ (see *Hamlet* V.2 380-81). Managing Oxford’s accession would likely have been a boon to the nation and the enlightenment.

HOLOFERNES

157 And, *certes*, the text most infallibly concludes it. (Variorum 179)

~ **and, certes** [(Latin) *certes*: I ‘certainly, undoubtedly’, playing on (L) *rato, ratus*: ‘certainly, surely’, with transitive pun on (L) *rattus* — (L) *mus, muris, wp, surname* Simur, Seymour.], **the text** [(L) *oratio, verba*: *wp Vere + ba*: see notes LLL V.1 46, p.] **most** [(L) *summus*: ‘the uppermost, highest’; (L) *plurimus*: ‘most’] **infallibly** [(L) *certo*: ‘infallibly’] **concludes** [(L) *conficio, conficere*: II. A *Transf.* ‘to diminish, lessen, weaken’; I ‘to make a thing complete’, I. A2 ‘to settle, finish’;] **it**. ~

~ **and Ratus, the Vere Ba most Verily Leicens it**. ~

~ **and Muris, the Vere Soul most Verily completes it**. ~

158 [To DULL] Sir, I do invite you too; you shall (Variorum 180)

~ **Sir** [(Latin) *bone (bene) vir*, likely meant to reduce the title of Leicester from Lord (Earl) to Knight; a ‘well man’/vel man,], **I do invite** [(L) *condico, condicere*: I. B2 ‘to engage one’s self as a guest at an entertainment’, *wp (E) engage*: 2 *figurative* ‘To pledge, offer as a guarantee (one’s life, honor, etc.)’] **you** [(L) *tu*] **too** [(Latin) *insuper*: *wp* ‘moreover’]; **you** [(L) *tu*] **shall** [(English) shall: ‘a command, promise, determination’] ~

~ **Sir, I do engage you, More o’ Vere; you shall** ~

► I think HOLOFERNES doesn’t emphasize his invitation; he says “you shall not say me nay”, predicting DULL will attend both as their constable and guard. If the time frame was definite, the Dudley in DULL would be John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and would represent the same individual as BARNARDO in *Hamlet*, who is among the guards on the battlements of Elsinore.

159 not say me nay. *Pauca verba*. Away! The gentles are at (Variorum 181)

~ **not say** [(L) *obrussa*: ‘the testing or assaying of gold’, (L) *exagium*: ‘a weighing’; *alt. (L) asseverare, adseverare*: ‘to do anything with earnestness, to assert strongly or firmly’] **me nay** [(E) *v.* ‘Originally: to deny a matter’, *adv. and n.* ‘to express negation, denial’, *adv.2* ‘never’]. **Pauca verba** [(English) ~ Few words ~, ~ Little discussion ~; *wp (E) few Vere-Ba.*], **Away** [(L) *abi! (abeo)*: II. 4 *Trop.* ‘Begone!’, be off!’, (L) *apage!*: *interjection* ‘away with thee! begone!’]! **The gentles** [*wp, metonym (L) mollis, Si-moll / Simorr*] **are** [*wp R(egius)*; *affixed to given names of monarch, eg. Elizabeth R*] **at** [*wp added to R = Rat, (L) mus, muris*] ~

~ **not assay me ‘Never’. Few words. Begone! The St Maur’s R’at** ~

~ **not a’Vere me, No. Say little. Begone! The Mollis R’at** ~

~ **not as E.Vere me, No. Few Vere souls. Away! The Seymours are at** ~

► The “gentles” are the (Latin) *mollis*: ‘easily moveable, pliant, flexible; soft, tender, gentle, mild, pleasant’. Oxford frequently marks the Seymours as *Mollis, anagram* ‘Simoll’/Si-morr, in contrast to the Tudors who are ~ Too-dure ~, ‘too hard’. These antithetical elements war with each other within him and within characters who are masks for himself. JULIET, for example, is: “so soft a subject as myself” (*Romeo and Juliet* III.5 212)—by such apt epithets, the artist has made her *his* ‘inner’ Seymour. ROMEO knows already; earlier he had seen her by moonlight: “But soft, what

light through yonder window breaks?” (*R&J II.2 2*) ... “*and Juliet is the Sun*” (*Son*). This is not madness! This is extraordinarily perfect allegory, and much of the story lies in names.

To find a One—that is, the *Princeps*—in *Romeo and Juliet*, who is hard enough to warrant the name, look to Rosaline:

MERCUTIO (*Romeo and Juliet II.4 4-5*)
 “that same pale hard-hearted wench, that Rosaline,
Torments him so that he will sure run mad.”

The ‘Line of the Rose’ was, at that time, in Queen Elizabeth I. Her colors were ‘green and pale’. She is ‘*Dure* at the *core*’ (Tudur), but by marriage she is, again, mollis / simoll—‘the Same’ (Or). ROSALINE torments, (*Latin*) *torquere*: ‘to twist, to turn about’ poor ROMEO (‘de Vere’) So (*mor*) such that he Will (*mores*)—sure (*ratus/muris*)—run Mad (*morio*).

160 their game, and we will to our recreation. [Exit] (*Variorum 182-3*)
 ~ **their** [*wp* (English) t’heir] **game** [(*Latin*) *ferae*: ‘wild game (hunting)’, *wp* (*L*) *facere, fieri*: ‘to do’, (*French*) *faire*], **and we will** [*wp* (*L*) *mos, moris, Mores*: ‘the Will, self-will’] **to our** [The common syllable of Tud’Or and Seym’Our.] **recreation** [(*L*) *recreo, recreare*: ‘to make or create anew, to remake’; ‘transformed or reformed life’]. ~
 ~ *t’heir Feral hunt, and we Maur to ’Or re-creation.* ~
 ~ *t’heir Fair-All hunt, and we Maur to Our re-creation.* ~
 ~ *the Faire game, and we will to Ore re-creation.* ~

Bio. ► The ‘Will’ or ~ *More* ~ recreation was the object of Edward Tudor-Seymour/‘Shakespeare’. He aimed to restore the name lost by extra-legal attainder. Since the Seymour name had been taken, and all rights of title and inheritance removed, a “recreation” or creation of new titles was needed.

Certain assets belonging to the Parr-Seymour marriage were restored (1550) to Mary Seymour, Edward’s half sister. Great wealth was transferred to Edward by the title Earl of Oxford, however he really only wanted acknowledgement of his true name and bloodline.

Once More: (Examination of wordplay appears on the page indicated to the right.)

- NATHANIEL: 1 ~ *Vere-y re-Vere’d variation, Verily, and Done in* (46)
 2 *attestation of shared Mercery Verities.* ~ (48)
- HOLOFERNES: 3 ~ *The [Ty] De’Or was (as you know) consanguine — a blood-relation,* (49)
 4 *Mure as the Sovereign Sea, who now Sus-pends like a Tudor in* (49)
 5 *the heir of Cae-lum, the Sea-mul, the Seymour, the St Maur;* (49)
 6 *and More, mors like a Cancer on the honor of Terra, the Te-RRa,* (50)
 7 *the Two-d’RR, the Tud’or.* ~ (50)
- NATHAN: 8 ~ *Vere-ily, Master Holofernes, the appellations R[egius]* (50)
 9 *Succeedingly Vere-ied, like a Vere doct’ard at the Leicest—, I aver ye,* (51)
 10 *it was a male De’Or — the Summus Prince.* ~ (52)
- HOLOFER: 11 ~ *Sir Nathaniel, haud credo!* ~ (52) (*L*) *haud credo*, misheard by DULL as ‘Old Grey Doe’
- DULL: 12 ~ *Yours [was] not an ‘old Grey doe’, yours was a second year male.* ~) (54)
- HOLOFER: 13 ~ *Most alien meaning! yet a way of stealing into,* (55)
 14 *(as it vVere) in Vi[r]a, in way of making clear the sense of ‘To do[r]’* (55)
 15 *(as it vVere) Two d’Or, a bullock reveal,* (56)
 16 *to demonstrate (as it vVere) his disposition in more of his rough,* (56)

- 17 *unrefined, unlearned, ungoverned, untrained,* (56)
 18 *Or-rother'est un-Fort'ified More,* (56)
 19 *to implant once More my "haud credo" for a De'Or. ~* (57)
- DULL: 20 *~ I assayed the de'Or; was not an ou'd Grey doe, yours was a Pricket. ~* (57)
- HOLOFER.: 21 *~ Tudor's Morio, twice Cooked!* (57)
 22 *O you inad-Vere'tent Maur — how O'More Tu-do[h]s seem. ~* (58)
- NATHANIEL: 23 *~ He hath not E.Ver pastured of the desires that R[egina] begat in the Vere.* (59)
 24 *He hath not de Vour'ed titles, as it vVere, he hath not de-Vir'ed Moor-Sea.* (59)
 25 *His heart is not twice-stocked, he is solely a vessel—* (59)
 26 *one-ly manifest in the Leices'er sense, and Maur sterile Plantagenets* (59)
 27 *R enthroned before us, that we should be Grey-Tudors, which we attend,* (60)
 28 *and notice R in favor of those members that bear in us More than he;* (60)
 29 *For as it would not suit me Vere-ly to be a fruitless, unregarded, 'Or-Maur:* (61)
 30 *So vVere t'heir, a'taint put on Tuedair, to see him in 's collar,* (61)
 31 *Only 'Tout-or', say I, being of a vVere parent's mind,* (63)
 32 *Many can Ferre the Ram that A'Mor not the heir. ~* (63)
- DULL: 33 *~ You two are freemen: Can you Tu-tor me by y'Our Muse,* (64)
 34 *What was one month St Maur at a Spear's birth that's not five* (64)
 35 *weeks born Tuda(y)? ~* (65)
- HOLOFER.: 36 *~ Say More goodman Dull, Say More goodman Dull. ~* (65)
- DULL: 37 *~ What is Dictynna? ~* (65)
- NATHANIEL: 38 *~ An appellation to Phoebe, to Luna, to the Moon. ~* (66)
- HOLOFER.: 39 *~ Elizabeth R was one month St Maur when a Dam was no Maur.* (66)
 40 *And was not Tu-do(r) five weeks, when he approached two years.* (67)
 41 *Thallus' scion takes possession in the con'Vere-scion. ~* (67)
- DULL: 42 *~ A To-do[r] Verity, the deception holds in the con-Vere'scion. ~* (68)
- HOLO.: 43, 44 *~ d'Ors Sons keep y'Our secrets, I say the pun holds in the conVere-scion. ~* (69)
- DULL: 45 *~ And I Say the Mar holds in the con-Vere'scion:* (69)
 46 *for Diana is no Vere, but a month Summer: and I Say Mour O'Vere that,* (70)
 47 *Yours was a two-year de'Or that this Princess killed. ~* (71)
- HOLOFER.: 48 *~ Sir Nathaniel, will you heir an unprepared* (71)
 49 *Summa'ry on the Mort of the De'Or, and to bear yo'u Mor* (71)
 50 *the unknowing call I the De'Or the Princess did vVere out, a Pricket. ~* (71)
- NATHANIEL: 51 *~ More, man! good Master Holofernes, Proceed! so it shall* (72)
 52 *please you to annul squirrel-ity. ~* (72)
- HOLOFER.: 53 *~ I more Sea-More dispose the lines, for it dis-eases:* (72)
 54a *~ The full-Fair Princess transfigured and troubled* (73)
 54b *an a'Morous Two-year Deor;* (74)

- 55a *Somme' say a Sore, but not A'More;* (74)
 55b *till now ill-littered with Vere-ing.* (74)
 56a *The Greys did howl: put alias to Sore,* (75)
 56b *then Red-heir springs from tangle —* (75)
 57a *Two-d'Or sore, or Sorell else,* (75)
 57b *The people start to slander.* (76)
 58a *If (H)Orse be sore, add alias to Sore,* (76)
 58b *makes fifty inky sorrows:* (76)
 59a *Of one sore I a hundred Do,* (77)
 59b *by adding but One Maur ell. ~* (77)
- NATHANIEL: 62 *~ A Tudor talon. ~* (78)
- DULL: 63 *~ If an ill-will be re-Taliate in Tudor, how he arms himself with such a kind. ~* (78)
- HOLOFER.: 64 *~ This is a natural gift that I have, pure : Sey-mer,* (78)
 66 *a Mores measureless nature, fairly cramm'd with seemings, modes, forms,* (79)
 67 *Kings and things, conceptions, arrests, sentences, con-Vere'scions.* (79)
 68 *These royals, generated in the [h]u'Mor of Same-Mor, increased* (79)
 69 *in the Mollis St Maur mother, and birthed upon the* (79)
 70 *Mater'ing of Opportunity. However, the genius is Mercery in those in* (80)
 71 *whom is Semor sharpness, and I am Amor for it. ~* (80)
- NATHANIEL: 72 *~ Domine, I name the Deus for Tu and So-Mau(r),* (81)
 73 *my Parr residents, for t'heir sons R ap Tudur,* (81)
 74 *and their daughters bear fruit Vere-y More-ly under you.* (82)
 75 *Tu-[d]ar, a Mercery Sey-Mor of the Res publica. ~* (82)
- HOLOFER.: 76 *~ My Hercules! if t'heir sons be Frank, they* (83)
 77 *shall require no instruction; if t'heir daughters be ap Tu-ta's* (83)
 78 *I, 'Maur', put Virga to them. But a Wise Vere says little.* (84)
 79 *An fool Muri-erar'ias preserves us. ~* (85)
- JAQUE.: 80, 81 *~ Tudors give you Sea-mour O, Father Persona. ~* (85)
- HOLOFER.: 82 *~ Father Per se only, as it VVere, to transfigure One? And if a Prince should*
 83 *be metamorphosed, which is the Prince? ~* (87)
- COSTARD: 84 *~ Maur-y, Father Tutor, he that is Most-like* (88)
 85 *to a Boars-head. ~* (88)
- HOLOFER.: 86 *~ Of transfiguring a Boar's 'Ead, a Mercery Night, or of marriage* (88)
 87 *in a Grey-man Tÿ d'Or, Ardor sufficient for a hard heart, De'Or bastard* (89)
 88 *for a Vere — the House is Venus't, Tÿ d'Or. ~* (90)
- JAQUEN.: 89 *~ Mercery Commander Person, be So Maur as [to] disclose me* (90)
 90 *this Lei[ces]ter, it was awarded me by Vessel, and forwarded me* (90)
 91 *from Done Arm'ed: I pray you unfold it. ~* (91)
- HOLOFER.: 92 *~ "How easy to entreat coldly when All sinners beneath the shade—* (91)

- 93 **Muse**”, and so more. *Ah, Mercery, en-During, Man-Tu-an.* (91)
- 94 *I Will, perhaps, Say of thee as the Bear[er] Does of Venus:* (92)
- 95 “**Woman-child**, who does not wound you, does not proceed from you.” (92)
- 96 *Vere Vir’tu-an, Vieux Vere’tu-an! Who comprehends thee not,* (93)
- 97 *a’Mores thee not. How so a King, my son of Tu-do(r)? By pardon, Sir,* (93)
- 98 *what is contained? Or, Rother? — as Horace says in his:* (94)
- 99 *What! my Soul turns. ~* (94)
- NATHAN.: 100 *~ Vere-ily, good Vir, and Vere-y taught by heart. ~* (94)
- HOLOFER.: 101 *~ Allow me to heir a Spear, a Moor, a’Verse. Bequeath to one, my lord. ~* (95)
- [Reading ll.102-17 < Latin or French?]
- NATHAN.: 102 *~ If a’More Does make me for ’s vVere, how shall I en’Dure a’ More?* (95)
- 103 *Ah, no Vere son of Liz could en’Dure if not to Beau-Ty de’Vere’d!* (96)
- 104 *[How] E.Vere so of myself say Vere, to you I’ll de Monstr-ate a child of Liz,* (97)
- 105 *Those re-Veries to me vVere Dure, Tu-deux like women Tordu,* (97)
- 106 *A’ Tude[h], his Two-door, departs and makes his l’Vere thine buds,* (97)
- 107 *vV[h]ere Tudor-Greys veer, that Ver-suit guile would seize upon.* (98)
- 108 *If acknowledged birth be the Mark, to learn birth of Tu’ More satisfies:* (98)
- 109 *Or-Tudu’d is that langue, that Or can Two preserve,* (98)
- 110 *Tudor unknown, the current heir in Tudor St Mer veils;* (99)
- 111 *Which is to me Som-more, that I ad-Maur thy Parr-aunts.* (99)
- 112 *Thy son Jove’s ard’Or reports, thy son, your Port-ending heir,* (100)
- 113 *Which, not to personation turned, is St Maur and suite Tudor.* (100)
- 114 *Sea-Leicest’ial as Tu-t’are, Oh pardon a’Mour this Mar,* (100)
- 115 *That Psalms St Maur’s eulogy with like Tudor tongue.* (100)
- HOLOFER.: 116 *~ You discover not the a’Vere-scion, and so de-sire the Son.* (101)
- 117 *Allow me to O’Vere-see the Grey Genista. Heirs R Onely* (101)
- 118 *Sums’ Mour Done; but for the Beauty and fluid nature, and* (102)
- 119 *Golden Measure of Maur poetry, it lacks : Ovidius Naso* (102)
- 120 *was the Vir. And why Verily, but* (103)
- 121 *for finding out the blossom fair, o’ d’Or Somnial,* (104)
- 122 *the sudden Tu-Mult of discovery? A counterfeit is Nobody:* (104)
- 123 *Too do’t the pursuing Grey his Leics’er Tu-’Dor, the St. Maur his Tudor,* (105)
- 124 *the Tÿde ’Ors his horseman. But De’or woman,* (105)
- 125 *was this intended for you? ~* (105)
- JAQUEN.: 126 *~ Vero, Mercery Sir, from my princely Lord Berowne, one among the* (105)
- 127 *Lords devoting himself to the foreign Princess. ~ (106)*
- NATHAN.: 128 *~ I will See once More the inscription:*
- 129 *‘To the clear instrument of the Tÿ-dur Sum-mus heiress Rosaline.’* (106)
- 130 *I Will in Tu-d’or Sum-More, on the disposition of the Epistle,* (107)
- 131 *for the proper name of the faction writing, to the persona written un-Tu.* (107)
- 132 *‘Th’ Or Ladyship’s in Tout d’[or] de-Sired usurping, Berowne.’* (107)
- HOLOF.: 133 *~ Sir Nathaniel, this Berowne is one of the supporters* (108)

- 134 *with the king; and here he hath fashioned* (108)
 135 *a letter to a successor of the Seeming Queen's,* (108)
 136 *Tudor (Beau)forte, Or-bi the Via of succession,* (108)
 137 *hath aborted. Heir and More, my Doe; bear this libel* (109)
 138 *in the royal script of the king: it may re-Fair More.* (109)
 139 *Delay not thy release (in mora); I condone your Tÿ-du(r): adieu. ~* (109)
- JAQUEN.: 140 *~ Rib-bone, suit me well. Sir (NATHANIEL), Dieu save your life. ~* (109)
- COSTARD 141 *~ Tu d'as, my girl. ~* [Exit with Jaquenetta and Costard] (110)
- NATHAN.: 142 *~ Mercery Sir, Tu-d'O[r] this in Vere of Dieu,* (110)
 143 *Vere'y Solumly; and, as a truthful father saith — ~* (110)
- HOLOF.: 144 *~ Good Vere, report not to me of the father; I Do' re-vere* (110)
 145 *fraudulent names. But to repair to the Veres —* (111)
 146 *Does it please to be Leicesten'd, Nathaniel? ~* (112)
- NATHAN.: 147 *~ Su'More d'Or for the scion. ~* (112)
- HOLOF.: 148 *~ I Do con-Sume Tu-da(y) at the fathers of a Mure* (112)
 149 *Orphan boy of mine where, if re-Sume'd, it shall Tu-(d)or,* (112)
 150 *to favor the host with an Heir, I More, on my right* (113)
 151 *hold with the procreator of the renamed Son or Ward,* (113)
 152 *to dare y'ore salvation, whereby I Will de-Monstrate those* (113)
 153 *Veres to be Vere-y rough, neither innate of Mures,* (113)
 154 *Tudor heirs, n'Or Discovery. I entreat y'Our partnership. ~* (113)
- NATHAN.: 155 *~ And thank you too: for union (saith the Vere Ba)* (114)
 156 *is the good fortune de Vere. ~* (114)
- HOLOF.: 157 *~ and Ratus, the Vere Ba most Verily Leicens it.* (114)
 158 [To DULL] *Sir, I do engage you, More-o'-Vere; you shall* (114)
 159 *not assay me 'Never'. Few words. Begone! The St Maur's R'at* (114)
 160 *t'heir Feral hunt, and we, Maur to Or re-creation. ~* (115)

Addendum — Love's Labor's Lost V.2 706-12

Enter a Messenger, Monsieur Marcade.

MARCADE (fortuitous anagram — de Ça'Mar, ~ of St Maur ~, referring to Lord Protector Edward Seymour)
 God save you Madame.

QUEEN

Welcome Marcade, but thou interruptest
 our merriment.

MARCADE

I am sorry Madame, for the news I bring is
 heavy in my tongue. The King your father ...

QUEEN

Dead for my life.

MARCADE

~ *Every Line, each Verse* ~ ; that's well over one-hundred thousand lines of verse for the *First Folio* plays! Yet I can demonstrate that this is true: every line (almost) of 'Shakespeare' is autobiographical and tells the reader something of his life. Each work is an allegory, but the Author has also devised a game of linguistic enigmas that provide the key to the historic identities of characters — therefore they are allegory and *romans à clef*. It's a difficult game. Some of the best literary scholars I know have a lot of trouble spotting puns and word wit. But here is a clue that should make things easier: Assume the Artist is playing with words. The more you know of our language and the origin of words, the better you'll be able to play. One reason you might want to learn a little of Shakespeare's game is because you cannot understand the full meaning of these masterpieces without identifying the history behind them.

To begin, we must always enlist the help of dictionaries. 'Shakespeare' has the knowledge of a lexicographer and uses his very advanced studies in language to disguise meaning in double entendre. Likewise, many of his contemporaries enjoyed playing the same games. I find very few 16th century mentions of the 'Shakespeare Canon' that do not resort to some rhetorical 'sleight of words'.

First we must clarify there is a double meaning in the word 'herse', which is derived from the (*Latin*) *hirpex*: 'a harrow' — *1a* 'a harrow, for agricultural use', 'a large rake used as a harrow' = (E) harrow: *1a* 'a heavy frame of timber..set with iron teeth or tines, which is dragged over ploughed land to break clods' (*OED*). In appearance, a herse resembled the portcullis of a castle, and such a frame also served in funerals or burials to support lighted candles and other decorations over the bier or coffin. Today we spell such a herse 'hearse'. We might interpret Digges' line:

~ ... *every Line, each Verse / here shall revive, deliver thee from thy death.* ~

That's a good reading, but we will not have discovered the line's potential. Here's another interpretation:

~ ... *every Line, each Verse / here, shall restore [thee], deliver thee from thy harrow.* ~

You may prefer the first, but the second is more to the point of the Artist's tireless effort. Throughout 'Shakespeare' our man attempts to memorialize his true name—Edward Tudor-Seymour—and to explain why he rejects the name Edward de Vere as deceitful and debilitating. More than just weakening, 'de Vere' is devil-itating; it provides the royal seal to all manner of crimes by the Dudley and Cecil families, *de facto* Regents of Elizabeth Tudor. Edward Tudor-Seymour wrote to bring justice—even belated justice—to those who many thought were the principal malefactors of Elizabethan England. Oxford's true identity can deliver him from *Damnatio Memoriae*: 'the condemnation of his memory'.

***The Taming of the Shrew* Induction 2 89-94**

1st MAN

87 Sometimes you would call out for Cicely Hacket.

BEGGAR

88 Ay, the woman's maid of the house.

3rd MAN

 Why, sir, you know no house, nor no such maid,
90 Nor no such men as you have reckon'd up,
 As *Stephen Sly*, and old *John Naps* of Greece,
92 And *Peter Turph*, and *Henry Pimpernell*,
 And twenty more such names and men as these,
94 Which never were, nor no man ever saw.

Examination of Wordplay:

1st MAN

87 Sometimes you would call out for Cicely Hacket.

~ **Sometimes** [wp some time: (Latin) *hora*: ‘the time of day’, ‘the hour’, hence, ‘Some-hours’, *surname* St Maurs] **you** [(L) *tu*] **would** [anagram (E) would — douw, hence Tu-douw, Tудо(r).] **call out** [(L) *vocare*: ‘summon’] **for Cicely** [wp *surname* Cecil-y] **Hacket** [wp (E) hacked: *1a* ‘chopped, especially roughly; having irregular and jagged cuts or wounds; slashed, mangled’; likely wordplay on (E) hack: *n.2* ‘a horse used for hire. Also an inferior or worn out horse; a nag’, referring to the Queen (see 1.88, wp “maid”/made, do) as an old, tired, (ME) [h]ors > horse; *alt. (L) hacetenus*: *1B* ‘thus far, no further than this’, *III.A* ‘opposite of more’, i.e. less, wp Leices[ter], ~ no more ~].

~ **Som-ours Tu-douw Sum-mon for Cecil-y Hacked.** ~

~ *Some hours you would Summon for Cecil-y Ors.* ~

~ *Seymour Tudors summon for a Cecil-y Nag.* ~

~ *St Maurs-Tudor summon for Cecil ‘no More’.* ~

BEGGAR

88 Ay, the woman’s maid of the house.

~ **Ay** [(L) *ai*: interjection ‘denoting grief’; *alt. (L) vero*: ‘true’, (E) aye: *1a* ‘used to express affirmation..or agreement’], **the womans’ maid** [(E) maidservant: ‘A female servant, usually a domestic servant’; wp (L) *facere*, (It) *fare*: ‘to do, to make’, hence ~ woman’s Made servant ~ woman’s To do(r):] **of the house** [(L) *domus*, (E) house: *10b* ‘A family including ancestors and descendants, especially noble, royal...’, wp Do, (L) *facere*, (Fr) *faire*: ~ to do[r] ~ + (L) *Mus*, *muris*: ‘rat’ — Si-Maur]. ~

~ **Alas, the woman’s Made of the [royal] house.** ~

~ *Alas, the Made-servant of Tudor-St Maur.* ~

3rd MAN

89 Why, sir, you know no house, nor no such maid,

~ **Why** [(L) *immo*: ‘no indeed’], **sir** [(L) *bone vir*: ‘good man’], **you know** [(L) *novisse*: ‘to be acquainted with’] **no house** [(L) *domus*: *II.B Metonym* ‘a household, family, race’], **nor** [(L) *nec, neque*] **no such** [(L) *talis*] **maid** [wp (L) *facere*, (It) *fare*: ‘to do, to make’, hence ~ made ~ , (L) *virgo*: ‘virgin’], ~

~ **Indeed, Good Vir, you know no [such] family, nor no such virgin,** ~

~ *Indeed, Good Vir, you know no [such] Do-Mus, nor nothing So Made,* ~

90 Nor no such men as you have reckon’d up,

~ **Nor** [(L) *nec, neque*] **no such** [(L) *talis*] **men** [(L) *vir, viri*: ‘man, men’] **as you have reckon’d up** [(L) *sumo, sumere*: *II B* ‘to take as one’s own, to assume, claim, arrogate’; *alt. (L) (e)numerare*: ‘to count, account for’, ~ to sum up ~ , *wordplay* Sommer’d, St Maur’d, etc.], ~

~ **Nor no such Veres as you have Sumèd,** ~

As *Stephen Sly*, and old *John Naps* of Greece,

91 ~ **As** [(L) *cum*, wp, *timesis* ‘sum’, as first syllable of ‘Summer’, ~ St Maur ~] **Stephen Sly** [(Greek analogue) Stephen: ‘crown’ + (English) sly: *1a* ‘knowing, wise’; *3a* cunning, deceitful, wily’, (L) *mores*: ‘manner, way’, ‘wise’, ‘the will’], **and old** [(L) *priscus*: ‘belonging to former times’; (L) *antiquus*: ‘old, former’] **John Naps of Greece** [John: (L) *Joannes*, Medieval Latin *Johannes* — *wordplay* (L) *Ionius*: *etymology* ‘designating the part of the Mediterranean between Greece and Southern Italy’, ‘metonym (L) mare + Naps: (L) *somnus* + of Greece: (L) *Graecia*: ‘country of the Greeks’, possible wp (E) grace: ‘mercy’], ~

~ **Some ‘Crownéd More’, and former Somn-Mare of Greys,** ~

~ *Some More ‘Crownéd’, and former Somn-Mare of Greys,* ~

92 And *Peter Turph*, and *Henry Pimpernell*,

~ **And Peter Turph** [(Gr) *petrus*: ‘stone, rock’, (L) *marmor*: ‘stone, marble’, wp *marmor* = Seamour + Turph < turf, turph: *n.I* ‘a sod of grass with roots and earth adhering’; (L) *gramen*: ‘for (L) *gras-men*, grass, turf’, likely wordplay Grey-man, (L) *Grai-men* = (L) *Grai*: ‘the Greeks’, *Graius*: ‘a Greek’, (L) *Grai-Vir*: ~ Greek-Vere ~, ~ Grey-Vir ~, or some such; and (L) *vir*: ‘man’ hinting at (L) *viridis*, *vireo*: ‘green’, (E) green: *3a* ‘grassy ground, a grassy spot’], **and Henry Pimpernell** [Henri, Heinrich: ‘House ruler’, *I* ‘lord’ + Pipinella, Bipennella, (*bipenula*, *bipenella*): ‘two-winged’, an herbal name for Burnet Saxifrage, *Apiaceae Pimpinella saxifraga*; refers to the Seymour Arms (coat of arms): ‘Gules (red), two wings conjoined in lure or (gold)’], ~

~ **And Maremour Grey-man, and L’ord Somerset**, ~

~ **And Seamour Grey-man, and L’ord Somerset**, ~

93 And twenty more such names and men as these

~ **And twenty** [synonym (E) score: *n.* ‘twenty’, wp ‘sum’; wp (L) *vicies*: ‘twenty times’, (L) *vicis*: ‘interchange, alternate or reciprocal succession’] **more** [wp *surname* Maur, More] **such** [(L) *modus*: *II.B Transf. ejus modi*: ‘of such a kind’ < (L) *modus*: *II.B Transf.* ‘a way, manner, mode’, syn. (L) *mores*] **names** [(L) *cognomen*: ‘family name’] **and men** [(L) *vir*: ‘man’, *virum*: ‘men’] **as these**, ~

~ **And Sum-More Maur surnames, and Veres, as these** ~

94 Which never were, nor no man ever saw.

~ **Which** [wp (L) *uter*: *IB5* ‘which of two ... the other’ — *uter utri*] **never** [wp (E) never = ‘not ever’] **were** [wp *surname* Vere, V pronounced as W in Latin.], **nor** [(L) *nec*, *neque*] **no man** [wp, *surname* (L) *vir* — Vere, de Vere] **ever** [wp E.Vere — Edward Vere] **saw** [wp (L) *intueor*: ‘to look upon’, Tudor.]. ~

~ **Which nor E.Vere VVere, nor no Vir E.Vere saw in Tu-d’éor.** ~

~ **Which nor E.Vere VVere, nor no Vir E.Vere in Two-[d]’or.** ~

~ **Tut’Ors nor E.Vere VVere, nor no Vere E.Vere saw.** ~

New reading (and much improved):

1st MAN

~ **Som-ours Tu-douw Sum-mon for Cecil-y Hacked.** ~

BEGGAR

~ **Alas, the woman’s Made of the [royal] House.** ~

3rd MAN

89 ~ **Indeed, Good Vir, you know no [such] family, nor no such Virgin,**

90 **Nor no such Veres as you have as-Sumèd,**

91 **Some Crownéd More, and the former Somn-Mare of Greys**

92 **And Mare-mour Grey-man, and L’ord Somerset,**

93 **And Sum-More Maur surnames — and Veres, as these**

94 **Which nor E.Vere VVere, nor no Vir E.Vere saw in Tu-d’or.** ~

Here is the message to the Beggar Amnesiac: ~ You are Lord St Maur Somerset!

There is no Edward de Vere, nor was there ‘Ever’ in Tudor.

Most names that Christopher Sly has used are some form of his true ‘Tudor-St Maur.’

However one name is a fiction — ‘Edward de Vere’. No such person ever existed.

And the Original (once More):

1st MAN

87 Sometimes you would call out for Cicely Hacket.

BEGGAR

88 Ay, the woman's maid of the house.

3rd MAN

89 Why, sir, you know no house, nor no such maid,90 Nor no such men as you have reckon'd up,91 As Stephen Sly, and old John Naps of Greece,92 And Peter Turph, and Henry Pimpernell,93 And twenty more such names and men as these,94 Which never were, nor no man ever saw.

— **Stephen Sly** < (*Greek analogue*) Stephen: 'crown, wreath', 'surrounded by' + (English) sly: 1a 'skilful, clever; knowing, wise'; 3a 'skilful in artifice or craft; cunning, deceitful, wily', (L) *mores*: 'manner, way', 'wise', 'the will' — hence:

~ **Crownéd Moor** ~

► As we know, STEPHEN SLY remembers himself "by birth a peddler, by education a cardmaker, by transmutation a bearherd, and now by present profession a tinker" (*Taming of the Shrew Ind. 218*). Each of these occupations will tell us something true and significant about the writer if we're willing to examine Shakespeare's words 'tropically' (*Hamlet III.2 233*). HAMLET slyly hints to CLAUDIUS that this (L) *muris* trap—a "mouse trap" or Maur's Trap—is the means by which he will catch the murderous King. By the same rhetorical trick, we can catch Oxford at his game. Think about that. The writer, behind the HAMLET mask, reveals to his persecutors the means by which his veiled meaning may be discovered. Evidently he is confident they won't understand him; but if we let that hint direct our reading, with some effort, *we will*.

Is Oxford a pedlar: 'a trader in goods', (L) *merx*? Certainly. He *is* the 'good' or Commodity that is traded—a Tudor-St Maur for a Vere. This is identical with the "bias commodity" railed upon by PHILIP THE BASTARD (*King John II.1 561-98*). It is the ~ Two-d'Or 'goods' ~, or (L) *bi-as*: ~ two-unit ~ commodity that seems a little inexplicable in the play.

Is he a 'cardmaker', a maker of cards, (L) *charta*: 'that which is written upon paper, a writing, letter, poem'? Of course, if STEPHEN SLY masks for the writer, as I intend to show he does.

How about a bearherd: 'a person who takes care of bears, bulls, apes, etc.'? That's a very unusual line of work, No? Having been 'transmuted' from royal birth to mere nobility, he is now 'Bear-heir'd', and doing the bidding of the 'Bear-nards' (see *Hamlet I.1* BARNARDO)—the Dudleys, as it were—who adopted the 'Bear and Ragged Staff' of the Earls of Warwick as their emblem. In effect, he has lost the ability to engender his own kind.

And is he presently a tinker: 'a person who makes a living by mending metal household utensils'? The name Tudor, *wp* (*Welsh*) *Týdur*, has been loosely translated as 'House of Steel', and 'Shakespeare' himself offers "hard house" as his refuge (*King Lear III.2 63*); so, yes, all the writer's effort is to restore the House of Tudor to its natural state.

SLY is not himself sly; the Lord who plays a practical joke on him is sly. However, the name will almost undoubtedly contain wordplay, so I suspect 'Sly' refers to 'wise' or 'wily'—i.e. Willy, (*Latin*) *mores*—as Oxford frequently called himself (see *Sonnets 135 & 136*). Stephen Sly may be a drunk, but I believe he is not such a fool that he believes he has but dreamed a life. He is 'wise' enough to see the benefit of his improved circumstances. If I understand Oxford's allegory, it's better to go along with a "transmutation" than fight Authority and die.

— **John Naps of Greece** < John: (L) *Joannes, Joannis, Medieval Latin Johannes* — wordplay (L) *Ionius*: *etymology* 'designating the part of the Mediterranean between Greece and Southern Italy', *metonym* (L) *mare* + Naps: (L) *somnus* + of Greece: (L) *Graecia*: 'the country of the Greeks', possible *wp* (E) *grace*: 'mercy'.

~ **Somn-Mare of Greece** ~, ~ *Mare-Somn* of Greece ~

► Here is a perfect example of Varronian or etymological wordplay. Many commenters have corrected the *First Folio*, which gives us “of Greece”, and substituted ‘of Greet’: “a Gloucestershire village near Stratford”. They have assumed the THIRD (SERVING) MAN is as provincial as BEGGER Sly, and that the intended word must be more like ‘Greet’, of the same district as “Burton-heath” and “Wincot” (*Shrew Ind 2 17 & 20*). But this is not the case. Rather, he is as learned as his Lord. “John of Greece” is *lonia*, playing on the given name Joannis, with ‘lo’ and ‘Jo’ pronounced ~ Yo ~ . “Of Greece” stands proud, and alerts us to something extra that may be understood in the name; (*L*) *lonius*, *lonia*, is a common metonym for (*L*) *mare*: ‘sea’ — the Ionian Sea. Hence ‘sleeping John’ is ~ *Somn-Mare* ~ , St Maur, Seymour.

— **Peter Turph** < Peter: (*Gr*) *petrus*: ‘stone, rock’, (*L*) *marmor*: ‘stone, marble’, *wp marmor* = Seamour + Turph < turf, turph: *n.1* ‘a sod of grass with roots and earth adhering’; (*L*) *gramen*: ‘for (*L*) *gras-men*, grass, turf’, likely wordplay Grey-man, (*L*) *Grai-men* = (*L*) *Grai*: ‘the Greeks’, *Graius*: ‘a Greek’, (*L*) *Grai-Vir*: ~ Greek-Vere ~ , ~ Grey-Vir ~ , or some such; and (*L*) *vir*: ‘man’ hinting at (*L*) *viridis*, *vireo*: ‘green’, (*E*) green: *3a* ‘grassy ground, a grassy spot’.

~ **Seamour Greymen** ~ ~ *St Maur Graymen* ~
~ *Stony Grai-man* ~ ~ *Rocky Grey-men* ~

► “Peter” < (*Latin*) *Petra*: ‘a rock, a stone’, or (*L*) *petrosus*: ‘rocky’, is clear; but (*L*) *marmor*, *marmur*: ‘marble’ can be nearly synonymous: *Transf. II.F.* ‘a stone’, or *II.G. poetic* ‘the bright level surface of the sea’. The pun on (*L*) *gramen*: ‘turf’ is more obscure, and so, we need a little history.

Henry Grey (1517-54), 1st Duke of Suffolk, conspired with Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour in 1548 to affiance his eldest daughter, Lady Jane Grey, to King Edward VI. This came to nothing when Seymour was attainted and executed (3/1549). Four years later, John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland arranged the marriage (25 May, 1553) of Jane Grey to his son Guildford (1535-54). On 21 June, 1553, Northumberland persuaded the ailing King to alter his ‘Devise for the Succession’ by “Letters Patent”, a document in the King’s hand expressing the Royal Will. In this new ‘Devise’, Jane Grey was named Edward’s immediate successor. Edward VI died 6 July, 1553. To many observers it has appeared John Dudley took advantage of the King’s weakness to elevate his own family. Unfortunately, Northumberland’s popularity and hold on power was not as strong as he wished, and many key figures chose to support Mary Tudor instead of Jane Grey.

Following the reign of Mary I (*r. 1553-58*), Robert Dudley (1532-88) became a *de facto* Regent for Queen Elizabeth. Young Oxford, then ten years of age, became a ‘Grey Man’ — a *Grey Vere* or *Grai-Vir* (*Greek Man*), and was the Crown Tudor counterpart to Lady Jane Grey among the Suffolk Tudors. Oxford is the “Pricket”—a male deer of two years—to Lady Jane’s “Old *Grey Doe*” (see the analysis of *Love’s Labour’s Lost IV.2 1-161*, Part II of this essay); she was probably not yet seventeen when she was killed.

Oxford’s life, it appears, was the means of coercion by which Leicester (Rob. Dudley) maintained power. I’ll let Leicester speak behind the mask of KING CLAUDIUS (*Hamlet IV.7 11-16*); this is how Oxford constructs the scene.

Original Allegory	The queen his mother	
12	Lives almost by his looks, and for myself— My virtue or my plague, be it either which—	
14	She is so conjunctive to my life and soul That, as the <u>star</u> moves not but in his <u>sphere</u> ,	star : (<i>L</i>) <i>astrum</i> , <i>wp</i> , <i>anagram</i> St Maur sphere : (<i>L</i>) <i>orbis</i> / <i>bis-or</i> — Two-d’Or.
16	I could not but by her.	

Interpretation:	~ Queen Elizabeth, his mother
12	Survives only by his [apparent] form, and to my purpose— My Mercies or my Moles-tum, Sum it Two-t’Or Witch—
14	She is So married to my life and breath That, as the St Maur mores not but in his Or-Bis,
16	I could [Do] nothing but by her.

— **Henry Pimpernel** < Henri, Heinrich: ‘House ruler’ + Pipinella, Bipennella, (*bipenula, bipenella*): ‘two-winged’, an herbal name for Burnet Saxifrage, *Apiaceae Pimpinella saxifraga*; refers to the Seymour Arms (coat of arms): ‘Gules (red), two wings conjoined in lure or (gold)’.

~ **House Master Somerset** ~

► ‘Henry’ was originally a German name meaning ‘house ruler’. ‘Pimpernel’ means ‘two-winged’ by folk etymologies current in the 16th and 17th centuries. The emblem of ‘a gold lure—two conjoined wings—on a field of red’ was created for Edward Seymour, Lord Protector Somerset in 1547. The title ‘Somerset’ was chiefly associated with the Beaufort family, beginning with John Beaufort (1371-1410), 1st Earl of Somerset (*creation 1397*) and eldest son of John of Gaunt, then removed to the St Maur/Seymour family in 1547; the title remains with them today.

Of special interest to Oxford is the title ‘Somerset’ granted to Henry FitzRoy (1519-36), the illegitimate child of King Henry VIII and his mistress Bessie Blount. That *acknowledged* son was Oxford’s uncle. He was also Princess Elizabeth’s half brother. According to English Common Law he was (L) *filius nullius*: ‘a child of no one’, but King Henry was in a position to smooth the law. Within the Shakespeare Canon, Oxford claimed legitimacy — at least under certain legal dispositions. Even if he were not, he might still claim the Dukedom of Somerset by example of deceased uncle Henry, FitzRoy: (Fr) *Fils du Roi*: ‘son of the King’. Hence Henry, ‘Duke of Richmond & Somerset’ is the noted precedent. “*Ducdame, Ducdame, Ducdame*” (*As You Like It* II.5 49), ~ **Duke give me** ~ go the verses of JAQUES, a lord attending DUKE SENIOR:

~ ‘Tis a Greek invocation to call fools into a circle: (L) **Grai**: ‘the Greeks’ **fool**: (L) *morus*
 54 I’ll go sleep, if I can; if I cannot, I’ll rail against all the **rail**: *wp réal*: (L) *regalis*
first-born of Egypt. ~ **first-born of Egypt**: *Moses*, *wp* (L) *mos, mores*: ‘the will’

~ ‘Tis a Grey invocation to call Maurs into Tudor.

54 I’ll go D’Or-Mir, if I can; if I cannot, I’ll réal against Tout’de—

Mor’es first-born (of Egypt). ~

implied Moses, *wp* (L) *mos, moris* < Seymours

Oxford—ever playfully precise in his words—describes “*Ducdame*” as an invocation. He refers to the (Latin) *invoco*: *Il. Transf.* ‘to call by name, to name’, and fully intends to name names. The word itself, ‘Ducdame’ is barely ‘for the nonce’ as it is essentially (Latin) *Dux da’ me*, or (French) *Duc donne moi* — ~ Duke grant me ~ , ~ Duke bestow me ~ . Such is Oxford’s polite request. Nonetheless, the phrase is perfectly hidden—according to Oxford’s system of plausible and less offensive alternatives—in the (Welsh) *Dewch da mi*: ‘Come with me’; and this echoes the phrase “Come hither” (*As You Like It* II.5 5 & 38).

In reviewing the *Variorum*, for *As You Like It* (H. H. Furness, 1890, p.99) it is difficult to understand the consternation among commenters as to the meaning of ‘Ducdame’. Is it because the intrusion of the writer’s ‘supra-text’ is entirely unexpected? The spelling of ‘Duc’ suggests it is based in French, while JAQUES’ demands for **More!** indicates the verb is give, not come. If he be titled a Duke, JAQUES will have no enemies but “winter and rough wether”, ~ (Fr) *hyver*: ‘winter’ (E.Ver) and (Fr) *ébouriffé*: ‘disordered’ + (Fr) *mouton, béliet châtre*, (E) wether: ‘a castrated ram’. That is, his enemy will be his name under either outcome—as E. Vere or Tudur-Maur—unless he is officially recognized. For readers, a conclusion of this argument is surely that the writer’s biography and purpose must be understood if we are to make sense of the whole. Almost invariably, you’ll find enigmas that are unfathomable in the Furness *Variorum* soon disappear when considered in light of the Oxford-Seymour Thesis.

Hence, this passage from *The Taming of the Shrew* (*Induction 2 89-94*) is counsel towards understanding the writer’s naming practices. Character names are metonyms based on biographical-linguistic elements. The allonyms and pseudonyms under which Oxford wrote are likewise taken from his true or false names. If a character behaves honorably, he or she will represent a Tudor-St Maur. If one is false, it will be that old deVile deVere. Once More — if true, ‘The Moor of Venus’, if false, the a’Boar-rant [*Sant*] *Iago* (*Matamoros* = ‘killer of Moors’).

ROSENCRANTZ, (E) ‘Rose Crown’, and GUILDENSTERN, (E) ‘Golden Star’ are examples of names that hint at royalty, but in *Hamlet*, are oily courtiers trusted by CLAUDIUS to unwittingly carry out his deadly

plans. As with Oxford's false names, which were clearly permitted by Authority, these two serve to erase HAMLET (Ed. Tudor-St Maur) from the record — to wipe HAMLET's face, to “rub thy brows” GERTRUDE suggests helpfully (*Hamlet* V.2 271). ROSENCRANTZ and GUILDENSTERN are like well intending Oxfordian enthusiasts who insist on supporting the name Edward ‘de Vere’ — the historical name analogous to that of the false ‘Greek’ candidate Oxford calls LAERTES. That name represents, to the Artist, the fatal stroke against him for a crime he had no part in. So, again, there are at least two levels of separation between the Art and the Artist. ‘Shakespeare’ is a fairly obvious pseudonym, but he is far more intent on preserving his Tudor-Seymour name. That is the one stolen by the *Graii* (‘Greeks’).

House (1876) by Robert Browning (1812-89)

- 1 Shall I sonnet-sing you about myself?
Do I live in a house you would like to see?
...
33 Outside should suffice for evidence:
And whoso desires to penetrate
35 Deeper, must dive by the spirit sense —
No optics like yours, at any rate! **optics**, ‘sight sense’, ‘sense of sight’
37 “Hoity-toity! A street to explore, **hoity-toity**: a) ‘frolic, riot’; b) ‘haughtiness’
Your house the exception! ‘*With this same key*
39 *Shakespeare unlocked his heart,*’ **once more!**”
Did Shakespeare? If so, the less Shakespeare he!

I suggest the sharp-witted Robert Browning sensed the importance of ‘More’ in ‘Shakespeare’. He recognized the ‘More’ identity of the playwright, and assumed ‘Shakespeare’ to be a pseudonym. However, that is not the end — it is only the beginning. The name that Oxford fears is ‘de Vere’, not ‘Shakespeare’. His aversion—his *a’Vere’s-ion*, *a’Vere-scion*—to ‘de Vere’ can be found throughout the Canon. That Boar-ish/*Verres* surname will rob him of his identity far more surely than any other. Why? Because under the ‘de Vere’ name, he may be—as the senior noble of the Kingdom—electable to the throne of England, and then serve out his reign as servant to coercive ministers of the Privy Council.

And Maur-pleasing stuff ... Invention — Shakespeare’s Topics

~ *Sea’s Son your admiration for a while with attainment’ heir ...* ~

(*First Folio*) **attent eare**, wordplay (*Old French*) **ateint eir: attained heir** (*Hamlet* I. 2 192, HORATIO)

I have already shown hundreds of examples from Oxford/‘Shakespeare’, both of **Arrangement** (*Dispositio*) and **Mastery of Style** (*Elocutio*). They are often thought to represent an artificial mode of speech common to educated Elizabethans—‘that’s just the way they spoke back then’—but no, there is a calculated use of virtually each word, meant to deceive the unwary reader yet cement the Artist’s intentions to those who are More attentive.

Perhaps the most important element of written Rhetoric, however, is **Invention** (*Inventio*) whereby the *topos*—the ‘place’ or topic, the subject—of the work is stated. Look for it near the beginning of each play or poem, or else in the dying murmurs of principle characters. Because Oxford’s method explores the range of semantic variation in so many words, the reader relies on the clearly stated topic to decide which of several possible meanings is the one intended. Let’s take a look at a few examples just to remind ourselves the importance of choosing the right course.

Invention: *4a* ‘In art and literary composition: The devising of a subject, idea, or method of treatment..’, *1d* ‘The discovery or selection of topics to be treated, or arguments to be used.’ (*OED*).

Sonnet 1 *The Sonnets* (Topic: *Succession of the Beaufort/Tudor Line*)

1 From fairest creatures we desire increase,
 2 That thereby beauty's rose might never die,
 ~ 1 ~ *From Tudor heirs we, by the Sire, accede*
 ~ 2 ~ *That by t'heir the Beaufort Rose might ne'Vere More, ~*

The Topic is the succession of the Beaufort Rose—the Red Rose—of the Royal Family. As I noted in the *Historical Preface* (Part I) of this essay, the Seymour Family held the key to the House of Beaufort and the Dukedom (Ducate/*Ducatus*) of Somerset after 1547. The exclusion of the (*surname*) Vere, assumed from the epithet never (ne Vere) and the metonym more (Maur) in line 2, matches the “*apostrophas*” or *Aversio*—a-Vere'scion—as noted by HOLOFERNES (*LLL V. 1 118*). Oxford's topics are not simply exercises in rhetoric, but a revelation of history and preservation of the Writer's Story—without which **Nothing**.

Hamlet I. 1 1 (Topic: Succession of the Hamlet Line)

BARNARDO

1 Who's there?
 ~ 1 ~ *Who's t'heir? ~*

Act I, scene 1 of *Hamlet* includes carefully allegorized observations and commentary on the guardianship of Edward VI (*reigned 1547-53*) as it pertains to the period 1547-49 during which our Writer was born. As I have mentioned elsewhere, BARNARDO represents the historical 'Bear', the Earl of Warwick, who seized control of the king's Privy Council in late 1549. MARCELLUS masks for Edward Seymour, Lord Protector or Regent from the accession of Edward VI until October 1549. FRANCISCO masks for the 'frank & honest' John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford, who became the godfather of Edward Oxenford/Tudor-Seymour. The *persona* of Oxford's true father is KING HAMLET; he would have become King as consort to Elizabeth R.

Titus Andronicus I. 1 1-9 (Topic: Succession, by primogeniture or selection).

SATURNINUS

Noble patricians, patrons of my right,
 2 Defend the justice of my cause with arms.
 And countrymen, my loving followers,
 4 Plead my **successive title** with your swords.
 I am his **first-born son** that was the last
 6 That wore the imperial diadem of Rome.

BASSIANUS

Romans, friends, followers, favorers of **my right**,
 10 If **ever Bassianus**, Caesar's son ...
 16 Let desert in **pure election** shine,
 And, Romans, fight for freedom in **your choice**.

All the works in the *First Folio* involve the question of Succession and the right to rule, either as the principal topic or as an attendant topic. Here, SATURNINUS masks for Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset and Lord Protector (1547-49). BASSIANUS represents his younger brother Thomas Seymour, Lord Admiral, Baron Sudeley, and biological father to Oxford/'Shakespeare'. See the postscript to this essay for the key (*Dramatis Personae*) to *Titus Andronicus*.

While our 'Shakespeare' appears to hold little hope for his own succession, in the end he makes a plea for readers to pay close attention to his words. Of course Shakespeare is a *nom de plume*, but Vere? ~ Ay, there's the **rub** ~, rub: (*L*) *delere*: 'annihilation'! (*see Hamlet III. 1 65*). At least his existence, his *Vie*, might be remembered as 'something More'—a (*L*) *res*: 'thing', *wp* (E) *rased*, race: *n.5* 'a breed of horses', a Some'More Orse; a St Maur race:

King Lear V. 3 312-18 (Topic: failed accession)

LEAR

- 312 And my poor **fool** is **hanged**: no, no, no **life**? **fool**: ‘term of endearment’ (Var.) & surname *Morio*
 Why should a **dog**, a **horse**, a **rat**, have life, **dog**, (L) *canis*, wp *canus*: Grey **horse**, wp Tu d’**Ors**
- 314 And thou no breath at **all**? Thou’lt **come no more**, **thou’lt**, wp, *timesis* Thou will — *tu’mæur*
Never, never, never, never, never. (Fr) *ne*: ‘not’, ~ not Vere ~
- 316 Pray you **undo** this **button**. Thank you, sir. **button**, (Fr) *bouton*: ‘bud, bourgeon’, ‘seed, scion’
Do you see this? Look here! Look, her lips, **look**, (L) *intueor*, wp in Tudor. **here**, wp heir
- 318 Look **there**, look **there** — **there**, wp ~ t’heir ~
- 312 ~ *And my poor More is Sus-pended: no, no, no Vere?* **hanged**, wp ~ Boar-hanged ~
Why should a Canine, a h’Orse, a Mus, have Vi(r)e,
- 314 *And Tu no Vi(r)e at Tout’(h)? Tu’Mæurs accede no More,*
Ne’Ver, ne’Ver, ne’Ver, ne’Ver, ne’Ver.
- 316 *Pray you, un-Do this bourgeon. Thank you, sir.*
Tu Do See this? Look here! Look, her Heir. **lip**, (Fr) *lèvre*, wp *lièvre*: ‘hare’, wp heir.
- 318 *Look t’Heir, Look t’Heir — ~ (he dies)*

CORDELIA—‘*Cœur de Lion*’, our very own ‘Shakespeare’, murmurs (*murmure*) even in death (*mort*). She lives, if you can hear *his* ‘feint’ voice! ~ **Not Vere, not Vere, not Vere, not Vere, not Vere.** ~ (315) Why, there it is — “that strain again, it had a dying fall” (*descendre*, see *Twelfth Night* 1.1 4)—**no, no, no Vi(r)e.** (312). CORDELIA is the heart of the Lion—the Tudor Lion. She/He lives on, like *Hamlet’s* HORATIO/*Oratio* in memorial words. Readers of ‘Shakespeare’, like NATHANIEL of (*Love’s Labour’s Lost* IV. 3 128), have not found the previously mentioned “*Apostrophas*”—the *Aversio*, (*a-Vere* ‘scion’)—or opposition to the Vere, and so miss the accent, wp (L) *accenseo*: ‘reckoned in addition’, ~ **what is more** ~ . King Lear’s FOOL *is* his ‘daughter’! In madness, his dying words intend to ‘un-Do’, ‘**Tu** (un) **Do**’ his child/*bouton*; and yet, that child is the ‘Heart of the Lion’. Look! The Heir — Do you see! In the mad state of Moria, Queen Elizabeth R will “undo” her son — hence his *Damnatio Memoriae*.

Conclusions — Edward St Maur, This is Your Life!

‘Shakespeare’ is constructed within Classical Rhetoric. The Artist uses nearly the full range of adornments—devices and figures of speech—to disguise his meaning and evade censors. As with many Latin writers of antiquity, Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ has hidden politically sensitive biography beneath a cloak of allegory. Orthodox grammar, including semantics, syntax, morphology, and phonology are overturned and twisted about to yield works of *noema*—enigmatic language. They must be read carefully, “and again and again” if we want to join in the Wit. His compositions hold secrets only understood by circumspect understanding.

To conclude, I believe it’s perfectly reasonable to have difficulty understanding ‘Shakespeare’. Literary theory approaches the great Artist in a manner sure to keep his meaning cloudy; and powerful political forces no doubt have a vested interest in maintaining things as they are. The obscure William Shakspere who communicated so little with his contemporary admirers, has only the crudest possession of another man’s Art. Any thief might present such evidence. You would do the rightful owner no justice to blindly insist on the thief. Even still, to some students, any Author seems preferable to the one man who claims ownership of the works in “**ev’ry Line, each Verse**” (L. Digges, *TO THE MEMORIE of the deceased AUTHOR* ...). Look where you will, no one has put their name to the Art except Edward (‘de Vere’) Tudor-Seymour—which is insinuated throughout in such manner (*once more*):

“That every word doth almost [fell, tell] my name. Showing their birth and where they did proceed.” *wordplay* (E) **fell**: ‘to unseat, to drop’

The name is *Good*. The story is *Good*. But Bad or Good, *Malus* or (*wordplay*) *Merces*, says Ben Jonson:

~Neither **Vir** nor **Mure** can praise too much! ~ (Latin) **Vir**: ‘man’, wp, surname Vere
 (L) **Muris** < **Mus**, wp, surname **Mure**, **Maur** **praise**, (L) *amplio*: Trop. ‘to amplify’, ‘to render glorious’

What Vere? This Maur! The Author had expert knowledge of Ovid, Vergil, Varro, and other Latin writers. He used their technique, Etymological Wordplay, to build verse of his name. By his choice of words and syllables, by puns, riddles, allusion, and allegory, he tells his name, his birth, and where by right he should Succeed. His message is clear, and all too sensitive.

‘Shakespeare’ signed his letters Edward Oxenford. He was permitted to do so; moreover, he did so under threat from Authority. That’s what he tells us. Perhaps the Queen herself was allowed to live only because his secret was kept (*Hamlet IV. 7 11-12*). I believe we have it on the best Authority—the Writer’s—that his works are “**a kind of History**” (*The Taming of the Shrew Ind.2 136-38*). It is ‘**More-pleasing stuff**’. You’ll profit by taking his words to be truth-telling jests; Oxford is BEROWNE:

MARIA ... Berowne, the merry madcap lord.

Not a word with him but a jest.

word, (Fr) *mot* **jest**, (Fr) *bon mot*

BOYET

And every jest but a word. **but**, (Fr) *seulement*/wp St Maur

Every (Fr) *bon mot*: ‘jest’, is his ‘good Moe’/‘good More’. Every word ‘good’ almost tells his Mercery name. The sacrificed identity of the Queen’s child is a fine or penalty—literally the amercement—that has been amerced /‘Mersea’d / SeyMaur’d, against the Crown Tudors by their Leices’[t]er (lesser) Grey-Dudley cousins. **Listen!** “Knock, knock, knock” — (Fr) ~ *Coup, coup, coup*. ~ (*Macbeth II. 3 11*) ... a king has been overthrown. Pity the poor PORTER’s report (porter / report — door”Two, Two-d’Or): “**Anon, anon!**” (*II. 3 18*)—(Fr) ~ *Tout d’heure, tout d’heure* ~ ... Tudor.

Solving a riddle does no ‘violence’ to the riddle. A riddle remains a riddle, even when it has been solved. As in teaching math, we don’t provide students with the solutions to all problems, but we give enough examples so they may see the way such problems can be approached. The riddle then presents itself to the next reader. Shakespeare’s Wit will remain enigmatic; thereby each student may observe first hand how brilliantly he managed the problem of censorship—his “tongue-tied” state.

Honest commenters admit how much of ‘Shakespeare’ is still a mystery to them. The language needs some careful interpretation. His works must not be thought nonsense. This would be an injustice to his talent and the extraordinary effort expended to create so many witty puzzles; and it would be an injustice to history. Authority has forced a sort of ‘violence’ against the Writer’s Art, and understanding his *noema*—his complex circumlocutions, his equivocations—undoes the violence of censorship. Let it be the first article of faith in Shakespeare’s Art: All apparent superfluity of expression is a deliberate exercise of rhetorical *pleonasm*; in fact, the more he says, the more we can learn. There is no true redundancy. Periphrasis is an illusion.

Content and dis-content mark the boundaries of the Artist’s character studies. In ‘Shakespeare’, we have seen two antithetical characters represent Oxford at war with himself—The Moor vs. The Boar. His true bloodline from illustrious parents struggles against a false creation: the line of Crown Tudors against the name ‘de Vere’—noble, to be sure, but a name enslaved to Suffolk-Grey-Dudley pretenders. Self possession contends with possession by others. How might such conflicts of interest be resolved? Either humorously, in marriage between the two adverse parties, or tragically, in their mutual annihilation. These are the conditions imposed on Oxford by his mother, Queen Elizabeth I, and her coercive Ministers of State, Cecil and Dudley.

Characters representing ‘The Moor’—Tudor-Maur—are drawn subtly benign. They have flaws and are rarely entirely unambiguous. They may be moody: sometimes merry, sometimes mournful. Sometimes they are rash—sometimes they hesitate. But they have great stores of admirable goodness. ‘The Moor’, in scores of iterations, doesn’t have designs on the lives of others; he merely tries to fulfill his purpose. ‘The Boar’—in a *Verres persona*—is also complex, but by degrees treacherous. He has only a small reserve of goodwill, and what he can muster is generally borrowed from ‘The Moor’. *Verres* want to possess, by whatever dishonest means, all that Moors hold naturally.

Once it is recognized that HAMLET *is* the Author—Edward Tudor-Seymour—we can constitute what seem to be missing elements in the fashioning of his characters. With apologies to T. S. Eliot, the cause of HAMLET’s hesitation in meting justice upon CLAUDIUS is his (*Latin*) *mora*: ‘delay’—his (St) **Maur**. He is too (*L*) *mollis*: ‘gentle’. In HAMLET’s authentic name is character inherent in the name itself—**Morio**.

Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ believes he is the sole heir to the state of *Dano-Marci* (Denmark)—the **Do**’s and the **Mars**’, Tudors & Maurs. The *Dano-Marci* represents the *de facto* state of marriage between Elizabeth Tudor and Thomas Seymour, that was forbidden by King Edward VI’s privy Council under Lord Protector Edward Seymour. The Tudor-Seymour family includes the descendants down from their only child, Edward ‘Oxenford’. Denmark is England. Oxford/‘Shakespeare’, is the family historian.

Can we forgive Samuel Johnson for his famous condemnation of the quibble or pun?

“A quibble is to *Shakespeare* ... the golden apple for which he will always turn aside from his career, or stoop from his elevation. A quibble, poor and barren as it is, gave him such delight, that he was content to purchase it, by the sacrifice of reason, propriety, and truth. A quibble was to him the fatal *Cleopatra* for which he lost the world, and was content to lose it.”

(*Preface to Shakespeare*)

It has been shown that Shakespeare’s puns are no ordinary puns. They have purpose. He did not pun for the modest humor of homonymy, or some such slight effect, but for some effect of sleight. He did not sacrifice reason or propriety, and he certainly appears to cherish the truth. He simply has something to say that is politically dangerous, and various forms of wordplay allow him to approach his complaint by an indirect route. From that vantage he saw new Methods and Processes by which to tell his story.

Elizabethans appear to have been intent on following the well-worn paths of Classicists, trying to match the artistic achievements of the great Latin writers rather than revolutionizing literature. If analysis or criticism is not in accordance with general rhetorical principles found in Puttenham (1590), or indeed in Aristotle (*c.* 335 BC), it is likely anachronistic to Oxford’s Art.

Some think I have concocted this astonishing Word Wit out of my little noggin — my little, wine-soaked, humorless noggin. As if this ugly mug—*Quel vilain museau!*—could imagine such riddles; but no, I am ‘not able to invent anything that intends to laughter’ ... what little Muse I have comes directly from Jack FALSTAFF. I do not deny it takes honest involvement to solve the enigmas of ‘Gentle Shakespeare’. But really, you ought to look. There is a store of clever language in ‘Shakespeare’ beyond what has been described here. “Well, we leave that to the proof.” (*1 Henry IV II.2 66, HAL to “whoreson” FALSTAFF*). Here:

As You Like It III. 3 10-14 ~ a Mawr Tudor in a concealed birth, ‘Vere-ily’...~

CLOWN — TOUCHSTONE: (*OED*) *n. and adj.* 2a ‘Fine-grained black stone (typically a type of chert) upon which objects made of gold or silver can be rubbed to determine their purity.’

10 When a man’s verses cannot be understood, nor
 11 a man’s good wit seconded with the forward child,
 12 understanding: it strikes a man more dead than a **great**
 13 **reckoning in a little room** : truly, I would the Gods had
 14 made thee poetical.

Examination of Wordplay

10 When a man’s verses cannot be understood, nor
 ~ **When a man’s** [(*Mid.Fr*) *viril* < (*L*) *vir*: ‘of man’, ‘in full possession of his powers’; *wp, surname* de Vere.] **verses** [(*MFr*) *verser*: *être renversé*: 2 ‘to be altered’, *Agriculture* ‘overturned’, (*MFr*) *versure*:

‘alteration’] **cannot be understood** [(Fr) *entendre*: wp en: < (L) *in*: I ‘to put something into what is denoted by the noun’ (see OED) + tender: (MFr) *mol, mou, mollet*: ‘soft, mellow; weak, tame’ < (L) *mollis*: wp anagram *Si-moll, Si-morr, Seymour*; alt. (MFr) *doux*: ‘sweet’], **nor** [wp negating the ‘golden syllable’ and fundamental morpheme of Seymour and Tudor — (Fr) *or*: ‘gold’] ~

~ **When a Vere’s Vere-iation cannot be en-tender’d, née Or** ~

~ *When a Vere’s alterations cannot be se More, n’Or* ~

11 a man’s good wit seconded with the forward child,

~ **a man’s** [(MidFr) *viril* < (L) *vir*: ‘of man’, ‘in full possession of his powers’; wp, surname de Vere.] **good** [(MFr) *bien*: ‘good’, (MFr) *commodité*: ‘product (especially from which profit can be made’ (OED, etym.), (MFr) *marchandise, mercerie*: wp Ce-Mer’y, Seymour(y); alt. (E) wp *vvares, wares* — unlikely because a lack of agreement with “wit”.] **wit** [(MFr) *muse* < (L) *musa*: ‘poetic inspiration’, ‘genius, wit, taste’] **seconded** [(MFr) *seconder*: ‘to back up, to assist, support’] **with the forward** [(MFr) *empres, empressé*: ‘following after’, ‘in front’; apparently referring to primogeniture—‘firstborn’, ‘having the right of succession and inheritance’] **child** [(Fr) *fil, le fil*: ‘a male child, son’; wp (L) *filum*], ~

~ **a Vere’s Mer-Sea’ry Muse, sup-Ported with the Empress’s child** ~

12 understanding: it strikes a man more dead than a great

~ **understanding** [(Fr) *entendre*: wp en: < (L) *in*: I ‘to put something into what is denoted by the noun’ (see OED) + tender: (MFr) *mol, mou, mollet*: ‘soft, mellow; weak, tame’ (see l.10); (E) *intender*: ‘a claimant, pretender’, ~ offered as a pretender ~] **it strikes** [(MFr) *rendre*: ‘to give up, surrender’, ‘to repay’; perhaps as in (E) *strike*: 11b ‘to mark, to stigmatize’] **a man** [(MidFr) *viril* < (L) *vir*: ‘of man’, ‘in full possession of his powers’; wp, surname de Vere.] **more** [surname More, St Maur] **dead** [(Fr) *mort*, wp, emphasis, surname More, St Maur] **than a great** [(Fr) *grand*: ‘great’, (Fr) *étendu*: ‘outstretched, extended’, as in (L) *amplius*: ‘more’, and (Welsh) *mawr*.] ~

~ **intender’d: it renders a Vere More Maur than a Mawr** ~

13 reckoning in a little room : truly, I would the Gods

~ **reckoning** [(Fr) *compte*: ‘account, report’, metonym Re-port: ~ Two-door ~, (Fr) *report*: ‘carrying forward, amount brought forward’ — this would be consistent with “forward” of line 11. Often thought to refer to (Fr) *comte*: ‘Count..corresponding to (E) Earl’, but is more coherent as (E) *report*.] **in a little** [(Fr) *petit*: ‘little, small’, ‘very young’] **room** [(Fr) *chambre, salle* — I find “little” and “room” to belong together, and suggest (E) *cell*, (Fr) *cellule*, (MFr) *celle*: ‘a monk’s cell’, hence ~ a small room ~, wp (Fr) *celer*: ‘to conceal, to keep secret, (E) *celation* < (Fr) *célation*: Law, Medicine ‘concealment of birth’, ‘to hide pregnancy, birth’] **: truly** [(MFr) *veraiment*, (E) *veriment*: ‘truly, verily’], **I would** [(E) *past and conditional Will*, as (L) *more, mos, moris*, indicating the writer’s surname More, St Maur (and certainly not the given name William); wp (Fr) *mæur*] **the Gods** [(Fr) *dieux*: wp surname Two-dieux, To Do(r), Tudor, punning expression “the Gods: (Welsh) *Tewdwr*, wp *Ty dur*: ‘House of Steel’, wp (Fr) *Té-dieux*: ~ having qualities of the Gods. ~] ~

~ **Tudor in a concealed birth : Vere-ily’ — I would Tudors** ~

14 had made thee poetical.

~ **had** [(Fr) *avoir, tenir, etc. faire*] **made** [(Fr) *faire*: ‘to do, make’] **thee poetical** [(Fr) *poétique*, but here referring to (Fr) *musique*: ‘art presided over by the Muses, especially poetry sung to music’; wp refers to root (Fr) *mus*, as in (Fr) *musoir*: ‘wing, wall (of a lock)’, cf. *mur*: ‘wall’]. ~

~ **had fair’d Tu Mus’ic-All.** ~

~ **had fair’d you Muris-All.** ~

10 ~ *When a Vere's Vere-iation cannot be in Si-More, nor Or,*
 a Vere's Mer-Sea'ry Muse, sup-Ported with the Empress's child
 12 *intender'd: it renders a Vere More Maur than a Mawr*
Tudor in a concealed birth : 'Vere-ily' — I would Tudors
 14 *Fair'd Tu Music-All. ~*

TOUCHSTONE — CLOWN (Again, for comparison, the original from the *First Folio*).

10 When a man's verses cannot be understood, nor
 a man's good wit seconded with the forward child,
 12 understanding: it strikes a man more dead than a great
 reckoning in a little room : truly, I would the Gods had
 14 made thee poetical.

There it is, 'bounded in a Nutshell'. The "little room" signifies at least two things. First, it is a (E) **cell**: 1a 'a small room', 'a small room for a monk', (L) *monachus*—wp (E) monarch. Related words include (L) *celata*: 'secrets', and (E) celation: *Law* 'concealment, especially concealment of a birth or pregnancy'. Second, a "little room" allows a transitive pun on ~ Smoll Moor ~, *Mollis Maurus* / 'gentle Moor', so as to almost tell the subjects name. Look what fun Oxford is having with his words; the fun comes from knowing words. A truth-telling CLOWN is only doing his job ... are we doing ours! Should schools teach the more playful language arts?

Has the Artist proved his name for all readers—who can say? In revealing his "well-proved Wit" he appears to think he has given sufficient evidence.

Dedication to *Lucrece*

The Heart of the Matter, Mater. and the Sonnets. The essential Unity of All 'Shakespeare' at the Super-textual level.

Once More, no formal declaration has been found for the disposition of Edward Oxenford's estate. There is, however, a written record of his wishes — wishes "without end", that cannot be revoked:

TO THE
RIGHT HONORABLE
HENRY WRIOTHESLEY,
 EARL OF SOUTHAMPTON AND BARON TITCHFIELD

The **love** I dedicate to **your** Lordship is without end; whereof this Pamphlet without beginning is but a superfluous Moiety. The warrant I have of **your** Honorable disposition, not the **worth** of my **untutored** Lines, makes it assured of acceptance. VVhat I have **done** is **yours**; what I have **to do** is **yours**; being part in **all** I have, devoted **yours**. VVere my **worth** **greater**, my **duty** would show **greater**; meantime, as it is, it is bound to **your** Lordship, to whom I wish **long** life **still lengthened** with **all** happiness.

Even to his **Will**, Oxford /'Shakespeare' will not give up his game. He *cannot* give up his game. This dedication is not an address. The Poet's Love—his a '**Mour**'—is assigned and surrendered to his son. As in a will, the writer's '**Mour**' is consecrated to his 'Brown' son by Mary Browne Wriothesley (1552-1607), *Countess Southampton*. This dedication may be the most important passage in the 'Shakespeare' Canon.

In this last paragraph I have alluded to a mysterious scene from *1 Henry IV II. 4 1-106*. The meaning has been lost to 'Time' (William Cecil), but Oxford-Seymour Theory can, and will, clearly delineate each word. PRINCE HAL takes a few moments to play a trick on FRANCIS the 'drawer', (*Fr*) *tireur*. FRANCIS is named so because he is 'frank, honest' and speaks verities; he is (*Fr*) *le vrai*, (*L*) *vere*: 'according to truth'. Herein lies the problem, and FRANCIS knows it — his name is false! When he hears

FRANCIS, *i.e.* Vere, called, he insists on correcting a frank misapprehension: his true name is Anon, Anon! in French *tout d'heure*, *tout d'heure!* with transitive wordplay on the surname Tudor, Tudor! He resents being commanded about; it is dangerous to draw and serve under that name. FRANCIS and PRINCE HENRY (HAL) signify the same historical individual, the man we call 'Shakespeare', and the "boisson" called 'Browne Bastard' refers to the first male offspring of both, and the grape variety call Muscadelle ... *wordplay delle Musca, ~ of the Fly ~*. Whether appearing as FRANCIS/ 'Frank de Vere', or as HAL, Prince of Wales, he is "Anon" — *tout d'heure*. And HAL can truthfully say: 'Browne Bastard is your only **boisson**' — **boy son**. As base Tudor, *all the* wealth he has runs in his veins, and this holds true of both father and son. Otherwise they are Nothing; each is *filii nullius*: 'a child of no one'.

As is often the case, one identity belonging to the Writer plays off another identity because:

**You have a double tongue within your mask
And would afford my speechless vizard half.**

(LLL V.2 246 LONGAVILLE; see: 243 KATHERINE as Maria; 272 PRINCESS;
386 ROSALINE; 387 BEROWNE; 388 ROSALINE; 405 BEROWNE)

► **vizard**: 3 'outward appearance..under which something different is hid' (OED); (French) *vis*: 'face', *wordplay (Latin) vis, plural vires*: 1 'energy, virtue, potency', 12c 'hostile strength, force, violence'.

A supposed etymological link between vizard and vis—(E) vizard: 'a mask', (E) visage: 'face', (MFr) *un fol visage*: 'a mask', and (E) vis: 'strength, vigour', (E) visage: 'to face or confront'—I suggest the mask or vizard points to *de Vir / de Vere*.

Examination of Wordplay:

1 The **love** I dedicate to your Lordship is without end;

~ **The love**: [*wordplay (Latin) amor, (French) amour; surname Maur, St Maur, Seymour*] **I** [The Poet, Oxford / Edward Tudor-Seymour] **dedicate** [(L) *dedicare*: II. 2b 'to destine, dispose, a thing for any purpose'] **to** [*wp (L) Tu*: 1st syllable Tu(d'or)] **your** [*wordplay y'our, y-, prefix: 1 'persons associated or related by birth, family, or status' + our: wp (Fr) or, ore, (L) orum — 'gold'*] **Lordship** [*wp (E) Lord, (L) deus*: 'a man or (occasionally) god who has power or pre-eminence', *wp I'dor + ship: (L) status*: 'state, condition'] **is without end** [(L) *immensum*: 'boundless, vast, measureless', (Welsh) *mawr*: 'great'];
— "O, I smell false Latin" (LLL V.1 72) —

~ **The 'Maur I bequeath to y'our Tud'or State is Mawr**; ~

~ **The a'Maur I destine to y'Our Tud'or State is Sea-mure'less**; ~

2 whereof this Pamphlet without beginning is but a superfluous Moiety.

~ **whereof** [(L) *de*:] **this Pamphlet** [*wp < Greek, literal meaning 'beloved by all' — hence wp Sum- amor ab (ap) Totus*] **without** [(L) *sine, wp (L) foras*: 'out of doors'] ~ **beginning** [(L) *inceptio*, (E) *inception*: 'origination, beginning', < (L) *incipio*: II 'to begin to be'; (L) *principium, primordium*] **is but** [(L) *modo: surnames ~ Moe-Doe ~ , More-d'Or*] **a superfluous** [(L) *supervacaneus*: *wp (L) super*: II B2c 'above, beyond' + (L) *vacca*: 'cow', '*boves operariae*: used in ploughing'; *alt. canis*: 'dog'] **Moiety** [(E) *moiety*: 'a half, one of two equal parts, (L) *medietas*: 'a half, one of two parts'; *wp Moe-ty, Maur-Ty*].

~ **VVere of Tудо(h)s Sum-Maur'd without MoeDoe inception,
More than Oxfor'd twice over.** ~

3 The warrant I have of your Honorable disposition,

~ **The warrant** [(L) *auctoritas*: I 'a producing, production, invention, cause', II 2E 'might, power, authority, weight'; *alt. (L) confirmare*: II C 'to give full assurance of'] **I have** [(L) *portare*: 'to bear, carry, convey' — (E) *port*: v.2 'carry, bear, convey'] **of your** [*wp y: (E) y-, prefix: 'persons associated or related by birth, family, or status' + our: 'belonging or associated with the speaker and one or more other people'; wp ~ the Ore ~ , ~ The 'Ors' ~ , etc. — see line 5 below.*] **honorable** [(L) *amplus*: 'great, large, ample,

long', (L) *amplius*: 'more'; *alt.* (L) *honoratus*: *wp honor, honos*: 'honor, repute' + *ratus*: 'certain, assured', *wp* (L) *rattus*: 'rat' as emblem of Seymour.] **disposition** [(L) *ordinatio*: *II Trop.* 'an ordering, orderly arrangement', *wp* Or-d'Or-ing, hence Two-d'Oring.], ~

~ **The Invention I comport of Y'our Maur Tudor-ing**, ~

~ **The Cause I bear of th'Or More-Tudor**, ~

4 not the **worth** of my **untutored Lines**, makes it **assured** of **acceptance**.

~ **not the worth** [(L) *valere*: 'to have power, force, or influence', likely playing on (E) *were*, (L) *vir*: 'man'; (L) *aestimatio*: 'to determine the value of a thing'; *wp* (L) *aestas*: 'the Summer season' + (Sanskrit) *mata*, (Latin) *mentus*: 'thought'] of my **untutored** [*wp* ~ un-Tudor'd ~] **Lines** [(L) *versus*: *II B* 'a line of writing', *wp* *surname Vere* + (L) *sus*: 'a swine, hog, boar'], **makes** [(L) *facere, fieri*; (It) *fare*, (Fr) *faire*: 'to do', *wordplay* *Tudo(r)*.] **it assured** [(L) *certus, ratus*: 'settled, firm, sure', *wp* (L) *rattus*: 'rat', as emblem of *Muris*, Seymours.] of **acceptance** [(L) *acceptio*: *I B* 'the accepting of a proposition'; *II* 'an esteeming of a thing'; *wp* "acceptance" + "assured", hence ~ *aesti-Mus* ~ , or ~ *aesti'Muris* ~]. ~

~ **not the St Maur value of my un-Tudor'd Vere'sus, fares it aesti'Muris**. ~

5 **VVhat I have done is yours; what I have to do is yours;**

~ **VVhat** [*wp* (E) *what* and *wat*: 'hare' — *heir*] **I have** [(L) *fero*: 'bear, birth'; *alt.* (L) *portare*: 'to bear, carry, convey' — (E) *port*: *v.2* 'carry, bear, convey'; *alt.* *wp* (L) *habere, habeo*: 'to have, possess, enclose, contain', *wp* (E) *harbor, port*.] **done** [*past participle* (E) *to do*, ~ Tudor ~] **is yours** [*wp* *y*: (E) *y*-, *prefix*: 'persons associated or related by birth, family, or status' + *our*: 'belonging to or associated with the speaker and one or more other people', hence the *ours, ors, ores*: ~ the golden ones ~ of Tud'Or.]; **what I have** [*see above*] **to do** [*wp* (E) *to do*—Tudor.] **is yours** [*as before*]; ~

~ **Wat heir I harbor Tudor is Y'ours; what I Port Tudor is Y'ours**; ~

6 being part in **all** I have, devoted **yours**.

~ **being part** [*wp* (L) *summa, summus*: 'summit', *II Transf.* 'the sum, height, perfection', (L) *primas partes*: 'the chief part', likely referring to first born, primogeniture.] **in all** [(L) *totus, wp* *Tudo(h)s*, *Tudors*.] **I have** [(L) *fero, porto*], **devoted** [(L) *conferre*: *II* 'to bear, carry, convey'] **yours** [*wp* *y*: (E) *y*-, *prefix*: 'persons associated or related by birth, family, or status' + *our*: 'belonging to or associated with the speaker and one or more other people']. ~

~ **Summer's Prime-part I bear in Tudors, conveying Y'ours**; ~

7 **VVere my worth greater, my duty would show greater;**

~ **VVere** [*wp* (E) *were*: *n.1* = (L) *vir*: 'a male person', and *surname Vere*] **my worth** [(L) *valere*: 'to have power, force, or influence', likely playing on (E) *were*, (L) *vir*: 'man'; (L) *aestimatio*: 'to determine the value of a thing'; *wp* (L) *aestas*: 'the Summer season' + (Sanskrit) *mata*, (Latin) *mentus*: 'thought'] **greater** [(L) *amplius, amplius*: 'more'], **my duty** [*wp*, *anagram* (Welsh) *Ty-du(r)*: ~ House of Steel ~, "hard house", see *King Lear III.2 60-67*.] **would** [*wp* (E) *would/wood*: (L) *materia*: *wp* (L) *mater*: 'mother'] **show** [(L) *monstrare*] **greater** [(L) *amplius, (Welsh) mawr*]; ~

~ **VVere my vvere'th Maur, my Ty-dur Mater would show Maur**; ~

8 meantime, **as it is, it is** bound to your **Lordship**,

~ **meantime** [(L) *interatim*: *wp inter*: 'among, between, amid' + *ratim*:], **as** [(L) *idem ac, atque*: 'the same'] **it is** [(L) *itis*: *dative eo* 'to increase', 'in addition, besides', 'moreover', hence 'more'], **it is** [*wp* (L) *itis*: *dative eo* 'to increase', ''] **bound** [*wp* (L) *vincio, vincire*: 'to compass, encircle'] **to** [*wp, timesis* (L) *Tu*] **your** [*wordplay y'our, y-*, *prefix*: *1* 'persons associated or related by birth, family, or status' + *our*: *wp*

(Fr) *or*, *ore*, (L) *orum* — ‘gold’] **Lordship** [wp (E) *Lord*, (L) *deus*: ‘a man or (occasionally) god who has power or pre-eminence’, wp l’dor + *ship*: (L) *status*: ‘state, condition’], ~

~ *among Maurs, Seym-mours, More compassed Tu y’our Tudor-state*, ~

9 to whom I wish **long** life **still lengthened** with **all** happiness.

~ **to whom** [wp (L) *uter*: II B ‘either of two’, referring to the close relationship conferred by wordplay Y’Our.] **I wish** [(L) *volo*: ‘wish, intend, purpose, will’] **long** [(L) *longus*: IC ‘great, vast’, II *trans.* ‘of long duration’] **life** [(L) *vita*: ‘life’, *anima*: ‘soul’, II *transf.* ‘air’, wp ~ heir ~] **still** [(L) *immotus*: ‘unmovable’, II *Trop.* ‘steadfast, firm’, ‘unchangeable’, unalterable.] **lengthened** [(Latin) *longitudo*, wordplay (L) *longus*: ‘great, vast’; (L) *amplus*: ‘great’; (L) *amplius*: ‘more’] **with** [(L) *cum*: ‘with’, conceived as (L) *sum*, wp St, Seym, hence Mawr-sum, Sum-maur, etc.] **all** [(L) *totus*, wp ~ Tudo(h)s ~] **happiness** [(L) *felicitas*: I ‘fruitfulness, fertility’, (L) *ferax*: ‘fruitful, fertile’, II ‘happiness’]. ~

~ *T’uter, I Will a Maur soul steadfastly Mawr with Tudor fruitfulness*. ~

~ *T’uter, I Will a More sole heir, unalterably Mawr, with Tudor fruitfulness*. ~

Once More: Oxford’s Will to his Browne Bastard, ~ Y’our only *boisson* ~ ,

wordplay (Fr) *boisson*: ‘drink’, ~ boy son ~ , male heir, by Mary Browne, (see 1 King Henry the Fourth II. 4 71):

~ *The ’Maur I bequeath to y’our Tud’or State is Mawr;*

2 *VVere of Tudo(h)s Sum-Maur’d without MoreDore inception,*

(More than Oxfor’d twice over). ~

The Invention I comport of Y’our Maur Tudor-ing,

4 *not the St Maur value of my un-Tudor’d Vere’sus — fares it aesti’Muris.*

Wat heir I harbor Tudor is Y’ours; what I Port Tudor is Y’ours;

6 *Summer’s Prime-part I bear in Tudors, conveying Y’ours;*

VVere my vvere’th Maur, my Ty-dur Mater would show Maur;

8 *among Maurs, Seym-mours, More compassed Tu y’our Tudor-state,*

T’uter, I Will a Maur soul, steadfastly Mawr, with Tudor’s fruitfulness. ~

The recurring “yours”, emphasized here as ~ *Y’ours* ~ , plays on *y-*, prefix: *1a* ‘persons associated or related by birth, family, or status’ (OED) + *ours*, wordplay, plural *ors*, *ores*: ~ the golden ones ~ of Tud’*Ors*.

The writer is true to his word (once More):

“Why write I stille all one, ever the same,

6 And keepe invention in a noted weed,

That every word doth almost **fel** my name, wp tell / **fel**: ‘to remove from a high position’

8 Showing their birth, and where they did proceed.” (Sonnet 76)

The intentional ambiguity of (E) **fel**, fell, and (E) **tell**, suggests an error on the part of manual typesetters, called compositors. But this is a critical verse; no verb in ‘Shakespeare’ is more telling or felling. I suggest Oxford would have taken great care to make his intentions clear in this middle line, of the middle Sonnet — the mid-point of the Sonnet series. This is the key line and gives counsel to the reader concerning much, if not all, of ‘Shakespeare’.

Oxford does not play on the false name ‘Henry Wriothesley’, and rightly so. Fathering a son by a young woman who, in the absence of senior pretenders, might claim the throne, was a very dangerous undertaking. Oxford repeated this action seven years later with Anne Vavasour, and wound up in the Tower of London fearing he might lose his head. Read the Sonnets of B. Griffin, *Fidessa, More Chaste Than Kind*, published in 1596, to get a sense of the Artist’s predicament circa 1581.

Somehow, Oxford's "Browne bastard" found acceptance among the great influence peddlers from William and Robert Cecil, to Robert Devereux (1565-1601), 2nd Earl of Essex. The Cecils were so intent on securing young Southampton—"Henry Wriothesley", but more properly Henry Browne-Seymour—as a spouse for Oxford's daughter Elizabeth that they attempted to coerce him under the threat of heavy fines. Southampton paid a £5000 fine rather than marry his half sister.

While Oxford/"Shakespeare" does not make jests of Wriothesley's false identity in the Dedication, he does make several mentions of his own false 'de Vere' surname.

Once More, now showing for each line: wordplay above, original below.

- 1 ~ *The 'Maur I bequeath to y'our Tud'or State is Mawr;*
The love I dedicate to your Lordship is without end;
- 2 ~ *vVere of Tудо(h)s Sum-Maur'd without MoreDore inception,*
2 cont. *(More than Oxfor'd twice over). ~*
whereof this Pamphlet without beginning / is but a superfluous Moiety.
- 3 ~ *The Invention I comport of Y'our Maur Tudor-ing,*
The warrant I have of your Honorable disposition,
- 4 ~ *not the St Maur value of my un-Tudor'd Vere'sus — it fares aesti'Muris.*
not the worth of my untutored Lines, makes it assured of acceptance.
- 5 ~ *Wat heir I harbor Tudor is Y'ours; what I Port Tudor is Y'ours;*
VVhat I have done is yours; what I have to do is yours;
- 6 ~ *Summer's Prime-part I bear in Tudors, conveying Y'ours;*
being part in all I have, devoted yours.
- 7 ~ *vVere my vvere'th Maur, my Ty-dur Mater would show Maur;*
VVere my worth greater, my duty would show greater;
- 8 ~ *among Maurs, Seym-mours, More compassed Tu y'our Tudor-state,*
meantime, as it is, it is bound to your Lordship,
- 9 ~ *T'uter I Will a Maur soul, steadfastly Mawr, with Tudor fruitfulness. ~*
to whom I wish long life still lengthened with all happiness.
- 10 ~ *Th'Our Tud'Or State in Tu-t'Or Ty-d'Or. ~*
Your Lordships in all duty.

William Shakespeare.

(Do you see? Do you see? The closing states clearly it is written by William Shakespeare, not by Edward Tudor-Seymour (alias Edward de Vere), so ...)

The Power of Etymological Wordplay—Varronian Wordplay—to tell alternate meaning.

Once More, Oxford means business. He leaves his rhetorical scent in his sentences, in each clause (*almost*), ev'ry phrase. When dead—*mortuus* indeed—"you shall nose him" particularly by his words and syllables (*see Ham. IV. 3 35*). "**Who's there?**" **He is t'heir**. And in a 'serious reverie', a Browne Bastard—the son of Mary Browne and Edward Tudor-Seymour—will succeed him. For this reason, I recommend you give Oxford-Seymour Theory a decent try. It is more than educational. You'll learn words better, and his *Mots et Oultrances*—his *Mots* an' *D'utterances*—his *Mores* and *Tudor'ances*, show merry Good Wit. Take a look; even the Prince of Wales is doing it:

PRINCE HAL, to **POINS** — playing a jest on **FRANCIS**. (*First Part Henry IV II. 4 25*)

25 *Anon, Anon Sir, Score a Pint of Bastard in the Half-Moon ...*

~ **Anon** [(Fr) *tout à l'heure, wp tout d'heure* — Tudor.], **Anon Sir** [~ (Fr) *tout d'heure monsieur* ~ 'titre donné à des personnages de haute noblesse' (Larousse), ~ a title given to persons of high nobility ~ , 'the King of France's eldest brother' (Cassell's), hence Duke.], **Score** [(Fr) *entailler*: 'to notch, cut', to trim, tailor; (E) entail: 1 'The settlement of the succession of a landed estate'; 2b the transmission, as an inalienable inheritance, of qualities, conditions, obligations'] **a Pint** [< (Fr) *peintre, peinture*: 'painting'] **of Bastard** [(Fr) *bâtard*: 'illegitimate, spurious', (Fr) *fruits bâtards*: 'spurious fruits', (E) Bastard: A 1a 'a person conceived and born out of wedlock', A 1b 'as an epithet for an illegitimate but notable son of a king or high ranking nobleman'; B 1b 'In the name of plants and animals: resembling or similar to that named' — with Brown or White Bastard wines being produced from the Muscadelle grape, which is similar but not related to grapes of the Muscat family.] **in the Half-Moon** [(Fr) *croissant*: 'waxing moon', (E) crescent, crescent moon; (E) scythe: *Transf.* 2 'the attribute of Time or Death', likely refers to Time/Wm. Cecil as the agency of *Mort.* (Fr) *être dans la lune*: 'a state of brown study' — 'a state of mental abstraction or musing, serious reverie' (attested to 1555, but particularly 1578, *Euphues*, John Lyly/Oxford; I believe we have found convincing evidence that Oxford wrote much of what is 'Lyly'.)] ...

~ **Tudor, Tudor Sir; Entail a Coloring of Musca-del in the waxing Browne É-Tude.** ~

~ **Tudor, Tudor Sir; Entail a Painting of del Musca in the acceding Browne Tud'ée.** ~

~ **Tudor Sir! Limit his inheritance by coloring this St Maur Bastard's Browne-Tudor.** ~

► Yikes! This may be the most compact statement of Oxford's conundrum in print. Good job, Man! "**Well proved wit**" (LLL IV. 3 5). The **Muscat** grapes and **Muscadelle** (a bastard scion) are the 'Fly' grapes, for their sweetness, which is especially attractive to the (L) *musca*: 'fly' (insect). The **fly** (*musca*) and **mouse** (*mus, muris*) are the animal 'Familiar Spirits' of Seymour, and recur as unexplained curiosities in association with Oxford's true identity and that of the Queen.

The servile attitude of FRANCIS owes to his position as a 'drawer'—he pulls the draft faucet to pour beverages from a barrel. Figuratively, he is *un sommier* (St Maur): 'a beast of burden'/a pack horse'—not a 'draught animal'/Ox that 'draws the hearse (a large rake)'. Oxford describes the employment of Tudor-Seymour Royals under Dudley/Cecil 'Counsel Overlords' thus: ~ *To grunt and sweat under a VVere-y life* ~ (see *Hamlet* III. 1 77). Tudor-Seymours are (L) *verna*: 'slaves born in the master's house' — Vere-na, *wordplay* ~ not Vere' ~ (but performing as Vere). Again, it is not that the Veres are not worthy or honored, only that the name is false when describing the Tudor-Seymours; 'de Vere' entails a state of weakness.

PRINCE HAL, to FRANCIS (1 *Henry IV* II.4 71)

71 Why then, your brown bastard is your only drink :

~ **Why then** [(Fr) *alors, wp* (E) All Ors — (Fr) *Tout d'or*, Tudor], **your** [(Fr) *votre, (pl.) vos*; repeated use of (E) your appears to be associated with the second syllable of both Tudor and Seymour.] **brown** [*surname* Browne, Mary Browne, wife of Henry Wriothesley, 2nd Earl of Southampton, by whom Oxford/'Shakespeare' believes he had a son while her husband was in the Tower of London involving the supposed treason of Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk.] **bastard** [(Fr) *bâtard*: 'illegitimate, spurious', (E) Bastard: A 1a 'a person conceived and born out of wedlock', A 1b 'as an epithet for an illegitimate but notable son of a king or high ranking nobleman'] **is your** [y'Or] **only** [(Fr) *seul, unique; wp* (E) only < 'onely', the unique, sole heir, of the Prince.] **drink** [(Fr) *boisson: wp* ~ boy son ~ or 'male heir'.]: ~

~ **Tout d'or! Th'Ors Browne bastard is y'our One-ly male heir** : ~

~ **Why Tudor! The Tudor Browne bastard is the Tudor's only male heir** : ~

► FRANCIS masks the Writer with the 'frank' name of the de Vere family. The Veres themselves practice no concealment; however, they had been selected by Rob. Dudley and Cecil to conceal Elizabeth's child. Now the Browne-Seymour bastard has been placed (1573) with Southampton.

Nonetheless, this child is the only ‘boy son’ of Edward ‘de Vere’ (who is, in fact, Tudor-Seymour). Perhaps you will see strong elements of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* in the confusion.

Rhetoric ► The importance of the ‘Reference Language’—*French* in the History Plays—is clearly evident. In English, his scene plays only at the first interpretive level; it is simple and entirely enigmatic. But if we consider French analogues of the English, great possibilities appear, and an entirely different interpretation enlightens us.

(1 *Henry IV* II. 4 72, *continuing*)

72 for look you Francis, your white canvas doublet will sully.

~ **for look you** [*wp* (*Fr*) *se regardez*: ~ look at yourself ~, as if a true de Vere looks nothing like the Browne-Seymour child; or simply ~ watch yourself! ~] **Francis, your white** [(*Fr*) *sans tache*: ~ without stain ~, untainted, *wp* ~ not attained ~] **canvas** [(*Fr*) *toile, peinture*: ‘painting, picture’] **doublet** [(*Fr*) *doublet* (of words): ‘double meaning’; (*Fr*) *voir double*: ‘to see double’, ~ a double image ~] **will** [*wp* (*Fr*) *devenir, 3rd sing. devient, wp, surname de Vere*.] **sully** [(E) sully: ‘stain, blemish’; (*Fr*) *souiller*: ‘to soil, dirty’, ‘to stain, blemish’, with playful allusion to (*Fr*) *souille*: ‘a wallowing place (of wild boars)’ and (*Fr*) *souillon*: ‘sloven, slut’]. ~

~ **for regard yourself Francis, y’Or unblemished image will become doubly attained.** ~

► Here, I think, is a warning to FRANCIS (*i.e.* Edward ‘de Vere’/ Tudor-Seymour) to avoid the “unswept stone besmear’d with **sluttish Time**” (*Sonnet 55. 4*). The bawd, William Cecil—who is PANDARUS (*Troilus and Cressida*) and POLONIUS (*Hamlet*)—is a panderer and often figured as the destructive element in ‘Time’. And like a clever stock trader, he sees opportunity in “the short and long” of it (*see Midsummer Nights Dream IV. 2 36*). Had direct accession of Tudor-Seymour been convenient, Cecil would likely have been the heroic manager. Had only a ‘de Vere’/Oxford accession been achieved, Cecil again would be credited. Oxford chose to avoid both directions and to Survive. His son Henry was seduced by Robert Devereux, *Earl of Essex*, to try usurpation.

ELBOW, “a simple constable” — with POMPEY (Clown), DUKE, and others (*See also II.5-9*).

(*Measure for Measure III. 2 1-3*)

We shall have all the world drink brown and white bastard.

~ **We shall have** [(*Fr*) *nous aurons*, possible wordplay *aurons* (*Fr*) *Or en*: ‘Gold in ...’, ~ golden ~] **all** [(*Fr*) *tout*] **the world** [(*Fr*) *terre < (L) terra*: ‘Earth, the world’ — *tout d’terre*, Tudor; *alt. (Fr) le monde, tout le monde*: ‘all the world’, ‘everybody’] **drink** [(*Fr*) *boire*: ‘to drink’, (*Fr*) *boisson*: ‘drink, beverage’, *wp* ~ boy son ~] **brown** [*surname* Browne, refers to maiden name of Mary Browne, mother of Henry Wriothesley, 3rd *Earl Southampton*, first born son of Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ and dedicatee of *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*.] **and white** [(*Fr*) *blanc, wp* (E) blank, (*Fr*) *blanc*: ‘empty, vacant’, ‘absolute, unlimited, unrestricted, positive’, (*Fr*) *confus*: ‘confused, obscure’; (*Fr*) *déconcerté*] **bastard** [(*Fr*) *bâtard*: ‘illegitimate, spurious’, (E) Bastard: *A 1a* ‘a person conceived and born out of wedlock’, *A 1b* ‘epithet for an illegitimate but notable son of a king or high ranking nobleman’; ‘Brown and White Bastard’ names the wines of Muscadelle grape variety, as mentioned above in *First Part Henry IV II. 4 25* (p.136)]. ~

~ **We shall have All Tudor sons boys of the Browne and Musca bastard.** ~

~ *We shall have All Tudor boys sons of the Browne and _____ bastard.* ~

~ *We shall have Tudor’s boy son del Musca bastard.* ~

► As noted, “Brown and White Bastard” indicates a grape variety called Muscadelle, source of these wines. The Artist has taken the namesake drink (“*boisson*”/ ~ boy-son ~) to identify his illegitimate child by Mary Browne-Wriothesley (1552-1607), *Countess of Southampton*, to whom the Narrative Poems and the Sonnets are dedicated. I guess “MR W. H.” (Henry ‘Wriothesley’) is the “ONLY BEGETTER”—[*1* ‘The agent that originates, produces, or occasions something’ (*OED*)] of the Sonnets, which is further evidence of their autobiographical nature.

► The line above from *Measure for Measure* is followed by POMPEY's remarks, apparently for the edification of the DUKE — and the reader. Commentaries identify “two usuries” (*III. 2 5*), correctly as prostitution and money lending at interest. Varronian wordplay allows the writer to be specific; prostitution is “the merriest” in a “never merry world”—a ~ Vere-less Maur'y Te-RRa ~ . ‘Shakespeare’, once More, speaks of the usurious solution to the rape of Princess Elizabeth (or the fornication by Lord Thomas Seymour and Elizabeth Tudor). A “merry” sex act is “put down”, while that sin's punishers enrich themselves. The punishers are, as always, Dudley, Cecil, and clients of the two Usurers.

Though I haven't made a thorough study of it, I suspect every use of the word ‘brown’ plays in some way upon the surname Browne.

The greatest achievement of Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ is the magnificent rhetorical architecture of his words. Each play may stand alone; each is a masterpiece. The marvel is that—because of a consistent scheme of hidden meaning—each combines with the others to produce a unified memorial to a man condemned to non-existence. GERTRUDE, masking the Writer's mother, intrudes on HAMLET's death — either he may choose self-erasure, or she will do it for him. She offers her “napkin”, (*Latin*) *mantellum*: ‘cloak’.

“Here, Hamlet, take my napkin, rub thy brows.” (*Hamlet V. 2*)

“Come, let me wipe thy face!” (*Hamlet V. 2*)

But, because we love him—“This side of Idolatry” (*Ben Jonson*)—we'll remember his face.

I am not able to impart Oxford's seemingly complete knowledge of etymologies and rhetorical games. I leave that to the better dictionaries; read them, therefore, and again and again—the meaning you seek is *t'heir*. What I can do is point students in the right direction. In the examples shown, much of the work has been done in the manner prescribed by the Artist; with a little determination anyone can do the same for all of ‘Shakespeare’. This work is a necessary complement to his “slow-endeavoring Art”, as John Milton called it, but allows a much better understanding of the writer's intent. It should not surprise us that political meaning which took extraordinary effort to conceal, takes a special effort to understand.

Postscript: A Disastrous *Love's Labour's Won*; *Titus Andronicus* and *Love's Labour's Lost* as Companion Pieces

Some students of ‘Shakespeare’ have sought the complement to *Love's Labour's Lost* in a hypothetical *Love's Labour's Won*. Francis Meres mentioned such a play in his “*Wit's Treasury*” of 1598. I would not expect a genuine sequel to exist, for the writer died intestate, *i.e.* without a will to bear witness to his true name and identity. Like HAMLET, Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ did not know the future of his cause. However, several of the Comedies tell of happy resolutions to dilemmas similar to those facing the writer: how to assert one's own identity without involving one's parents. Even today (2022), his name and state/‘ship’ remain “wounded”: (*L*) *saucius*. His is a “saucy bark” (*Sonnet 128. 7*)—a ‘So-Sea ship’ or (*Welsh*) *mor-môr llong*. How unfortunate if he were to be remembered as a lesser vessel (*Welsh*) *llestr môr*, wordplay ‘Leicester Maur’ — a Maur according to Leicester (Dudley), that is, a ‘de Vere’. This is why we remember that ‘de Vere’ ~ *n'E. Vere was nor no man E. Vere saw* ~ (*The Taming of the Shrew Ind.2 94*).

‘Shakespeare’ is the master of artistic Wit. His words nearly always have an amusing twist, to be found in double or multiple meanings. Our language lives eternally by his hands. If we seek objective justification for the careful study of his plays and poems, it is because he often provides the most quoted examples of various rhetorical and logical structures. Centuries of scholarship in this specialized field of discourse has established that there are no better or more familiar models than those of his Canon. But there is more. I have tied Shakespeare's Art to a great historical Matter—a political affair that be-deviled England from 1455 until at least 1603.

I believe Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ sought, in the supremely expressive Latin language, the best vehicle by which to convey forbidden political matter. He is an historian. Telling his fascinating story, again

and again, gave him reason to continue a tortured life. He is a subtle informant. The hope, evidently, was that ceaseless reminders might jog his mother's sense of duty, and move her Tu-Do(e) Some-Thing ... to ~ **find 'the name of Action'** ~ (*Hamlet III.1 88*), he must 'catch the conscience of the Queen' (*II.2 544*).

Having been stripped of his identity by Royal Authority, the Works of 'Shakespeare' is an attempt to preserve the Artist's soul in a '*St. Maur-y pointing Monument*' — "*a starre-y-pointing Pyramid*", again as Milton called it in the *Second Folio* (1632). This denotes the writer's ~ *As-trum-y pointing Pyramis* ~ . But where is the (*L*) *pyramis*, the ~ missing Pier ~ or Pier-amiss? Look for his body, his literary (*L*) *corpus*, and there his name lies. The name is figured in a myriad ways, but one is (*Latin*) *moles*: *IB* 'a mass, a cliff or ridge of rock, *B3* 'a massive structure, a pier, **mole**', a great '**More**', **amor**. He has been figuratively murdered, like the 'Old Maur'/'Old Mole', as HAMLET calls his beheaded father (*Hamlet I.5 162*).

This is a tale of royal ambition and the struggle for the Crown of England. It is a tale of fratricide. Contention between siblings, literal and tropical, frames the Canon. At the rhetorical level, nearly the entire body of Shakespeare's work is built around the struggle between the Boar-*Verres* of the House of Oxford, and the Rat-*Muris* of the House of St Maur; and though it seems an odd way to figure competing claims on the name of Tudor-St Maur, he is insistent — "**How now? A Rat? Dead for a Ducate, dead**", (*Hamlet III.4 25*) ~ How now? A *Muris*? Maurs for a **Ducate**, Maurs! ~. Most modern texts have amended Oxford's word Ducate for ducat, but this is an error. The writer intended Ducate < (*L*) *Dux*: 'leader' (Duke): 1 'a hereditary title of nobility ranking next below that of prince' + *-ate*, *suffix1: 1a* 'substantives denoting office or function', as *curate*, *episcopate*, *palatinate*, instead of (*E*) ducat: 'a gold coin of the type minted by the Republic of Venice', *i.e.* Venus—a popular metonym for Queen Elizabeth I. Both are questions of worth, but O! what a difference to the Author. HAMLET hurls a parting question at dying POLONIUS:

~ ***What do you say (I am) now (iam)? A Muris? Maur for a Dukedom, Maur!*** ~

Again, many corrections made by editors of Oxford/'Shakespeare' locate a mystery, but mar the meaning.

Here is the writer's central concern, and represents his place in a larger series of historic events called the 'Wars of the Roses' (1455-85) between cadet branches of the English Plantagenet family. The conflict ended nominally at Bosworth Field in 1485, but spilled into the 16th century in the mortal 'Devices for the Succession' and the story of 'Shakespeare'.

The historian may well object that John de Vere (1516-62), Oxford's godfather, was as much a victim of coercion by heavy-handed 'Regents' as was the immediate Tudor-Seymour family. It is only an artistic conceit that names the Boar (*Verres*) and 'Piggy Things' as his persecutor. It is how he chose to 'color' his allegories. A careful review of *Venus and Adonis*, Shakespeare's first printed work, will show the name de Vere—'The Boar'—alone is sufficient to wipe the Artist's face from the record (*Hamlet V.2 271-77*).

Titus Andronicus is something of an orphan. Many commenters disparage the senseless violence; some wish it could be removed from the 'Shakespeare' Canon. Here I'll suggest it is a much better play than you imagined and that gore is often symbolic for less bloody action. TITUS is Oxford. Anonymity is forced upon him by the loss of a hand—a hand he blindly agrees to sacrifice in the hope of mollifying SATURNINUS. Oxford's capacity for action—'Tu' Do—manifest in the loyal military force of his many 'sons' (*Personas*), is inexorably diminished as one after another is committed to the family crypt. LAVINIA, as the mythological *genetrix* of (*anagram*) Rome/More, loses her tongue and hands — and thus her ability to explain the crime that has rendered her 'speechless'.

As with *Love's Labour's Lost*, '*Titus*' is topical and autobiographical. It shows a grim end to the accession of the PRINCESS of FRANCE of the latter play. Perhaps the two might be taught as companion works. The characters of the first transpose into those of the second. Though more than a thousand years separate the settings of the two, when viewed as historical allegories, the gulf is reduced to a lifetime—the lifetime of our poet-historian. Both plays are highly polished. If less modern than the writer's later styles, they are more linguistically formalized. Both are identified as 'early plays', *Love's Labour's Lost* on account of the confirmed Euphuism, and *Titus Andronicus* for 'Senecan' violence linked to Thomas Kyd and his *Spanish Tragedy*.

Dramatis Personae

The dramatic characterizations of the play are particularly apt. Subjects can usually be discovered in a general source like *Wikipedia*, as Oxford chose major historic persons—conveniently, members of his immediate family—and events on which to model the characters. A small difficulty arises when he creates multiple masks to represent a single individual, as may occur if the subject is himself or Queen Elizabeth Tudor. He may separate a single person into two or more characters to demonstrate change with time and still maintain some vestige of the traditional ‘unity of time’ in tragedy. Such ‘doubling’ demonstrates how a character who is virtuous in youth may become embittered and monstrous with age.

Titus Andronicus: “*a noble Roman, general against the Goths.*” (*Dramatis Personae*, Craig & Bevington) < “Surnamèd Pius” (*I.1 23*). The name **Titus Andronicus** appears to be derived from the names of two Roman writers with whom Oxford wishes to be associated, Livius **Andronicus** and **Titus Livius** (‘Livy’). (*Latin Andronicus*: ‘a male name from Classical Greece’, ‘the cognomen of several Romans, among whom the most distinguished, L. Livius Andronicus’, < (*Greek*) *ανδρον*, (*L andron*: ‘In ancient Greece and ancient Rome, the apartment reserved for males’, *andro-*, *comb. form*: ‘man, male’, hence (*L*) *vir* = Vere.

► Livius Andronicus (284-04 BC) is called “the father of Roman Drama” (*Wiki*). Titus Livius (59 BC-17 AD) was a great historian of Rome, covering the period from its founding in 753 BC through the reign of Augustus (14 AD). Hence, ‘Titus-Andronicus’ is a historian-playwright, and the message to audiences is that the work is a fictional representation of history. It is an allegory. Oxford/Shakespeare notes TITUS ANDRONICUS has been given the honorary surname “Pius” (*TA I.1 23*), likely to suggest he has the ‘good character’ of Rome’s ‘good emperors’, including Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (121-180 AD). Researchers, however, have not found historical persons who model for the cast of the play. Therefore I feel justified in suggesting Oxford himself, and his Tudor-Seymour family, are the inspiration.

It is clear that the name Andronicus is a metonym for the writer; specifically, it is the writer under his false ‘de Vere’/Vere name. In this guise, he is rash and unwise. Like MACBETH, he is injudicious, lacking the discretion of MACDUFF. The wise counterpart of TITUS ANDRONICUS is manifest in the character of MARCUS ANDRONICUS. According to Oxford-Seymour theory, the name ‘Edward de Vere’ is a creation, an assigned name, to shield Princess Elizabeth Tudor from having to explain her child in light of the extra-legal sentence of attainder and death passed on the father, Admiral Thomas Seymour. Other character names in this play are likewise evocative of the 16th century figures closely associated with Oxford.

If a historical time may be superimposed on the fictional occurrences of *Titus Andronicus*, I guess it would find itself within the reign of Theodosius the Great (*r. 379-395 AD*). Much of Oxford/Shakespeare’s rhetoric matches well with the methods of the writer Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (348-413 (?) AD), whose arcane Latin is likely an artistic inspiration for our playwright. However, and I repeat myself, all works by ‘Shakespeare’ are allegories concerning the writer’s life and times — 1547-1604.

Saturninus: “*son of the late Emperor of Rome, and afterwards declared Emperor.*” (Craig & Bevington) < *Appuleius Saturninus*: ‘a tribune of the people, who with *C. Servilius Glaucia*, was pronounced guilty of treason and put to death’ = primarily: Edward Seymour (1500-1552), Duke of Somerset, but also a composite, including elements of John Dudley, 1st Duke of Northumberland (1504-53) + Robert Dudley (1534-88), 1st Earl of Leicester.

[Appuleius Saturninus] “is most notable for introducing a series of legislative reforms ... Senatorial opposition to these laws eventually led to an internal crisis and the declaration of *senatus consultum ultimum*, and the deaths of Saturninus, Glaucia, and their followers in 100 BC.” (*Wiki*)

► Lord Protector Somerset, Edward Seymour, whose land reforms during his Regency (1547-49) for his nephew King Edward VI were unpopular with the nobility, clearly parallels the historical Appuleius Saturninus. Saturninus was stoned to death, Somerset was beheaded.

Bassianus: “*brother to Saturninus; in love with Lavinia.*” (Craig & Bevington, and so forth) < (*L basis*: ‘foundation-wall, foundation’, hence the ‘foundation Mure’; *III.C* ‘in grammar, the root’; < (*L basilicus*: ‘kingly, royal, princely, splendid’ = Thomas Seymour, Baron Sudeley.

► In *Titus Andronicus*, Bassianus is a younger brother of Saturninus; both claim the right or duty of “emperey”—of supreme power in Rome. This is a similar state to that in which Edward and Thomas Seymour vied for conservatorship of their young nephew Edward VI and for royal power, following the death of King Henry VIII in 1547. Edward Seymour had seniority, but was increasingly unpopular among the people and nobility. The writer’s father, Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour, appears to have had a knack for style and popular esteem, even more so among the ladies. Henry VIII’s last wife, Katherine Parr, had hoped to marry him when she was lucky enough to be ‘tapped’ for the role of the King’s last wife. Several masks for Seymour in the plays of ‘Shakespeare’—including KING HAMLET and JULIUS CAESAR—suggest he possessed a kingly bearing. His portrait by Hans Holbein evidently shows this.

Marcus Andronicus: “tribune of the people, and brother to Titus.”

► Marcus speaks warlike language: of “weary wars” and “warriors”; I suggest he represents Oxford’s ‘Martial’ form, i.e. that descends from the *gens Marcii* — a true St Maur, yet showing a gentle, ‘soft’ side. He is (*L*) *mollis* = simoll, Seymour, Semel, St Maur = Marcus / Sumar-Andronicus.

Lavinia: “daughter to Titus Andronicus.”

< Lavinia was the only daughter of King Latinus and Queen Amata of Latium. Latinus’ father, Faunus, warned that Lavinia must not marry a Latin. She became the last wife of the mythic hero Aeneas, the Trojan son of goddess *Venus*, and legendary founder of Lavinium (< Lavinia) in Latium. Aeneas and Lavinia were progenitors of the Roman people.

► Lavinia appears to represent the young Princess Elizabeth Tudor who, having been ‘raped’, was deprived of the power of Action and Speech. Elizabeth was weakened by the event of her pregnancy in 1548-49. It must be remembered she petitioned the king’s Privy Council twice, both before and after the Admirals marriage to Katherine Parr, that she be allowed to marry Thomas Seymour. Under different circumstances, she might have acceded to the throne already possessed of an heir remarkably similar in blood to the reigning monarch, Edward VI.

As for Princess Elizabeth’s young age, CAPULET’S WIFE informs JULIET (*Romeo and Juliet* 1.3 69-71), who was not quite fourteen according to the writer:

... think of marriage now. Younger than you,

70 Here in Verona, ladies of esteem, esteem, *wordplay (L) aestimare* = St Maur, Seymour
Are made already mothers. made, (*L*) *facere*, (*It*) *fare* already, *wp (L) iam: IA 2a ‘already, so soon’*

Juliet’s birthday, as I’ve noted elsewhere, was “Lammas tide”, July 31st. Considering the precision of Oxford’s allegories, it’s probable the Artist’s true birthday is this “Lammas Eve” (most likely of 1548), and not April 12 (of 1550), as recorded by William Cecil. After all, “Juliet is the Sun” (*Rom.&Jul. II. 2 4*) ...

Another date specially repeated in the Canon is October 25, marking the martyrdom of St Crispin and Crispinian, and the date of the battle of Agincourt, 25 October, 1415. So few dates are emphasized by the Artist that we suspect they likely have great significance. This may be the date of a secret marriage between Princess Elizabeth and Admiral Thomas Seymour.

Lucius: “Son of Titus Andronicus”

< (*L*) *Lucceius* (*of Rhegium*), ‘a witness against *Verres*’, 2 *Lucceius*: ‘son of Marcus, a friend and correspondent of Cicero’ — *lucens* < *luceo*: 2 ‘Of the day, daylight, dawn (morning), to become morning’, *Il. Trop.* ‘to shine forth, to become apparent’ = Edward Tudor-Seymour (‘Shakespeare’), Our Author.

► LUCIUS is ‘*p*ius’ and stresses the duties owed to the family. His suggestion to sacrifice the “proudest prisoner of the Goths” (*TA* 1.1 99) sets the play’s cycle of revenge in motion. LUCIUS joins forces with Goths and kills SATURNINUS.

All sons of TITUS ANDRONICUS appear to represent the significant allonyms used by the Author to disguise his presence. Notice TITUS summarily disposes of sons when they cease to perform as he wishes; Oxford does the same with his decoys. Perhaps they draw suspicion on the writer. Perhaps they begin to take on a life of their own. Robert R. Prechter is currently studying the range of works by Oxford

attributed to pseudonyms and allonyms — see *OxfordsVoices.com*. See notes for AARON, below, p.130.3rd (paragraph).

Quintus: “Son of Titus Andronicus”

< (*L*) *quintus*: ‘the fifth, with or without *mensis*, the fifth month counting from March, afterwards [the month of] Julius, in honor of Julius Caesar’; the month of Oxford’s birth (31 July, 1548) according to Oxford-Seymour theory. He is wrongly accused of murdering BASSIANUS and unjustly executed.

Martius: “Son of Titus Andronicus”

< (*L*) *Mars*: ‘the bright god’, ‘progenitor of Roman people, the god of war, of husbandry, shepherds and seers’; Martius is a variant spelling of Marci, figured as the *gens* of the St Maurs. He is wrongly accused of murdering BASSIANUS and then executed.

Mutius: “Son of Titus Andronicus”

< (*L*) *muto*: ‘to alter, change’. He tries to protect LAVINIA and is killed by TITUS.

➤ As an ‘alteration’, likely indicates a variation or ‘de Vere’ form.

Tamora: “Queen of the Goths”

< (*Latin*) *tam*: ‘so, so much’ + (*L*) *Mauri*: ‘Moors’, hence *surname* So-Maur, St Maur — a St Maur.

➤ Though I repeat myself: naming the Queen of the ‘Gotts’—(*L*) *deus*, *wordplay Tudeus /Tudors*), ‘the Queen of Tears’ (*Gotones*, *wordplay guttae Arabicae*: ‘drops of Myrrh’), Elizabeth Tudor as Elizabeth St Maur, suggesting Princess Elizabeth married Thomas Seymour shortly after the death of Katherine Parr. Our Author, Oxford/‘Shakespeare’, would thus be the child of Elizabeth (*née* Tudor) Seymour, and the true heir of Tudor. Children of Tamora appear ‘time out of context’ as iterations of ‘de Vere’, agents of Dudley (Chiron, Master of the Horse) and Cecil (Demetrius, *Corambis*) malfeasance. A further allusion may be to Tomyris, Queen of the Massagetae (Scythia), who was said to have preserved the head of Persian King Cyrus the Great in a wine-skin full of blood.

Alarbus: Son of Tamora — “Proudest prisoner of the Goths” (*TA* 1.1 99).

< All, (*Latin*) *totus* = Tudus, Tudors + (*L*) *arbos*: ‘a tree’, hence ~ Of the Tudor Tree, Tudor Line ~ . A jest may be intended in the spelling of Alarbus, suggesting (*L*) *arbuscula*: ‘a small tree, shrub’.

➤ Representing the elder ‘son’ of the Suffolk-Tudors, down from Mary Tudor (1496-1533), Queen of France, and Charles Brandon (1484-1545), Duke of Suffolk. The line continued through their daughter Frances Brandon (1517-45), Duchess of Suffolk, and Henry Grey (1517-54), 3rd Marquess of Dorset, together parents of Lady Jane Grey (Dudley) and her sisters, Katherine (Grey) Seymour, and Mary (Grey) Keyes, both of whom appear to match ROSALINE’s KATHERINE and MARIA. Thus, according to Oxford’s allegory, ALARBUS—executed by the Andronici—matches Jane Grey. The ‘Goth’ / Suffolk interests are then carried forward by CHIRON and DEMETRIUS, representing Dudley and Cecil, respectively.

Chiron: “Son of Tamora”

< Classical Myth, Chiron: ‘one of the Centaurs, son of Saturn and Philyra.’ Chiron was ‘the good Centaur’ and tutor to young Achilles (a Greek).

➤ Chiron, a Centaur in myth, is of a different lineage, and said to be less horse and more human than the others. Nonetheless, Oxford has chosen him to be the agency of “Rape and Murder” (*V.2* 45), and such was Robert Dudley’s reputation. His title in the household of Queen Elizabeth was ‘Master of the Horse’ and in the Queen’s palaces he maintained apartments near hers.

CHIRON wrongfully accuses QUINTUS and MARTIUS of killing BASSIANUS; TITUS kills he and DEMETRIUS and serves them to TAMORA in pasties).

Demetrius: “Son of Tamora”

< (*L*) *de*: ‘of’ + (*L*) *metricus*: *II*. ‘of or relating to meter or metrical’ < (*L*) *metor*: ‘to measure off, mark out’, ‘a person or thing which measures’, here used to mark time, hence ‘Time’ as metonym for William Cecil (1520-98).

➤ William Cecil, a personal secretary to Edward Seymour, Protector Somerset, and later Secretary of State and Treasurer to Elizabeth I, is not so well regarded by Oxford/‘Shakespeare’ as he is

by some historians. As POLONIUS in *Hamlet*, his role is dubious at best. The father-in-law of Oxford / 'Shakespeare', he engineered the spy network that kept watch on our writer, and by penalties and fear managed to subjugate the Catholic population of England to his Anglican will.

It was Cecil's wish to elevate his own family to the peerage, and in this he was successful. By 1571 he was created 1st Baron Burghley, in part to rationalize the marriage of Oxford to Cecil's daughter Anne (1556-88). DEMETRIUS wrongfully accuses QUINTUS and MARTIUS of killing BASSIANUS; TITUS kills he and CHIRON and serves them to TAMORA in pasties).

Aaron: "a Moor, beloved by Tamora."

< (Biblical) **Aaron:** 'a prophet and high priest, and elder brother of Moses'. Probably alludes to the story in Exodus 4:1-17 in which God gave to Moses the ability to produce signs of having spoken to the Lord. The first was that he could throw his rod, (L) *virga*: II *Transf. E* 'genitalium, the virile member' (penis), and striking the ground, it turned into (L) *vermis*: 'a worm or serpent'. He also made Aaron the mouthpiece of the Lord through Moses. Casting the rod, *wp D'or* (Tudor), to the ground, (L) *terra*, *wp* ~ Two-d'RR ~ is the analogy imagined by Oxford.

► Admiral Thomas St Maur is clearly the source for AARON. The child he leaves behind—figured as TAMORA's child—is Edward Tudor-St Maur, the writer of 'Shakespeare'. This suggests a state of 'de facto' marriage existed between his parents. Oxford, as TITUS, was left nearly 'childless'. All his Offspring-Art was forced from him by false attributions; even the hand with which he writes is figuratively chopped off lest he conspire to by-pass his "tongue-tied" state. Oxford's natural child, Henry Wriothesley by Mary Brown-Wriothesley, was also rendered mute by a false name. LAVINIA, as a young Elizabeth is silenced with threats by those who seek to displace her. Her marriage to BASSIANUS (Admiral Seymour), whether secret or *de facto*, was side-stepped, but it could not be truly annulled. The events regarding Sir Thomas were described thus in *Proceedings of the Council at Westminster the 17th of January, 1548*:

After diverse conferences had at sundry times by the Lord Protector [Ed. Seymour, Somerset] with the Lords and others of the Privy Counsel ... touching Lord Seymour of Sudeley, Admiral of England, tending to the danger of the Kings Majesty, and the Lord Protector and Counsel, and the subversion of the whole state of the realm ... the said Admiral ... forgetting all duty, love, and kindness wherein he stood bound to his sovereign, to his country, and to his brother; upon his great pride and ambitious mind, would have laid his hands upon the person of the Kings Majesty, and have taken the same into his order and disposition ... to the great peril and danger of his Majesty ... And failing of his purpose that way, to serve his mischievous devises by another way, induced the [King], without the advise ... either of the Lord Protector or Counsel, to write letters of his devising to the Parliament, minding, by colour of the same, to have set sedition in the Realm. And thereupon, as himself said to diverse noble men, intended to have made **the blackest Parliament that ever was in England.**

(Macleane, John; *The Life of Sir Thomas Seymour, Knight ...*; p.74; 1869)

These are among the charges, but as noted before, no trial was allowed the Admiral. His son Oxford/'Shakespeare', a trained and more than competent legal mind, was not only dubious but in complete disagreement with their judgement. He characterized Lord Protector Somerset, Admiral Seymour's brother, as a brilliant but calculating usurper of Royal Power—a strong element within KING CLAUDIUS if you will (see *Hamlet*).

Historians, as usual, give varying accounts of events surrounding the death of Henry VIII and the reign of Edward VI (*r. 1547-1553*). William Camden's *Annales*, 'The History of Princess Elizabeth' is a carefully worked record, but unfortunately appears to have been heavily influenced by the patronage of "Cloud Captors"—the Cecils, William and Robert, and included recollections by Robert Devereux, a weak remnant of the Grey-Dudley group. But we may now add the tales of 'Shakespeare' to the existing histories. His record has not been understood or considered. Oxford *is* TITUS ANDRONICUS, a dramatist and poet, as was Rome's Livius Andronicus; he *is* Titus Livius ('Livy'), Rome's great historian.

What remains is the question of madness. I think it is clear that the Artist believes himself to be the child of Admiral Thomas Seymour and Princess Elizabeth Tudor. Is this the delusion of a man who is

out of his mind? If it is, he possesses a great deal of privileged information — some of it that only his parents and a very small number of aristocratic insiders could know. This, coupled with the exquisitely crafted rhetoric, endlessly equivocating wit, and the single-minded determination to preserve his name in every line, speaks of one who has been personally injured and is driven to avenge that wrong. Further, accepting Oxford's explanation reconciles many, if not most, puzzles, of the Tudor monarchies. It can do no harm to posit he tells the truth. While understanding his "slow-endeavoring Art" (Milton) is itself a slow-endeavoring art, the process is a good education. What remains to be discovered about him in the ninety-eight percent of 'Shakespeare' that has not yet been examined with an eye to Oxford-Seymour Theory? And when that job is done, we can search the treasury of John Lyly and a hundred Or More Elizabethan writers who too may mask for the Same "Soul of the Age"—(L) *Aetas / Aestas*—Age, Summer, St Maur.

Is this a conspiracy theory? Yes? The English Parliament judged in 1552 to restore properties to the Earldom of Oxford that had been coerced from his estate by Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset. Similar and related schemes continued under a subsequent Lord President and *de facto* Crown Regents through about 1612. Their method was to effect unlawful financial and political gain by blackmail. It is unknown what might have been the charges against John de Vere, but we have Oxford/Shakespeare's testimony as to the cause of far more significant coercion against Princess Elizabeth Tudor — it was the error of her forbidden marriage and a forbidden child with Admiral Thomas Seymour. The joint conspiracy by two competing cliques in Elizabeth's Privy Council, those of the Bacon-Cecil's and the Grey-Dudleys, led to both parties tapping into England's Treasury in a 'grand manor'. Many citizens were aware of the graft, described in popular treatises against 'Leicester's Commonwealth' and the '*Regnum Cecilianum*' yet, often as not, those punished were not the principals, but titular heads of their faction: Lady Jane Grey, Edward Tudor-Seymour ('Oxenford'), John de Vere (16th Earl Oxford), Thomas Howard (Duke of Norfolk), Mary Stuart (Queen of Scots). The "honey-tongued Boyet" (*LLL V. 2 334*)—*i.e.* the Bacons and Cecil's—meanwhile, 'retailed their wares' (~ *vVeres* ~; *V. 2 318*), and worse, put MOTH "out of his part" (*V. 2 337*). This scheme benefited the perpetrators for a very long time.

The idea that 'Shakespeare' was a victim in a great conspiracy to defraud England can hardly be called a theory. It was a widely held political view at the time, and is well attested by our Author. Perhaps it should be called suppressed History. Oxford/'Shakespeare' gives first hand evidence. His proofs are more than convincing; if he does not present 'fact', at least Oxford gives his considered opinion, and that's what is important. To ignore his statements would nullify the idea of expert testimony.

"Will this gear ne'er be mended?" (*Troilus and Cressida I. 1 6*)

(otherwise) ~ **Will this Golden birth never be Tu-d'Or'd?** ~

gear, wordplay (L) *ornatus*: 'attire', wordplay ~ Or-born ~ **mend**, (L) *reparare*: wp Re-Pair-R = Two-d'Or'd

"Out, out! brief Candle," (*Macbeth V. 5 23*)

(French) ~ *Outre, outre! sommaire [set / St] Maur,*"

(French) ~ **d'Or, dehors, Sommaire-[set / St] chandelle,** ~

or ~ **Tu-d'Or, Somer-set / St Maur,** (Fr) *astre*, (L) *astrum* ~

or **Tu-d'Or, Somerset Star,**

(English) **out**, wordplay (French) *outré*: 2 'en dehors de', 'outside' (E) **brief**, (MFr) *bref*: 'a summary'

(E) **Candle**, (Fr) *chandelle*: 2 (Fr) *astre*: 'star', (Latin) **astrum** — anagram, surname St Maur

► As in the case of Henry Fitzroy (1519-36), Duke of Richmond and Somerset, and illegitimate son of Henry VIII, Oxford suggests justifiable advancements to his title.

Bibliography

A Latin Dictionary (Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary); Lewis, Charlton T. and Short, Charles ('Lewis & Short'), 1879.

Cassell's French — English, English — French Dictionary, ed. Girard, Denis.

Cassell's Latin Dictionary, ed. Simpson, D. P.; 1968.

Dictionnaire du moyen français, ed. Greimas, Algirdas J.; Keane, Teresa M.; 1992

Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru — Dictionary of the Welsh Language; <https://welsh-dictionary.ac.uk>

OpenSource*Shakespeare* — opensource-shakespeare.org

► An invaluable site. The 'Advanced Search' feature allows specific words and passages to be easily located.

The Oxford English Dictionary (Online)

The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation, Volumes 1-4; Ed. in Chief: Hildebrand, Hans J.; 1996.

Webster's New World Italian Dictionary; Ed. Love, Catherine E.; 1985.

The Holy Bible, King James Version, Oxford: University Press

The Complete Works of Shakespeare, ed. Hardin, Craig and Bevington, David. 1973 Revised.

Ahl, Frederick M.; *Metaformations, Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. 1985.

Alford, Stephen; *Burghley, William Cecil At The Court of Elizabeth I*. 2008.

The Early Elizabethan Polity ... the British Succession Crisis, 1558—1569. 1998.

Anderson, Mark; *Shakespeare By Another Name*. 2005.

Bloom, Harold; *Shakespeare, The Invention of the Human*. 1998.

Chamberlain, Frederick; *Elizabeth and Leicester*. 1939.

Clark, Eva Turner; *Hidden Allusions In Shakespeare's Plays*. 1931

Danner, Bruce; *Edmund Spenser's War on Lord Burghley*. 2011.

Delahoyde, Michael; website: michaeldelahoyde.org

► Dr. Delahoyde's website gives an excellent overview of likely biographical content for all the works of 'Shakespeare'.

Dunkley, Diane Lucille; *Thomas, Lord Seymour of Sudeley: Treason and Power in Tudor England*. 1983.

Dyce, Alexander; *A General Glossary to Shakespeare's Works*. 1904

Farina, William; *De Vere as Shakespeare, An Oxfordian Reading of the Canon*. 2006.

- Furness, Horace Howard, (editor); *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Love's Labor's Lost*. 1904.
 ► An invaluable resource. For students of 'Shakespeare', the *Variorum Editions* locate apparent errors and lines or words that cause differences of opinion. Where there is much disagreement among commenters, there is likely *noema*—purposed ambiguity or indeterminacy. Further, the commenters are ancient enough to be untainted by anachronistic literary theories.
- Garber, Marjorie; *Shakespeare After All*. 2004.
 ► Of great value for Marjorie's acute insights.
- Green, Nina; *The Oxford Authorship Site*; oxford-shakespeare.com
 "The Fall of the House of Oxford", *Brief Chronicles*, Vol.1 (2009), pp. 41-95.
 ► An outstanding resource for historical information on Edward Oxenford /'Shakespeare' — oxford-shakespeare.com
- Ives, E. W.; *Lady Jane Grey : A Tudor Mystery*. 2009, Ch. 4, pp. 39-41.
- Joseph, Sister Miriam; *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language*. 1947.
 ► Superb!
- Lanham, Richard A.; *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* (2nd Edition). 1991.
- Lyly, John; Bond R. Warwick; *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, Vol.s 1-3. 1902.
- Maclean, John; *The Life of Sir Thomas Seymour, Knight, Baron Seymour of Sudeley*. 1869.
- Mahood, Molly Maureen; *Shakespeare's Wordplay*. 1957.
 ► An excellent study; however Ms. Mahood was apparently unaware of Varronian (Etymological) Wordplay in Classical Latin works at the time of writing this work. She describes technical aspects of Shakespeare's wordplay, but not its purpose.
- Malamud, Martha A.; *A Poetics of Transformation, Prudentius and Classical Mythology*, 1989.
- Miller Cutting, Bonner; "She Will Not Be a Mother: Evaluating the Seymour Prince Tudor Hypothesis". *Brief Chronicles, Vol. III (2011)*.
- Mitsis, Phillip and Ziogas, Ioannis; *Wordplay and Powerplay in Latin Poetry*. 2016.
- Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies*; prepared for facsimile Kökeritz, Helge. 1954.
- Nelson, Alan H.; *Monstrous Adversary, The Life of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford*. 2003.
 ► A great resource for historical information, set in a singularly ill-disposed interpretation.
- O'Hara, James J.; *True Names, Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. 1999.
- Ovid's Metamorphoses, 'Arthur Golding Translation'*; ed. Nims, John Frederick. 2000.
- Paschalis, Michael; *Virgil's Aeneid, Semantic Relations and Proper Names*. 1997.
- Prechter, Robert; *Shakespeare's Voices (ebook)*, 2022.
- Puttenham, George; *The Art of English Poesy*, 1590; ed. Wigham, Frank, and Rebhorn, Wayne A.. 2007.
- Stepniewski, Michael S. and Spencer; oxford-seymour.com

Shakespeare's Will ... In What He Hath Left Us. 2018.

Streitz, Paul; *Oxford, Son of Queen Elizabeth.* 2001.

► The primary thesis of Streitz' work—that Oxford/Shakespeare is the son of Elizabeth Tudor—is good. However, Paul included secondary speculations that are not supported by Shakespeare's autobiographical reports as found throughout *The Canon*.

Wittemore, Hank; *100 Reasons Shake-speare was the Earl of Oxford.* 2016.

The Monument ... Shake-speare's Sonnets. 2005.

Wikipedia

► I can't overstate the associative power and convenience of this wonderful invention. Though Wikipedia is not detailed enough to cover every hare-brained explanation conceived, it does provide a framework by which the associative process can bring together many historical and artistic characteristics needed to solve the 'Shakespeare' mystery.

There are hundreds of books, essays, papers, etc. that I've enjoyed, concerning the nature of 'Shakespeare'.

Αα Ββ Γγ Δδ Εε Ζζ Ηη Θθ Ιι Κκ Λλ Μμ Νν Ξξ Οο Ππ Ρρ Σσ Ττ Υυ Φφ Χχ Ψψ Ωω
