

Shakespeare's *First Folio* (1623) — Prefatory Letter To the great Variety of readers.

Michael Stepniewski, 6/2025

In their prefatory letter to the *First Folio*, Heminge and Condell set forth an *exordium* and *narratio* to the plays of Shakespeare. They introduce readers to a simple guiding principle that will help those who need it: Where's the Wit? Where is the (Latin) *musa*: the 'genius, wit, and taste'? That's the first question we ask when reading virtually every passage. Wit is the rhetorical or trōpical twist that tells readers they have found hidden meaning — any word that is “belabored” > ‘belaboared’, may be (Latin) ~ *de Verres* ~.

“To the great Variety of readers.” — (Latin) *Ad magnam lectorum varietatem*
False Latin ~ *To’ða-Mawr de Vere-sity* (—*il-le’ Gens*) ~
~ *Tu da’ Maur Vere-iety* (these, his famous gens). ~
~ *Of the Gens Tudor-Maur* — ‘Vere-iety’. ~

Is this the smoking gun? Are we to understand the relationship of surnames de Vere and Tudor-St Maur? ‘De Vere’ is a non-native epithet, but ‘de Vere’ and Tudor-Maur name the same person.

“Can you read any thing you see?” (*Romeo and Juliet* I.2 57-62)

57 PETER I pray, sir, can you read?
58 ROMEO I mine own fortune in my misery.
59 PETER Perhaps you have learned it without book:
60 But I pray, can you read any thing you see?
61 ROMEO Ay, if I know the Letters and the Language.
62 PETER Ye say honestly, rest you merry.

These are Rhetorical Questions and Counsel. We know, of course, the letters; they are taken from the Latin alphabet; but the language? It is evidently English, yet the evidence, in part, deceives. The Poet has invented a means for evading censorship by which he equivocates within the semantical range of Shakespeare's English or of foreign language analogues of the words. In ‘Shakespeare’, all discussion of reading and understanding concern his Invention and reveal a part of the Poet's method. They are not commands; they are suggestions towards a more subtle sense. Disregard them at your own peril. The beauty of the deception, is that even when we know it's there, we can hardly believe it:

From Heminge & Condell, First Folio

(Line 1)

Original Text A. “To the great variety of readers”

Rewordings ~ To the [*wp: wordplay* Tu’ða—Tudor] great [(L) *amplus*: ‘great’ > *amplius*: ‘more’ — surname Maur, St Maur, Seymour; (Welsh) *mawr*: ‘great’] variety [(Latin) *varietas*, *diversitas*: ‘variety’, ~ *de Vere’si tas* ~ — surname de Vere state or condition.] of readers [(L) *legens*, *wp* (L) *ille gens*: ‘these gens’, ‘these well-known gens’, ~ these families ~]. ~

Supra-text ~ *To’ða-Maur (de Veres-e’s state) — of these famous Gens* ~

(Line 7)

B. “Do so, but first buy.” Syllabic treatment of names.

~ Do [(Latin) *facere*, (French) *faire*: ‘to do’, “the name of action” (*Hamlet* III.1 88)—Tudor] so [(L) *hoc modo*: ‘in the manner indicated’, (Welsh) *mor*: ‘as, so, equally’ — Blanche Parry, one of Elizabeth's personal attendants, was known to speak of sensitive matters to the Queen in Welsh.], but [(L) *modo*: ‘only, but’, ‘expressing restriction of an idea’] first [(L) *primum*; wordplay *primus*, *princeps*: II.E ‘a prince’]

buy [(L) *coemere*, ~ *Çoemere*/Semere ~, (L) *sumere*: 2.B ‘to take as one’s own, assume’, 2.G ‘to buy, purchase’]. ~

~ *Do-So, Mo-Do, princep’ly Sumer.*

~ *Two’do So’mo—St Maur princep’ly.* ~

(Line 12)

C. “But what ever you do, Buy.”

~ **But** [(Latin) *modo*: ‘only, but’, ‘expressing restriction of an idea’, representing Tudor-Maur together as ‘Mor-d’or’] **what** [(L) *quisnam*: ‘who, which, what’, wordplay ‘what name’] **ever** [wp, proper name E.Vere] **you do** [surname Tu’ða—Tudor], **Buy** [(L) *sumere*, wordplay [ç]*oemere*—St Maur, Seymour]. ~

~ *Mo’do, quis-name E.Vere : Tудо(r)-Sumer.* ~

~ *Maur-d’Or, what name E.Ver is Tudor—St Maur.* ~

(Line 34)

D. “for his wit can no more lie hid, then it could be lost.”

~ *for his Musa can, without Maur, lie hid — then it could be lost.* ~

(Line 39)

E. “And such **Readers** we **wish** him.” (E) **Readers**, (L) *legens, le gens* (E) **wish**, (L) *welle, avere*

~ *And these Gens we Will him.* ~

Here, in a few short phrases, is the Artist’s name and his Method. It’s disarmingly simple in concept. **Hamlet’s Method is digested in these phrases.** You have to work with him — he’s ‘tongue-tied’. Each comment reiterates in various ways, the message of the first line. **There is more**, but it gets complicated.

(Line 10)

F. Judge **your** six-pen’orth, **your** shillings worth, **your** five shillings worth at a time

~ **Judge** [(Latin) *censere, censeo*: ‘assess, rate, estimate’ — all of which make important comment on the St Maur name; the ‘rate’ summons (L) *rattus, mus*, as animal familiars of the Seymour clan.] **your** [wordplay *y + orum*: ‘The Golden Gens’/family — (Fr) *Tout-d’Or*, (L) *totus aureas*] **six** [probable Regnal numbers: VI, referring to Edward VI.] **-pen’orth** [wordplay (L) *pennor*: ‘to put forth wings, to fledge’ — Seymour emblem: ‘wings joined in lure’ worth; hence “six pen’orth” > ~ *winged St Maur VI* ~ .], **your** [~ *House of Tudor* ~] **shillings** [(L) *solidus*: wp *tota’aurum*, (Fr) *tout-d’Or*, ~ *Sol li Dus* ~] **worth** [(L) *aestimatio, aestimare*—wp *St Maur*], **your** [~ *House of Tudor* ~] **five** [Tudor V likely refers to Elizabeth R who is the fifth Tudor.] **shillings** [(L) *solidus*: wp *totus aurum*, (Fr) *tout-d’Or*, **Tudor**—*Sol li Dus*.] **worth** [(L) *aestimare*—wp *St Maur*] **at** [(L) *domi*: ‘at home, in the house’] **a time** [(L) *tempus, hora*—wordplay *aurum, orum*: ‘gold’, metonymy ‘things made of gold’], ~

(Line 11)

or higher, so you rise to the just rates, and welcome. ~

or [(L) *vel*: ‘or’] **higher** [(L) *summus, amplius*], **so** [(L) *sic*: ‘such that’] **you** [(L) *tu*] **rise** [(L) *ascensus*: ‘ascend’, ‘approach’—accede.] **to the** [wordplay ~ *Tu da’* ~] **just** [(L) *justus*: ‘lawful, rightful, true’] **rates** [(L) *modus*: ‘manner, condition’—(L) *more*: ‘custom, way, practice’], **and welcome** [(L) *salutatio*—*salutaris*: ‘state of wellbeing, healthful, wholesome, salutary’]. ~

~ *Rate St Maur-Tudor VI—a fledging Tudor; y’Or Tudor-St Maur; y’Or Tudor V-St Maur at the House of Tota’Or’um, such that you Accede Tu’das rightful Maur and Well-being.* ~

Was William Cecil a loyal servant, or a sly fox ... how about a Welsh Fairy under the direction of Queen Mab? (< *Mabinogi*). Cecil had apparently ‘tailored’ alterations of two royal children—two St Maur children—who became the “true” (*Verus*) Edward and Mary ‘de Vere’. Thus the Poet prods his Queen:

“Howsoe’er ’tis **strange**,
Or that the negligence may well be laugh’d at:
Yet is it true, Sir.” (*Cymbeline* 1.1 65-7).

In this manner ‘Shakespeare’ is “**Comontie**” < (*Latin*) *Commentum*: ‘a careful contrivance, invention’ — yet “**It is a kind of history.**” (*Shrew Ind.* 2 134-38).

Character names reveal much of the story. By *ethopoeia*, Oxford is ORLANDO (*AYLI*); the name adapts (E) Or + (*French*) *o*, *ou*: ‘or’ + *lande*: ‘moor’, to produce ~ *Two d’Or-Moor* ~. Having been waylaid by his villainous *alter ego*, OLIVER, ~ O-LE’ VER ~, ORLANDO strives tropically to overthrow CHARLES, a **wrestler**, (*French*) *lutteur*; but literally he defeats [Martin] **Luther**—or an English **Luthérien**—and earns a fair chance under liberal Canon Law of marrying his native ROSALINE, his other self, and thereby uniting himself in one flesh.

Edward de Vere? The name was a creation by the Privy Council of Edward VI — an attempt to dissociate Princess Elizabeth from her brat. In July of 1548, John de Vere needed a male heir. At the same time, Elizabeth did not. Yet the Council, led by Edward Seymour, hoped to enlist the strongest possible candidates as Royal Spares, preferably of Edward Seymour-Tudor blood (as was Edward VI). There was nothing to be had — not without Mustard! TOUCHSTONE, who assays what is *tout-d’Or*/Tudor and what is not, *tells us all*: the “pancakes”, (*French*) *placenta*, were “naught”, (*Fr*) *néant*: (*wordplay*) *ne*: ‘no, not’ + *ant*: (*English*) *maur*: ‘ant’ — **no Maur**; and “the mustard was good” — ‘mustard’ > (*moutard*: ‘brat’ > (*Fr*) *moutarde*: ‘mustard’ — was ‘good’ (*Fr*) *marchandise/de Se’March’and* > (*L*) *Merces/Çes Mer*: St Maur — see TOUCHSTONE, *As You Like It* 1.2 63-64; hence we interpret:

“the pancakes were naught, and the mustard was good ...”
~ the placenta [était] no Maur, and the moutard [été] St Maur ... ~
~ the afterbirth was no Maur, and the brat was St Maur ... ~

By any standard, it’s a first rate jest — and ~ *Much To-do About Nothing* ~. This is the truth that may **catch the conscience of the Queen**: Edward Tudor-Seymour (*b. July 1548*) is ‘good’; Edward ‘de Vere’ (*b. April 1550*) is ‘naught’. Oxford’s treasury of wit is tied to interlingual wordplay. What is the significance of “**Nothing**”? It is the state of being (*Fr*) *néant*: ~ **not Maur** ~: ‘Nothing’. (See Arianrhod > Dylan ail Don > Llew Llau Gyffes, of the *Fourth Branch of the Mabinogi*).

Much of the argument between Prince Tudor (PT) enthusiasts and ‘Looney’ Oxfordians can be reconciled by shifting from the well-known PT ideas 1 & 2, to the Oxford-Seymour Thesis whereby a love affair between Oxford and Mary Browne-Wriothesley begat Henry Wriothesley, 3rd Earl of Southampton, and dedicatee of Oxford’s long narrative poems. This concedes maternity of Henry to Countess Mary Browne, and relieves us of having to wonder whether the 2nd Earl had access to his wife during his imprisonment (1571-73). Perhaps Henry Sr. did know her, but Oxford evidently believed himself to be the true father, and thus willed “**what I have to do(r)**” (Tudor), to young Henry (*Lucrece*, Dedication).

Edward Oxenford then becomes the focus of Prince Tudor. As the ‘love god’ *A’Mor* (like *Aeneas*), child of Princess Elizabeth and Admiral Thomas St Mour, he is understood to be the source of princely dignity. He might be selected for accession; or else his son—Oxford’s “Browne bastard”—may serve ...

HAL “then **your** Brown bastard is **your** only **drink**”, (*First part Henry IV* II.4 71) *your, your* : ~ *Tu-tes* ~
~ then your Browne bastard is Tudor’s only (*Fr*) *boisson* (boy son). ~

Listen to the simple “drawer” of drinks and harrows (FRANCIS/*franc/de Vere*):

FRANCIS Anon, anon ... Anon, anon ... (*1 Henry IV II. 4 43, 62, etc.*).

~ *Tout d’heure, Tout à l’heure... Tout d’heure, Tudor...*

► FRANCIS, (*Fr*) *franc*: ~ *Vere* ~, insists on correcting PRINCE HAL/POINS each time his name is called — it is not FRANCIS, *i.e.* Vere, but **Tudor** ... another fine jest that eluded *Variorum* commenters.

Each passage, so wittily presented as fiction, is nonetheless taken relentlessly from the Poet’s life.

Neither Edward Oxenford nor Mary Browne-Wriothsley were in a position to admit their illicit sexual relationship. The Second Earl Southampton’s suspicion of “one Donesame, a common (ço’Mō : St Maur) person” strongly suggests Oxford under a playful interpretation of his true Tudor-St Maur name — ‘Done’ < (*French*) *faire*: ‘to do’, *past part.* ‘done’ + Same, (*Fr*) *même*: ‘same’ > (E) memory > Seym-Mor’y — he is St Mauria the “**Deare Sonne of Memory, great Heire of Fame**” as John Milton proclaimed in the *Second Folio* of 1632. “The Epistle Dedicatorie” of Heminge & Condell makes clear, the masterpieces of Oxford are, in fact, mere “trifles”, “trifles”, “trifles” — (*L*) *Summaria*, St Maur’ia, Seymour’ia, *ad nauseum* ... to an extent that is ‘Sea-sickening’. Of course, the 2nd Earl was not likely to relish admitting being cuckolded, and at any rate, very unlikely to be allowed to name the Queen’s child as the offender.

Some Oxfordians are inclined to think the Poet cannot be the son of Princess, later Queen, Elizabeth. It was rumored at the time that she had given birth to Seymour’s child, and Princess Elizabeth wrote several letters to Edward Seymour (Somerset) pleading for him to make the rumors stop. Anyway, it is not a question of what is true or not, but what Oxford believes, and he evidently believes he is the Queen’s ‘legitimate’ son. As only name and means of accession separates HAMLET and LAERTES, Oxford is both “th’ **occurents, more and less**” ... St Maur and Leices, (*Hamlet V. 2 340*), *wordplay* ~ *Au’ couronne, Maur et Leices* ~ ... you know, I think PRINCE HAMLET was about to explain this jest when, unfortunately, he dies. HAMLET/Tudor-St Maur serves the Crown Tudors and the State; LAERTES/‘de Vere’ serves the Suffolk-Grey Tudors by shaking the “superflux”, not to the wretched, but themselves; witness the ‘Prodigy Houses’ of Elizabethan England. The Canon of ‘Shakespeare’ attempts to confirm Oxford’s birthright as sole direct heir of the Crown Tudors — *The Tragedy of Hamlet* is the essential template. (Elizabeth’s letters to Lord Somerset, 1548-49: British Library and the National Archives at Kew).

The Epistle Dedicatory to the *First Folio*, dedicates the plays to the Herbert boys, William and Philip, and implies the progeny of Susan de Vere-Herbert (Countess Montgomery) had replaced the 3rd Earl of Southampton as preferred heirs of the Crown Tudors. It is likely Wriothsley was no longer in the State’s ‘good graces’ after the Essex Rebellion (1601). Heminge and Condell repeatedly address these “Noble Brethren” as either ‘Your Lordships’, or ‘Your Highnesses’ — there’s a difference. Of course, either Southampton or a Herbert were options requiring the removal of the Stuarts from the throne, and that would mean a revolution. At any rate, the works of Shakespeare reveal the Poet’s state of mind, and so of his ideological successors. They also hold the keys to anything and everything else we want to know — “**Marry, how? Tropically.**” (*Ham. III. 3 233*).

The Poet is in a very tight spot, and can give only a part of his story at any moment. If only we had a complete and articulated biography of the Artist, we might be far more certain. And yet, “Every Line, each Verse”, every sub-plot, each word and syllable—almost, (*Latin*) *fere*-ly—contributes to his lengthy story. Is it too much to ask that readers do some of the work ... to reword obviously pregnant passages? What if we gather up the pieces and apply them to the framework of *Hamlet* — will we then have it?

Edward Oxenford’s cipher is to be understood tropically. If fathomed, his mother’s conscience may be materially ‘caught’ by a rhetorical presentation of their shared history. I suggest the Artist hoped

to alter her attitude, that she might officially acknowledge her son, perhaps to conspire with him against the hostile forces of the Queen's Privy Council. The Council had leveraged the missing 3rd reading of the banns of marriage—the last step that might have legitimized the union of Admiral Thomas Seymour and Princess Elizabeth Tudor, and their child to boot—into a nation shaking political-religious realignment.

When reading literary analysis, we hope to gather a deeper understanding of a literary text. Often, an artist does not explicitly state their ideas, and it may help readers if a trained and experienced critic can summarize ideas, and assess the artist's success at expressing them. Such critics will usually make clear what the artist avoids stating openly. This assumes the critic has properly understood the text; and this is the problem with 'Shakespeare'. **His critics have not discovered the artist's name**, his place in the social order, his meaning, and therefore his reasons for writing obscurely. They have often read his confidential (esoteric) words at a superficial (exoteric) level, thereby missing virtually everything important. While much of literature has no express purpose, it is only in those examples that have a purposeful design that we can analyze more completely. 'Shakespeare' belongs to this latter subset.

We assume that each 'variety of reader' is entitled to their own interpretation of 'Shakespeare'. Evidently many have expressed unique views, and a great diversity of opinion exists — as we expect when faced with language that is purposely ambiguous. Nonetheless, we acknowledge that the writer is permitted to have his say, and particularly so if he has delivered an invention or key towards reconciling indeterminacy. Separate understandings may be held simultaneously, his and ours, but I think we must be careful to acknowledge the poet's process and the preeminence of histories he's trying to record. Art may be a springboard for the reader's own conceptions, but the artist has taken trouble to produce the works, and therefore deserves first place among constructors. We may own a copy of the Art, and do with it what we like, but that doesn't erase the experience that caused it to be made. Artists may wish to live on in their Art; and I suspect nowhere is this more true than in 'Shakespeare'. He defies the 'condemnation of memory' — *Damnatio Memoriae*—forced upon him.

Who knows what the future brings? Perhaps we'll discover positive historical evidence that definitively identifies Oxford as the artist behind 'Shakespeare'. However, it will have to be more specific than just linking Edward 'de Vere' with the Works. As it appears, many knew 'de Vere' to be the artist; but perhaps very few knew of his more dangerous identity — that he was sole heir to Queen Tudor-St Maur. This was the secret of secrets during the Elizabethan Age. This was the reason for his "tongue-tied" state. And note the difference: his concealed condition was not self-administered—it was not for the indignity of nobles penning comedies, as Oxfordians tell—but was ordered by State Authority. I trust it will be seen that the 'de Vere' identity alone is not a perfect fit for the evidence we have. There's much more to it.

Taking cues from his "friends": If you are not astonished at Oxford's manipulation of language, something is amiss; you may not have fully appreciated his wit. Read him again, ~ *t'heir for* ~, and again. If we do not *a'Mour* him, surely, (L) *nimirum*: '**no wonder!**', ~ *No One-d'Or* ~ ... we are in some manifest danger—danger clearly re'Vealed—not to have understood him. Then we may fail to spot some difference between this **Man** (*Vir*) and his **Muse** (*Musa* > *Mus*, *Muris*, *Simur*) — see Ben Jonson, *First Folio*.

With appreciation to William James and Michael Dudley, we ask: 'What is the cash value' of Oxford-Seymour Theory vs. other theses of Shakespeare? Our theory gives us his Art as a practical workbook in the *Trivium*—grammar, logic, and rhetoric—including an irregular grammar by the intimation of English, French, and Latin languages. Here we find greater semantic range, as words are considered in relation to their analogues in translation, and readers become active participants in the fathoming of his political message. There will be ambiguity and hidden double meanings. Word wit will be discovered. There is even an increased flexibility when examining verses in relation to poetic meter. All we find unique in Oxford's 'Shakespeare'—his "*strangeness*" (Nicholas Royle, 2005)—is largely attributable to his need to speak subtly and evasively. Thus, 'Oxford-Seymour' interpretations are a sort of 'Guide for the Perplexed'

(Maimonides). We attempt to show that: ‘every word doth [indeed] almost tell his name’ — his language is largely constructed of variants of his names. The young student cannot approach a deep understanding of the Plays and Poems without preparation; but access to the Artist’s knowledge of literary languages, logic, and the sciences, will be your reward. Most likely you will need additional study of linguistics and rhetoric before the wit embedded in Oxford’s work, and in the commentary of his friends, can be found ... **“if you need them not, you can lead yourselves, and others. ~ And this More gens we Will him.”** ~ (Heminge & Condell, *First Folio*). I say, no matter who you are, you’ll need their help to begin.

Heminge & Condell? or Ben Jonson?

The first line by Heminge and Condell is a classic ‘**Red Herring**’ — an irrelevant diversion from our first glimpse of ‘Shakespeare’. What follows is more of the same. They should have mentioned the great Playwright by name and said something about him. But they don’t! After insisting on the need for book sales, Oxford’s friends finally advise readers of difficulties they may find — but again, never once noting the Artist’s name. Should they have to? It’s simply a violation of *decorum*. They mention ‘SHAKESPEARE’ in their ‘Epistle Dedicatory’ on the previous page, but their omission in the preface is indecorous and a warning ... consider it sort of rhetorical *paralepsis*, or *occultatio*. It is deliberate concealment by silence, yet also an insinuation; we know the Poet ought to be named.

All of ‘Shakespeare’ is at the service of Oxford’s story. Comedy, Tragedy, or History ... it’s all bent to the telling of the Artist’s Tale. If he appears to fault a Jew for demanding settlement of a ‘pound of flesh nearest the heart’, it is a figurative manipulation of laws so that a man or woman of *Tchu-da* (Judha/Tudor) may possess the soul of a Christian Mer’Chant/Psalm’Mer (St Mer). Ideas of unjust appropriation are figured in language that plays on proper names, but the question of religious or ethnic hatred has no part in the play. It is allusion to the story of Esau and Jacob, or Judah and Joseph, at which Oxford aims; and within himself is the subject Christian and the subject Jew. “Christian” is used to contrast the character of the (*L*) *Iudaeus*, Judaeans — Judahs/‘Chudahs’ (Tudor), from the Christian/ (*Greek*) *Chrestianos*: ‘good, kind’ (*L*) *merces*: ‘good’; see *Merchant of Venice*. So it is important for readers to understand the very real points — presented tropically — being made, or else we’ll accuse the Artist unjustly of violating our modern sensibilities. I posit Oxford was more than commonly broad-minded, and accepted a wide range of opinion without judgement — to each his own.

Likewise, OBERON and TITANIA contend for possession of a little “**Indian boy**”, (*Latin*) *indigena*: ‘a native, a child of *Terra*’, held as a slave/servant (*Verna*) — figuring the war between the Beaufort Tudors and the Suffolk Tudors, specifically Queen Elizabeth and Robert Dudley — for the possession of the marketable quantity Oxford (Edward Tudor-Seymour) represents.

Oxford’s ‘Shakespeare’ doesn’t fault OTHELLO’s race for his rash jealousy; it is the diabolical IAGO — Santiago *Matamoros*, ‘killer of Moors’ — who should be punished for the tragic outcome. IAGO’s Jacob-like attempt to usurp the title and power of the great Esau-like General almost succeeds. OTHELLO has been “wrought”: ‘worked upon by an artificer’, and is not in his right mind; he pays with his life. Note also, that the given name James translates to Iago in both Welsh and Galician.

Oxford-Seymour is a useful theory:

Oxfordian Studies is a forensic analysis of the life of Edward Oxenford. One noted researcher says the Authorship Question is solely an historical endeavor. Perhaps it would be so, except we have concealed testimony from the Poet as regards authorship. With these statements, and with examinations of the texts based on ‘Hamlet’s Method’, the question becomes more deliberative; how shall we proceed applying the Author’s guidelines. He and his friends have revealed the Writer’s name and method; do we have an alternative to testing their assertions?

Oxford-Seymour Theory suggests we renew our interest in rhetoric, but this time, add the study of Latin and French so as to better understand the etymology of English words. The Shakespeare Writer is a 'passing fine' practitioner of the rhetorical arts (see archive.org for full text of *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language*, Sister Miriam Joseph), and the best teacher we have of English to the English speaker.

What's the Problem? Heminge and Condell play on the idea of understanding.

~ *If then Tu-do not Amare [the Poet], surely you are in some aper-ant danger not to understand him.* ~

Stasis: The main point at issue is **the extraordinary nature of 'Shakespeare'**. A consistent problem has been the **perplexing texts**. Many readers have assumed the original texts were not carefully produced. Horace H. Furness (1833-1912), in his *Variorum* series, began the lengthy process of recording opinions—of understandings and amendments suggested by prominent literary critics—to either correct or explain difficult passages. I too began my studies because I didn't understand all the words; even after taking the trouble to consider the semantic range of each, I still could not make sense of them all. The problem might be relatively simple. Perhaps finding the right 'companion' to supplement my Craig & Bevington — Samuel Johnson, Leo Tolstoy, T.S. Eliot, W.H. Auden, Harold Bloom, Stephen Greenblatt, Marjory Garber; many of them produced magnificent volumes in their own right, but did little to allow students themselves to fathom the Poet's meaning. Innocent readers, like myself, want to understand first hand the Poet's process. I've come to believe, *First Folio* commenters—Jonson *et al*—would have been my best tutors.

➤ The **Variorums**: assume the problem is created by a somewhat incautious writer, corrupted by imperfect typesetters. The problem is worsened by editors delicate sensibilities, who sometimes altered ideas that were not acceptable in later, more genteel times. I now suggest the type-setters were mostly excellent — as you would expect.

➤ I have a complete set of **Bell's Edition** of *The Dramatick Writings of Will. Shakespere*, "With the Notes of all the various Commentators, taken from the best editions of Sam. Johnson and Geo. Steevens" (1788), a complete set in good condition, which an uncle of mine sent from England.

The authorship of 'Shakespeare' is contested for a number of reasons; good arguments can be found elsewhere. I never thought it mattered much until I had read the entire canon and was still stymied by the language. The Author is getting at something about which he is not able to be forthright; I suggest only those who haven't made an effort to read him closely can find 'Shakespeare' clear. Questions of Authorship become imperative when we are told directly—as directly as can be tropically stated—his gens are **Tudor-St Maur** "Variety". Though **Tudor-Maur**, he is conditionally **Vere**; '**Vere**' is his *agnomen*.

Shakespeare wrote 'Shakespeare'? **Every Oxfordian is convinced that Edward Oxenford wrote 'Shakespeare'**; but Edward himself is at war with those who want him to be called 'de Vere'; they belong to the [pro] Suffolk-Grey faction led by Robert Dudley and William Cecil, and profit greatly by the servility of Tudor to the Privy Council. But wouldn't **a Rose by any other name smell as sweet?**

We should be careful when using the surname 'de Vere' speaking of Edward Oxenford. The entire 'Shakespeare Canon' identifies difficulties that arise when the wrong name is used; specifically whether he is called Tudor-Seymour or 'de Vere'. The first is his 'great' name: **Tudor-Maur**; by which he is master of his fate and that of his nation. The second is his 'Leices'r'—Leicester—name: '**de Vere**'. There, his place is to produce wealth for overlords without regard for the people. Together, they are:

"**th'occurrants more and less**" (*Hamlet* V. 2 340) ... [with th'], ~ *au couronne, plus et moins.* ~

So, what's it going to be, eh? William Cecil's choice: Edward de Vere?

Or Oxford's choice, Edward Tudor-St Maur?

The notion that one does '**violence to the text**' when rewording Oxford's original is erroneous.

Our Poet has qualified his text to mollify censors, but has left a system in place that allows the reader to reconstruct his intentions: “**Though this be madness, yet there is method in’t.**” (*Hamlet II. 2 425*).

The thing is, every word of ‘Shakespeare’ is chosen to express some facet of his identity. Every word is important and germane. If you don’t grasp his *psychomachia*: ‘**the war for the soul**’—the war for the Poet’s Virtues and Vices embodied in Tudor, St Maur, and de Vere—you will not fathom his words or “delve him to the **root**” ... (*Latin*) *radix*, (*Cymbeline I. 1 34*). He, like FALSTAFF, is “a bunch of **radish**” (*1 Hen. IV II. 4 178*). His names indicate three lines of descent, two of which are unacknowledged.

I suggest that Oxford-Seymour Theory is the most natural, and most cohesive, of the explanations so far put forth regarding the practical reading of ‘Shakespeare’. Though there is only slight historical data to support the existence of Elizabeth’s child, there is overwhelming literary support in the ‘Shakespeare Canon’; the entire Canon is committed and insistent on the ‘fact’ of his descent. Oxford is *The Psalm-Mer of Venus (Chant-Mer of Venice)* ... *The Maur of Venus (The Moor of Venice)*. Do you find these punning translations unbefitting of the great ‘Shakespeare’? Well then, I believe your definition of ‘great’ is too limited.

Oxfordians have found the right man (*vere Vir*); but knowing the ‘Man’ is only the tip of an iceberg.

We must judge ‘Shakespeare’ by influences that produced it. Modern criticism of his work largely misses the mark, giving him attributes that don’t belong. The fashion of neglecting an Artist’s purpose may be thrown aside; the study of Oxford’s ‘Shakespeare’ concerns his **memorial intent**.

No matter is so important to ‘Shakespeare’—to the question of meaning and authorship—as that noted in Heminge & Condell’s preface to the *First Folio*. In the lines of their short epistle ‘*To the great Variety of Readers*’ they emphasize the point repeatedly. Oxfordian author Richard Whalen has laid the foundation for my argument by suggesting both Ben Jonson’s, and Oxford’s strategy is memorial. (“*Look Not on this Picture*”, *Brief Chronicles, First Folio Special Edition*, 2016).

“To the great variety of readers” “Do so, but first buy.” “But what ever you do, Buy.”

Here, in a few short phrases, Heminge & Condell reveal the Artist’s name and his Method. It’s disarmingly simple. Each comment reiterates in various ways, the message of the first line. *Example D* (see p. 2 above) goes so far as to introduce a problem that, if not observed consistently, will be an obstacle to your appreciation of ‘Shakespeare’.

This method produces a kind of shorthand such that someone accustomed to the scheme can sense significance immediately. The use of metonyms or repeated epithets instantly suggests the mode of thought; however, careful interpretation of each word rewards the reader with more. We don’t need complete fluency in reference languages—Latin or French—because an excellent dictionary will suffice. Full comprehension doesn’t come until a range of substitutions is made. It’s a wonderful word game in my estimation — *Ae’St-Maure*.

It’s a conceit: ‘Shakespeare’ is best understood on the stage. **Exoterically** yes, **Esoterically** no. When a ‘Shakespeare’ play is produced on the stage, trained actors give their lines with polished vocal inflection and physical action, and it helps greatly to convey meaning. For the stage, so much depends on presentation that without the help of fine actors, a large part of the Master’s work would be unintelligible. Yet the heart of the matter can only be found in interpretation. The words *are* a little archaic, but the real problem lies in their witty complexity.

MACBETH *Macbeth V.5 16-23*

She should have died hereafter;

There would have been a time for such a word:

To morrow, and to morrow, and to morrow,
 Creeps in this petty pace, from day to day,
 To the last syllable of recorded time: (E) **recorded time**, (Fr) *toise*: ‘fathom-measure’
 And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
 the way to dusty death.

SEYTON ~ *Etymology* (Old English) **sae**: ‘sea’ + **tun**: ‘town, settlement’; yet another facet of the writer.

16 The Queen, my lord, is dead.

~ **The Queen** [*allegory* Queen Elizabeth of England], **my lord** [(Fr) *maître*: wp (E) mater: ‘mother, womb’], **is dead** [(Fr) *mort*; hinting at the Queen’s More identity.]. ~

~ ***The Queen, my mater, is More.*** ~

► *name, wordplay* Seyton, *wordplay* sea, (French) *océan*, *mer* + (Fr) *ton*, *mœurs*: ‘morals, manners’; hence (Fr) *mer-mœurs* = *Mer-More*; hence a minor character stands to deliver the Ox-Seymour message.

MACBETH ~ *Etymology*, (Scottish Gaelic) *Mac*: ‘son (of)’ + Beth, diminutive of Elizabeth — ‘Son of Beth’

17 She should have died hereafter:

~ **She should have died** [(French) *mort*] **hereafter** [*wordplay* heir-after, ~ after having heired ~]:

~ ***She should have Mor’t heir-after:*** ~

18 There would have been a time for such a word.

~ **There** [*wordplay* t’heir] **would have been a time** [(Fr) *saison*: wp ‘sea-son’; alt. (Fr) *heure*: ‘hour’] **for such** [3 ‘Of the same kind or class’; *predicatively* < *so* + like: *I.1* ‘In the way or manner described’] **a word** [(Fr) *mot*, wp (E) *moe*, *more*]. ~

~ ***There would have been an heure for such a Mot.*** ~

~ ***There should have been a Sea’son for such a Mot.*** ~

19 **To morrow, and to morrow, and to morrow**

~ **Tomorrow** [(Fr) *demain*: *wordplay* *de*: ‘out of, made of, from’ + *main*: *5a* ‘from the Sea’; *alternative, timesis* Tu Maur’O—Tudor-Maur ’O], **and tomorrow** [*as before*], **and tomorrow** [*as before*] ~

~ ***Tu Maur’O and Tu Maur’O, and ... Tu Maur’O*** ~

~ ***Made of the Sea, and From the Sea; and to the Sea*** ~

20 Creeps in this petty pace from day to day

~ **Creeps** [(Fr) *traîner*: (E) *entrain*: ‘to follow, succeed’] **in this petty** [(Fr) *ordinaire*: wp (Fr) *ordonné*: ‘ordered, regulated’] **pace** [(Fr) *train*, (E) *suite*, (Fr) *suite*: ‘series, succession’] **from day** [*wordplay* (Fr) *de*: ‘origin’, (Fr) *origine*: ‘descent, derivation, birth’] **to day** [wp (Fr) *de*: ‘origin’] ~

~ ***Worms its way in this ordered succession from Or to Or*** ~

~ ***Follows in this ordered succession from descent to descent*** ~

21 To the last syllable of recorded time,

~ **To the last** [(Fr) *dernier*: ‘last’, ‘meanest’, basest, ‘utmost, greatest’] **syllable** [(Fr) *syllabe*: ‘sound’, wp (E) *sane*, (Fr) *sain*: ‘healthful, sound’, wp *son*] **of recorded** [wp (Fr) *re*: ‘back, again’ + *cor*: ‘heart’, two-hearted, twice-souled; (Fr) *recorder*: ‘rehearse’, to repeat, hence *twice*; alt. (Fr) *registre*: ‘registered, accounted’] **time** [(MFr) *hystoire*, (Fr) *histoire*: *hist* + *oire*; (Fr) *heure*: ‘hour’, wp *Or*, *our*], ~

~ ***To the latest son of Tu-d’Or,*** ~

~ To the basest son of Tud'heure, ~
 ~ To the last son of twice-soul'd Or, ~

22 And all our yesterdays have lighted fools

~ **And all** [(Fr) *tout*, wp first syllable of *Tu*-(d')*or*] **our** [second syllable of *Tu*-(d')*or*] **yesterdays** [(Fr) *hier*, wp (E) *heir*; alt. (E) *hire*: 'Payment contracted to be made for temporary use of anything, esp. for money lent; usury, interest'] **have lighted** [(Fr) *éclairer*: 'to light, to give light, illuminate' —made fair, (Fr) *clair*: 'light of color, blond', 'light of the Moon'; alt. (Fr) *allumer*: 'to light, to kindle, to set on fire'] **fools** [(Fr) *sot*, (Welsh) *mor*: 'so, sea'] ~

~ **And Tud-or heirs have So made Fair** ~

23 The way to dusty death.

~ **The way** [(Fr) *route*: wordplay 'root'; (Fr) *manière*: 'manner, way'; (Fr) *mœurs*: 'ways, manners'] **to dusty** [(Fr) *poudreux*: 'dusty', wordplay, epithet *pudeur*: 'shame' —(MFr) *verecond*, wp ~ Vere condition ~; (Fr) *poussière*, condition *basse*: 'shallow' (see *fool* 1.22)] **death** [(Fr) *mort*]. ~

~ **The mores to Vere-cond Mort.** ~

~ **The root to Vere-cond Mort.** ~

Once More:

SEYTON (Macbeth V. 5 16-23)

16 ~ **The Queen, my mater, is More.** ~

MACBETH

17 ~ **She should have *Mor't* heir-after:**

18 **There would have been an heure for such a *Mot*:**

19 ***Tu Maur'O*; and *Tu Maur'O*, and ... *Tu Maur'O***

20 ***Worms* its *way* into this *ord'Ored* succession from *Or* to *Or***

21 **To the latest son of *Tu-d'Or*,**

22 **And the *Tud-or* heirs have *So made Fair***

23 **The *mores* to *Vere-cond Mort*.** ~

How apt is Shakespeare's language! The meaningful elements represented by syllables, and particularly morphemes, are handled with great facility. The more we read his words, the more we see the extent of his knowledge and genius. You might "*strain t'outdo*" (L. Digges, *First Folio*) his name, but to remove it from his "*wit-fraught Booke*" would be to dispose of virtually "*every Line, each Verse*".

What's the cause? **Attainder: 'The stain or corruption of blood of a criminal capitally condemned.'**

(French) *Éteindre*: 'to extinguish, put out', wordplay *ataindre*, *ateindre*: 'to strike, touch, accuse, convict, condemn'.

Éteins!: imperative 'extinguish!' (E) candle, (Fr) *bougie*, wp *bourgeon*: 'bud, scion'

MACBETH

Out, out, brief candle!

(L) *aut*: 'or, either', (Fr) *dehors*, *dehors*: 'out of doors, outside'

Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player,

(E) **poor**, wp (Fr) *indigent*, wp *indigène*: 'native'

That **struts** and **frets** his hour upon the **stage**,

(E) **strut**, (Fr) *demarche*, *fier* (E) **fret**, (Fr) *effacer*

And then is heard **no Maur**: It is a **tale**,

(E) **tail**, (Fr) *taille*: 'limitation of inheritance'

Told by an **idiot**, full of **sound** and **fury**,

(E) **sound**, (Fr) *son* (E) **fury**, (Fr) *furie*, *fureur*, (L) *furor*

Signifying **nothing**.

(E) **nothing**, (Fr) *néant*—wp (E) **no maur**, (L) *formica*

~ *Two d'Or, Somaire scion!*

*Vere's only an homme qui Marche, an actor indigène,
That Marcs and VVeres his h'Or upon the scene,
And then is heir'd no Maur: It is a tail,
Told by a Morio, full of Son and theft,
Signifying No Maur. ~*

(E) **tail** > attainder

Tudor-Seymour Attainder (*Macbeth* V.1 34)

(E) **out**, (Fr) *dehors*, *dehors*: 'out of doors, outside' — Tude'Or

“**Out**, damned spot! **Out**, **I say**, (E) **say**, (Fr) *répéter*: *wp* 'repeat' — *wp* ~ two-dear ~, ~ re + Pierre ~

(E) **damned spot**, (Fr) *damné teinte*: 'damned taint' < (Fr) *teindre* < (L) *tingere*: 'stain, dye'

Queen Elizabeth / LADY MACBETH cannot rid herself of the 'stain' of attainder. But is guilt the cause of her apparent madness? Perhaps this is a misunderstanding of the text. If DUNCAN masks Elizabeth's half-brother, Edward VI—and the story of *Macbeth* parallels events subsequent to his murder in 1553—it may be the limitation of her monarchy that grieves the Queen, not guilt. Coerced by Suffolk-Grey Tudors, who hold the secret of her complicity with Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour (1547-49), Elizabeth suffers the loss of control over her treasury and corruption of blood — she will not be known by her married name nor acknowledge her own child.

Oxford suffers far greater loss for her deeds. The Queen publicly called him a bastard, likely in exasperation; perhaps she felt some pang of conscience upon hearing one of his bitter asides! Surely this is not for accusations against John de Vere's philandering, but for the unsanctioned marriage that haunts Elizabeth's life. Who is represented by MACBETH, 'Son of Beth'? Thomas Seymour, Robert Dudley? Or does Oxford, with polite gallantry, assume part blame as the 'Opportunity' driving others to act? Look To't! It was the **dagger**, wordplay (Fr) *daguet*: 'brocket, the yearling deer', that begat the murder of DUNCAN. That beautiful child, seemingly shameful evidence of illicit sex, was sweet/suite 'Opportunity' to Suffolk-Grey emulators. Along with Night (Dudley), and Time (Cecil), Opportunity (Oxford & Elizabeth's secret):

But **ill-annexèd opportunity**

(E) **ill-annexèd**: 'poorly joined (married)' (E) **opportunity**

Or kills his life **or** else his quality. (*Lucrece* 874-75)

(E) **Or ... or** — Two d'Or

Oxford-Seymour translations demonstrate an obsessive repetition of the Artist's true name. I suggest his identity was **so explosive** at the time—striking awe in the ear of the Cecil/Bacon faction—that he was forbidden to reveal it. Oxford's response was to produce a defiant text in which every word “**almost**” — wordplay *ferely*/fairly—tells his name.

The scope of Oxford-Seymour Theory is vast. In Oxford's 'Shakespeare' alone, we have nearly a million words that tell of little other than the Poet's place, or his Mother's place, in the line of succession. The remaining members of FALSTAFF's sad-merry band—a false staff—add another mountain of as yet unexamined pages — they are prelude or supplements to the main show.

The unfortunate choice before all readers of 'Shakespeare' is whether to acknowledge Oxford Tudor-Seymour as one of the wittiest men in Elizabethan England—a reputation he held in his lifetime—or to acknowledge me as one of the wittiest speakers of English anywhere and anytime. I can find the Poet's name in virtually any verse, any passage — either Tudor-St Maur, or his hostile *alter-ego* 'de Vere'. Is it possible that I can be so clever? Nobody has ever thought it before. Let me answer for you. No! Alas, I've not yet found anything in the Canon that 'almost' reveals my name (see *Sonnet 76*).

Tongue-tied ‘Shakespeare’ — What’s to be done?

The Writer says he’s ‘**Tongue-tied by Authority**’. This means we read, not what he wishes to say, but what he is permitted to say. The Poet chose to speak tropically, and we will find his intended meaning in the figurative definitions; his writing is necessarily oblique. Hence the riddles and difficult wording. What might be said briefly — Summarily/St Maur’ily, if Oxford had not been ‘tongue-tied’ — is rendered tediously (*Latin*) *molestus*: ‘in a labored manner’ — it can become ‘annoying or affected’.

“O, know, sweet Love, I always write of you.”

~ *O, recognize this, Sui Amoris, I always write of you.* ~ (Sonnet 76)

~ *O, acknowledge Se A’more, I always write of you.* ~

Any time we find a character so carefully drawn, it’s to be suspected the character is taken from life. It may be *ethopoeia*: ‘An expression of character’; *I* ‘manners, morals’; *II* ‘delineation or drawing of ethos’. **Ethos** is not what happens transiently, but the inherent qualities that give rise to behavior and action. *Ethopoeia* is the creation of the intrinsic parts of a character that—for lack of a better understood source—are likely to be drawn from the Poet’s life. HAMLET gives us strong indication that his character is drawn from the Poet’s in the speech: “**To the manner born**” (*Hamlet* 1.4 13-38): ~ *From the Artist’s Ethos created* ~. That which is his **native manner, more, custom, observance, nature, habit, complexion, attribute, birth, stamp, nature’s livery, fortune’s star, virtues, particular fault**—all found in that piece—correlate or are synonymous with his surname More, Maur, (*Latin*) *mos, moris*, (*French*) *mœurs*.

Because of his need to speak circumspectly, Oxford is free to choose, not the most economical way of expressing an idea, but the most rhetorically polished — and in such a manner that is consistent with the entire Canon. Abstracting literal meaning into tropical meaning adds considerable elegance and an element of mystery — precisely that which makes poetry attractive. Oxford strives for good-sounding language. ‘Shakespeare’ is intelligent yet euphonious. It was only after discovering something of his method that I detected the true accuracy of each word, either literally or tropically.

W.H. Auden wondered whether Shakespeare was undecided if he should write plays or dramatic monologues. We can answer that, the broadcast effect of the theater always directed him towards plays — there we find “**the two hours traffic of our stage**,” ~ *the Tu-d’hor’s Çom’Merce of Or Grey’d Os*; ~ (*Romeo and Juliet* Prologue 12). Auden says monologues or set pieces are “detachable”, yet they are bound to the play and Oxford by Varronian Wordplay. Yes, they can be detached and in some cases given to certain other characters, but this is only because so many characters represent the Writer. A HAMLET soliloquy might be delivered by HORATIO because, we are told, he is the ‘*De’Or Daimon*’ (*Tudor Daimon*) of HAMLET, but not by LAERTES who is a usurper of HAMLET’s birthright.

ROSENCRANTZ (‘Rosy Crown’) and GUILDENSTERN (‘Golden Star’) can only represent offensive competitors to the Tudor-Seymour poet; they are insisted upon by ‘State Authority’ and throw the reader off the Artist’s scent; but we, like the GHOST OF KING HAMLET, ~ *scent the Mour’ning Heir (is sent)* ~ (*Hamlet* 1.5 58). In a dramatic turn-about, Oxford/HAMLET can kill the unsubstantial personators simply by starving them of his literary output.

The Inductions to *The Taming of the Shrew* tell us the play is “**a kind of history**”. I suggest this counsel, or *narratio*, is intended to speak to the reader about the artist’s conception. What is directed to a specific work is intended for all. He slyly tells us it is a “**Comonty**”, perceived to be a misuse of ‘comedy’, but in truth, it is comment upon the Commons — the monarchy of England.

What can perplex readers of the Oxford-Seymour readings is the ‘madness’ of our derived

‘supra-text’. When a verse is taken apart and translated so its structure can be seen, the result may seem incoherent. It may be improper English. The steps we take appear unnecessary because the original was not obviously coded ... or rarely so. **Steganography**, ‘the art of concealing information within seemingly unrelated matter’, is most effective when the viewer is not aware the message is coded. If we find a text of apparent nonsense in a series of letters or such, we suspect the use of a **substitution** or **transposition cypher**; but the type used in ‘Shakespeare’ is more deceiving; it’s a kind of *double-entendre*. Such double meaning is often undetected.

So why mess with language that seemed perfect as it was? Well, first of all, that perfection attributed to ‘Shakespeare’ is something of a conceit; difficult, unconventional, language is inherently imperfect. But secondly, because the Poet, through the mask of HAMLET, has suggested we do:

“It is not **madness** (English) **madness**, (*Latin*) *morio*, *furor*
 That I have **uttered**. Bring me to the test, (E) **uttered**, *wp* [wordplay] Tu-d’Or’d
 And I the **matter** will reword, **which madness** (E) **matter**, *wp* (L) *mater* (E) **which**/Witch
 Would **gambol** from.” (*Hamlet* III. 4 141-44) (E) **gambol**, (L) *saltare*: ‘to leap or **spring**’ — (L) *ver*

The *Variorums* show the need of much explanation in ‘Shakespeare’. Oxford-Seymour methods suggest that minor corrections of the original text are not the way to find Oxford’s intent. We demonstrate that he systematically corrupted his intended text to circumvent censorship. Now we must reverse the process to discover what he was not permitted to say openly. The “poet’s rage” (*Sonnet 17*) is (*Latin*) **furor**: ‘raging, madness’; the ‘stealthy theft’ — again **fūror** — of his descent and inheritance explains his indignation. He and the Crown Tudors have been struck in a *coup d’État* by the forces of Robert Dudley and William Cecil. The concealment of his birth, Tudor-St Maur, has been effected by changing his name to ‘de Vere’. ‘De Vere’ is figured as the mystical **iacchus** (the ‘firstborn’ facet of Bacchus in Greek myth, but in ‘Shakespeare’, he is figured as the second born usurper **Jacob**, as we find in the Bible); he is the alter-ego of ‘twice born’ Bacchus, son of Jupiter and **Semele** (**Semel**/St Maur). Edward ‘de Vere’ represents a ‘personation’ or theft of the true Edward Tudor-St Maur.

Oxford has given enough ‘Counsel’ to permit readers to produce a reliable substitution for all passages. Our book, *Shakespeare’s Will*, demonstrates the particular devices used by Oxford to reveal his method. The ‘mad method’ not only produces a double meaning, but allows the poet to beautify his language without being absolutely concerned with economy or clarity; and, of course, he took every opportunity to make his work rhetorically stunning. The double purpose is to state his case, and make it so fine that it will not die — it must resound, (*Latin*) *resonare*; it must ‘cry out’, (L) *personare*.

It must repeat and make his plea.

Rules and Precepts

These simple rules and precepts—stated openly or obliquely in the Sonnets and Plays—are held faithfully in the rhetoric of the *Canon*. Oxford is playful with language; his English plays on Latin, French, and often other languages as well. The Latin and French are taken playfully as well. This is a view of language that recalls the Latin of the great Roman writers, like Ovid and Vergil (see Fred Ahl), when using Etymological wordplay—often called Varronian or Alexandrian, to extend meaning. Oxford’s ‘Invention’ aims not to etymologize, but to allow etymologies and syllabic emphasis to help develop hidden meaning — e.g. **Dido**: (**di**-, *prefix 1*: ‘in two, in different directions’, + **do**: *wordplay* ~ To do(r) ~ , thus Dido plays on Tudor. The allusion to Dido in *Hamlet* (II. 2 375-458) is a tropical representation of something concerning the Tudor monarchy — something ‘Tu-do’ about a “mobled Queen” (1603), or “inobled Queen (1623), either ‘muffled’, ‘inobled/ennobled’, or ‘marbled’ (*marmoreus*—Sea’Mor-eus); choose your poison.

“Every word doth almost tell my name.” (*Sonnet 76*).

Aptronyms, Aptonyms, Euonyms.

~ *Tous les mots semblent presque révéler mon nom.*

~ *Totus Muttum—omnia verba—doth fairly reveal my name.* ~

“It is not madness

That I have uttered. Bring me to the test,

And I the matter will reword, which madness

Would gambol from.” (*Hamlet III. 4 141-44*)

► “I remember, the Players have often mentioned it as an honour to Shakespeare, that in his writing, (**whatsoever** he penn’d) **hee never** blotted out line. My answer hath beene, would he had blotted a thousand. Which they thought a **malevolent speech**. I had not told posterity this, but for **their ignorance**, who choose that circumstance to commend their friend by, wherein he most faulted. And to justify mine owne **candor**, (for I lov’d the **man**, and **doe honour his memory** (on this side **Idolatry**) as much as any.) He was (**indeed**) **honest**, and of an open, and free nature: had an excellent Phantsie; **brave** notions, and **gentle** expressions: wherein hee flow’d with that faculty, that sometime it was necessary he should be stopp’d: “*Sufflaminandus erat*”; as Augustus said of Haterius. His **wit** was in his owne power; would the rule of it had beene so too. Many times hee fell into those things, could not escape laughter: As when hee said in the person of Cæsar, one speaking to him; “*Cæsar thou dost me wrong.*” Hee replied: “*Cæsar did never wrong, but with just cause*”: and such like; which were ridiculous. But hee redeemed his vices, with his virtues. There was **ever more** in him to be **praysed**, then **to be pardoned**.” (Ben Jonson; *Timber: or, Discoveries*; c. 1620-35)

(*Latin*) *sufflaminandus erat*: ~ **He needed to be checked.** ~ , ~ **He was repressed.** ~

Ben Jonson tells us: “he would [Shakespeare] had blotted a thousand” lines, but does not mean ‘thousand’ as an approximate number; he uses it as Latin speakers intended: (*L*) *mille*: 1 ‘a thousand, thousands’, and generally: *Transferred II* ‘innumerable others’. Would that Oxford’s ‘Shakespeare’ was not entirely written in equivocal language ... that it had not been necessary for him to do so. But as we find it, all of ‘Shakespeare’ concerns his own ‘Great Mortal Matter’ (Attainder).

“O, know, sweet love, I always write of you.” (*Sonnet 76*).

~ *O, know (this), Doux-Amour, I always write of Tu.* ~ *Tudor-Maur, Tudor St Maur.*

“Is it a Comonty?”

~ *Is it a commentum?* ~ *Çomonty, St Maur-ty* (-ty, suffix 1: ‘forming nouns denoting condition’)

[MARIA]: “Not a word with him but a jest.” [BOYET]: “And every jest but a word.” (*LLL II. 1 215-16*).

“Let’s part the word.” (*LLL V. 2 250 – timesis*) *etc.*

[ARMADO]: “Some enigma, some riddle. Come, thy l’envoi — begin.

[COSTARD]: “No egma (*Noema*), no riddle, ... Or, sir, plantain (*Musa*), a plain plantain!

~ *Noema, no riddle, ... Or sir, Musa, a Frank Sa’Maur.* ~

► (*English < Latin*) *noema*: ‘obscure speech’; “The obscurity of the sense lieth not in a single word, but in an entire speech.” (*English Poesy*”, Puttenham, 1589).

► The term *Musa*, for plantain and banana, is found in “*A Nieuwe Herbal ...*”, by Rembert Dodoens (1517-85), a Flemish physician and botanist, translated to English in 1578 by Henry Lyte. The name *Musa* likely predates his use, and appears to be translated in Medieval times out of an Arabic work

'*The Canon of Medicine*', completed in 1025 AD by Avicenna. *Musa* apparently refers to the Roman freedman Antonius Musa (63 BC-14 AD), personal physician to Emperor Augustus (63 BC-14 AD). The plant *Musa* was prescribed for various ailments including loss of blood (hemorrhage) — which may be the present figurative allusion. "Did [SHAKESPEARE] ever do anything without reason?" (H. H. Furness, *Variorum: Anthony and Cleopatra*, Preface pg. IX)

► (French) *envoi*: 'a sending forth' > 'to convey across or communicate', *II* 'to pass over', ; what follows is a transmission > (L) *trans*: 'across' + (L) *mittere*: 'to send' — perhaps hinting at a necessary change of state.

"Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?", Robert Browning, *Andrea del Sarto*.

What's Different about 'Shakespeare'? His Queen is not Tudor, but Tudor-St Maur.

Oxford's 'Shakespeare' is a lengthy appeal to his Monarch for official acknowledgement of his legitimacy. His texts are woven with an abundance of qualifying matter which may appear as paraphrase, but whose purpose is to specify—either to extend or restrict—exact conditions that inescapably relate to her truthful 'Tudor-St Maur' monarchy and a Suffolk-Tudor *coup d'état*. Had she confirmed later in life that it had been her intention to marry Thomas Seymour in 1547 and '48, Oxford's chances may have taken another turn. Was she told such an admission might bring punishment for her part in Seymour's 'treason'? **"The Queen, his mother, lives by his looks."** (*Hamlet* ...) > ~ **The Queen, his mother, only survives because of his personation.** ~

To state his case, Edward Oxenford, the Poet, first locates well-known source material—history or literary—whose themes suggest his own biography and that of Elizabeth I of England. In them, we usually see two opposing personal and political forces vying for power. He then develops the existing story and characters by rhetorical *Ethopoeia* in which he substitutes details of his own situation for those found in the source. Thus Oxford's 'Shakespeare' seems free and easy with original plots; if historical events are the basis, he is an unreliable historian. The intended reader—the Queen—will be continually reminded of the connection between this fiction and her own life by clever, and usually concealed, wordplay.

Oxford, like HAMLET, would 'catch the conscience of the Queen'. **She may be the only person who can recognize him as her son.** When we consider the opportunity for personal gain presented by Elizabeth's pregnancy, the Privy Council cannot be relied upon to be forthcoming with this information:

ADAM (*As You Like It* II. 6 6) **ADAM** figures as Queen Elizabeth — a dame/Adam.

6 If this uncouth forest yield anything savage, I will either be
 ~ **If** [(French) *si*] **this** [(Fr) *cette*; wordplay *sept*: 'seven', regnal number 'seventh'] **uncouth** [(Fr) *étrange, singulier/sanglier*: 'wild boar', *sanglier de mer*: 'boar-fish' — (English) uncouth: 'unknown, uncertain'] **forest** [(Fr) *forêt, bois*: 'a wood or forest'] **yield** [(Fr) *rapporter, livrer*: 'deliver', *wp* ~ *de le Vere* ~] **anything** [(Fr) *quelque chose*: 'something'; (Fr) *créature*: 4 'a person..who remains subservient..to a patron' (OED), 5 'the offspring of something'; ; (Fr) *bête*: 'animal, beast', 'fool, stupid creature'] **savage** [(Fr) *féroce*: *wp ferrous*: 'made of iron'—hence (Fr) *dur*: 'hard', ~ *Faire*'ous ~ , ~ **Tudur** ~], **I will [] either [] be [] ~**

French ~ *Si cette bois inconnu delivre quelque chose féroce, soit je lui serai ~*

~ *If this unknown boy 'deliVere', as due, Some' fer'rous creature, I Will be, Or ... ~*

7 food for it or bring it for food to thee. Thy conceit is

~ **food** [(French) *nourriture*: 'food, sustenance', 'nourishment'] **for it, or** [(E) either ... or, or ... or: Two-d'Or; (Fr) *l'un d'eux*: 'one of them', *wp* ~ the one & two ~] **bring** [(Fr) *apporter*: 'to bring,

supply'; (Fr) *porter*: 'carry' — wp (Fr) *port*: 'door'] **it for** [amphiboly ~ to feed ~ or ~ to be fed ~] **food** [(Fr) *nourrisson*: 'an infant, nursling'] **to thee. Thy conceit** [(Fr) *conception*: 'conception'; alt. (Fr) *trait d'esprit*: 'witticism'—referring to ADAM's wordplay on the surname Maur (line 2).] **is ~**

French ~ *nourriture pour cela, ou je te apporterai pour te nourrir. Ton conception est ~*
 ~ *nourishment for it, Or a'Port it for to Nurse thee. Thy witticism is ~*
 ~ *nourishment for it, Or a'D'or it for thee to Nurse. Thy witticism is ~*

8 nearer death than thy powers.

~ **nearer** [(Fr) *plus proche*; **cher**: 'dear'; (Fr) *voisin*: 'next door, neighboring'] **death** [(Fr) *mort*—surname Maur, St Maur] **than thy powers** [(Fr) *virulence* < (L) *vis*, **vires**: 'force, power'—Veres]. ~

French ~ *plus proche de la Mort que ta Vere-ilité. ~*
 ~ *Tout d'Or-Mort than thy de Veres. ~*

Once More:

~ *If this unknown boy 'deliVere', as due, Some' fer'rous creature, I Will be, Or ...*
nourishment for it, Or a'Port it for to Nurse thee. Thy witticism is
Tout d'Or-Mort than thy Veres. ~

Unusual linguistic schemes join his words. Relief from the contrivances of Royal Court is shown to be (French) *dehors*: 'outside', playing on *Tu-de'Ors*, as having an unenclosed or unlimited inheritance — *de la forêt*, without entail (*taille*). This is the distinction intended in *As You Like It*. By the 1600s, the Forest of Arden in Warwickshire was largely enclosed by hedgerows, while the Ardennes of northern France was still open and unrestricted. The old Roman name—*Arduenna Silva*—likely plays in the Oxford's mind as ~ *RR-Deux'en* ~, ~ *Two-d'Or'an* ~, or some such sense. Thus, allusion and wordplay usually go hand in hand (see Roberts, B. K.; '... *Medieval Colonization in the Forest of Arden, Warwickshire*', British Ag. Historical Soc., c.1966). A word for word reference to a foreign language will be apparent in interlingual wordplay.

Is each speaker in 'Shakespeare' a tropical speaker? With so many characters answering for Oxford, others must prompt him. That means an answer that may be understood tropically is likely occasioned by a question that may be understood tropically. To create double-entendre in conversation, all speakers usually contribute, knowingly or unknowingly, to the exchange:

HORATIO "Is it a custom? (*Hamlet* 1.4 14) (English) **custom**, (Latin) **more**
 ~ *Is it a more?* ~

HAMLET "Ay, marry, is't. (E) **marry**: interjection 'expressing surprise'—surname **Maur'y**
Interpretation ~ *Ay, St More.* ~ (Sey)**Mour**, **St Maur**, the Poet's surname.

Alternative ~ *Ay is it — More.* ~

The presence of History plays in the Shakespeare Canon give us the precise context in which to place non-history plays; all are episodes in the Poet's life — a life that continues the struggle for Beaufort-Tudor Succession shown in the *Histories*. The divided interests of each are drawn from among branches descending from the royal Plantagenets. Cadet families of one's offspring often diverge as their interests become independent. The "Two households, both alike in dignity" described in *Romeo and Juliet* mask the Beaufort and York lines—of John of Gaunt (1340-99), and Edmund of Langley (1341-1402) respectively—the third and fourth surviving sons of King Edward III (1312-77). Conflict arose between their lineages that brought civil war from 1455-87. Differences were largely resolved in 1485 by the overthrow of Richard III by Henry, Earl of Richmond (crowned Henry VII in 1485), and Richmond's subsequent marriage to Elizabeth of York, daughter of deceased King Edward IV. Thus the two Houses, Beaufort and York were

united in the Crown Tudors — a peaceful solution that was interrupted by the death of Henry VIII. Remember, if Oxford and his friends do not deceive, he is the only grandchild of Henry VIII.

In Oxford's 'Shakespeare', if opposing forces may be reconciled, it is usually achieved by marriage; representatives of warring parties join to form a single concern, with shared interests and responsibilities. Sometimes, however, a disagreement may be so profound—and its implications so damaging to the parties—that deaths occur. These are the Comedies and Tragedies, respectively.

As researchers have found, 'Shakespeare' is a treasury of rhetorical and logical devices. Sister Miriam Joseph (1947) confirmed the artist's expertise and unfailing authority in virtually all aspects of the language arts; and Horace H. Furness, founder of the *Variorum* series, was generally satisfied that the *First Folio* required very little amendment despite the contrary opinions of many commenters.

How to Catch a Conscience? Here are the usual Steps:

Note how linguistically apt are his metaphors & analogies: "*A rose by any other name ...*"

1 **The source material is chosen because it is apt to the Poet's history.**

2 In being '**tongue-tied by Authority**', the Writer is not able to say directly what he would like — the words on the page only summon or call forth an idea. The reader must translate and interpret his veiled speech, trying to summon-up one's own wit so as to find kinship with Oxford's. The true matter is found in more revealing language than that which the Poet has made obscure. This is counterintuitive to readers who regard the words of 'Shakespeare' as perfect just the way they are. The large vocabulary and unique phrasing, typical of Oxford's work, exist because his double-meanings force him to be creative with words in ways the typical poet would not. His knowledge of language and wit are used to good advantage.

3 **Translate** obscure passages into the reference language. Google Translate is a start, but you'll likely find in the best dictionaries some apt definition within the semantic range of a translation—usually into French or Latin—that cleverly comments on the Poet's known predicament — his name, birth, and chances of advancement. Otherwise, you may discover possible wordplay implied within the linguistic structure of an analogous word. Choose among literal and tropical definitions that may answer to his concerns — Oxford favors the tropical. The best dictionaries yield classical selections worthy of the Bard. If you don't find a precise fit, there is usually a delightful pun on the very word you need. "**Who's there?**" ... it works doesn't it? But ~ *Who's t'Heir?* ~ is better; it also gives us the *exordium* we'd like to see — 'the warp we'd like to weave'.

What sounds like complexity, is actually fairly simple and self-correcting. Consider the etymology of all words, English, Latin, French, and you'll likely find a number of words in the vicinity, the *milieu*, that serve to reinforce what seems a logical definition; this is the purpose of Varronian Wordplay. Intent, is the name of the game. How does the meaning of words and verses secure the meaning of those nearby? Why "**starling**"? yes, they can be taught to mimic human speech; but the connection runs deeper. Ah yes ... (ME) *stare* > (Fr) *astre* > (L) *astrum* > St Maur > "**This Starre of England.**"

[HOTSPUR] (1 Henry IV I. 3 219-24)

~ He said he would not ransom **Mortimer**, **Mortimer, Mer**: 'sea' + **Mor** + ty: 'state' > Sea-Mor (cond.)

Forbade my **tongue** to **speak** of **Mortimer**, (E) **tongue**, (Fr) *langue*: 'language'

But I **will** find him when he **lies asleep**, (E) **will**, (L) *more* (E) **asleep**, (Fr) *endormi*

And in his **ear** I'll holla "**Mortimer**". (E) ear, *wp* heir; Oxford descends from Hotspur.

Nay, I'll have a **starling** shall be taught to **speak** (E) **starling**, *stare* > *wp* (Fr) *astre*, (L) *astrum*

Nothing but “**Mortimer**,” and give it him (E) **nothing**, (Fr) *néant*, *ne*: ‘neg. part. + (E) ant, maur—no maur
 To keep his anger **still** in **motion**. (E) **still**, (L) *immotus* (E) **motion**, (L) *motus*, *movere* (mo’er)
 (E) **lie**, (Fr) *reposer*, *rester*; *de meure* — *mensonger*

4 When given a choice between interpretations, it is a general precept to **emphasize the term that evokes the Writer’s name**, or the name of another factor in his story. The Writer repeats his themes in various form, so the names soon become familiar. Because there is only one direct heir of the Queen’s body—the Poet himself—the protagonist is usually Edward Tudor-Seymour. The Antagonist will be the Poet’s *alter-ego*, Edward ‘de Vere’, who is merely a creation of the Queen’s Privy Council and dooms the Rose-line of Tudor to extinction. ‘De Vere’ will slander the ~ Daimon of Origin / DE’S DAIMONa ~, the HERO of the ‘Tail’, or the ~ CŒUR DE LION ~. ‘De Vere’ stands as an impermanent place-holder for the Suffolk-Tudor cadets; they who nip at the heels of the Crown Tudors and emulate them are the ÆMILIA. Like Oxford’s wife, Anne Cecil, they may be dear and loving towards their Crown Tudor family (?), but in pursuing the family interests of their parents, they may opportunistically steal for the (Latin) *sudarium*: “the handkerchief”, “the handkerchief”, ... ~ *Pseud-OR-iums* ~, the ‘False’ or Suffolk-Tudors.

5 **The grammar usually remains, more or less, the same.** The basic grammar of Oxford’s verse is carried by Anglo-Saxon words. Double-entendre is more often revealed in words of Latin or French origin in which the Poet finds an extended semantic range, ripe for appropriation.

6 **Character names are linguistic developments of an historic person’s name.** The language spoken by characters may suggest the name of the historical person upon whom the character is based. If the subject discussed—if the situation in question—has a trade language common among its practitioners, Oxford will often engage them in their own proper jargon.

Reword! But ... the context is Succession.

“There is special providence in the fall of a sparrow.” (*Hamlet* V.2 198)

~ **There** [*wp* t’heir, ~ The Heir ~] is **special** [(L) *eximius*, *singularis*: ‘singular’, (L) *praecipuum*: ‘that which is received from an inheritance before the general distribution of property’ — ‘principal, peculiar’] **providence** [*wp* (Latin) *deorum providentia*; *pro*: ‘forward, towards’, + *videns*: ‘a seer, prophet’ > ~ Tu-de’Or prophecy ~] in the **fall** [(L) *incurrere*: ‘to fall foul of’ — [*in-curro*], I ‘to fall in with, attack, assail’, IIB ‘to run against, strike against’; (L) *cadere*: I ‘to be carried by one’s weight from a higher to a lower place’, IB2 ‘to fall in battle, die’ — (E) *degrade*: *wp* ~ de-Grey’ding ~; *wp* (L) *incanus*: ‘quite grey’ — (E) *cur*, (L) *canis*: ‘dog’, *wp* (L) *canus*: ‘grey, hoar’] of a **sparrow** [(L) *passer*; *wordplay* ~ a *spero* ~, (L) *spes*: ‘hope, expectation’, *spero*: ‘to hope’]. ~

~ **There is De’Or foreknowledge in the in-Cur’ence of a hope.** ~

~ **There is [Tudor] foresight in the de Grey’ding of an expectation.** ~

~ **T’heir is singular foresight in the de Greying of hope.** ~

➤ The ‘Fall of a Sparrow’ is a quaint metaphor, but wordplay on (Latin) *spero* clarifies the matter. While a sparrow may weigh only 1 ounce, the weight of hope is inestimable; so what seems a small matter can bear greatly on life. The loss of expectation, as a peculiar insight of divine providence — (Latin) *deorum providentia* — is a crushing thought in the general sense; but here it is particularized as a loss of Tudor accession for the natural Prince. Is it due to an **incurrence** with dogs of the House of Suffolk-Grey? They are the *canus/canids* — it’s a pun not etymologically related to (L) *currere*: ‘to run’? This is *noema*. We’ve got to work it out!

➤ Oxford’s words are woven and reinforced. As “report (‘Two’door’) speaks goldenly’ of him, the Poet is — *De’Or*, *deorum*. (AYLI I. 1 6). He is Y’OR-ICK, “a fellow of infinite jest.” (*Hamlet* V.1 172).

Remember, the readings of Oxford-Seymour are tentative; they are to be collected and further considered. Like the commentary of the Variorums, **they are open to further commentary.**

If you don't like my rewording, try your own — I insist! There's a catch. You must show your work; we want to see the linguistic connections. Each of us has limitations, so it's a group effort.

If you begin with the individual plays, you may not sense the meaning of the Preface.

Oxford's 'Shakespeare' may be **roman à clef**. We don't know this at first; however, it may be. The keys are hidden or carefully disguised; but if you begin at the beginning with prefatory materials, the reason will become apparent. **These keys are 'counsel'**; they tell us which character represents which historic person. We should not be looking afield, because the answers are close to home.

We read **Hamlet** not knowing that it is English History. Yet we keep the possibility in mind — it may be a record of the Artist's life. He speaks, not of Denmark, but the *Dano-Marci, Dani-Maricianus* — To'do-Maurs. We don't know for certain, but *Induction 2* to *Taming of the Shrew* says it's "Comonty" — (*Latin*) *comminiscor* > *commentum*: 'an invention, fiction'. Comments concerning the 'Common'/Ço'Mon > St Maurs, are "**a kind of history.**" (*Ind. 2* 138), "**Ay, Madam, it is common.**" (*Hamlet* 1.2 74).

There is a mistaken avenue of analysis that plagues the Oxfordian argument — that followed by Eva Turner Clark, who found historic parallels between the lives of various and numerous persons of the 16th century, and the stories and themes of 'Shakespeare'. This is 'red-herring' material. Whether Oxford intended to link their stories, we can only guess, but the rhetorical structure and counsel point to interest in offshoots of only one family group — the most prominent members of the Tudor-St Maurs and their Suffolk-Tudor antagonists. The Tudor-St Maurs are "**Fair, kind, and true.**" > (*Fr*) *faire, bienveillance, et vrai* > ~ To do(r), Good Will, and Vere ~ (see *Sonnet 105*); by contrast, the Suffolk-Grey Tudors are "Old Grey Dogs".

- Wordplay usually locates precisely the person intended: "You are a **fishmonger**" (*Hamlet* II.2 174), (*Latin*) *cetarius* ... It must be *se(cre)tarius* Wm. Cecil: fishmonger *par excellence*, and seller of Sea-Mon'sters) — POLONIUS is pointedly reminded of his service to the Crown; the Crown does not exist to serve POLONIUS. Inside jokes, seemingly lost to history, will be explained within local wordplay. When POLONIUS is heard behind the *Arras* (RRs), HAMLET wonders whether it is 'King' CLAUDIUS. It's an honest mistake, for who should be expected in the Queen's chamber?

Once More:

"O, know, **sweet Love**, I always write of you." (*Sonnet 76*)

~ O, recognize this, **Sui Amoris**, I always write of you. ~

~ O, know this, **Se'Amores**, I always write of you. ~