Oxford-Seymour Theory — **An Introduction**

The determination between traditional Oxfordian vs. Prince Tudor schemes was made for us by the preface writers Heminge & Condell (Ben Jonson?) in the First Folio printing of the Works of Shakespeare.

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 that confirms Oxford-Seymour Theory and Oxfordian Theory in one stroke? Are we to understand the near equivalency of Edward 'de Vere' and Edward Tudor-St Maur?

➤ Observe here: most words of Oxford's 'Shakespeare' are referenced to foreign languages. This means we should consider words not only as the English Dictionary defines them but also by the extended semantic range implied by synonymous terms in languages tributary to English. His plays set in Britain and France find extended meaning in French analogues of English. Plays set elsewhere —in Italy, Greece, Illyria, Denmark, Vienna—use Latin. As language becomes obscure, HORATIO, *(Latin) oratio:* 'speech', questions HAMLET: "**Is't not possible to understand in another tongue?**" *(Hamlet V. 2 110)* Yes, that is a critical element of his cipher — see: Oxford-Seymour.com .

A.   "To the great variety of readers"

~ **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'—*surname* de Vere] **of readers** [*(L) legens, wp (L) ille gens:* 'these gens', 'these well-known gens', ~ these families ~]. ~

~ To'ða-Maur (Vere-e'state) — these Gens ~

B.   "Do so, but first buy."

~ **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'], **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. ~

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 : Tudo(r)-Sumer. ~

~ Maur-d'Or, what name E.Ver is Tudor-St Maur. ~

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. ~

Here, in a few short phrases, is the Artist's name and his Method. It's dis**arm**ingly simple.

When a 'Shakespeare' play is produced on the stage, trained actors give their lines with highly polished vocal inflection and physical action to help convey meaning. It is no exaggeration to say: so much depends on presentation that without its aid a significant part of the Master's work would be unintelligible. Is it because the words are a little archaic, or because they are wittily complex?

Shakespeare's wit is a development of his method—**HAMLET's Method**—by which we, and the Prince's mother GERTRUDE < *Gutthiuda* ('Goth People'—*wordplay* Goth Tudor), are tested for our rhetorical skills. Like FALSTAFF, ~ *he is not only witty in himself, but the cause that wit is in other men' ~ ;* as for me, I'd like to have a little more of what he has. If we understand the scope of his "words, words, words", we may reword Oxford's text according to his brilliant 'Invention'. It's a secret process that's revealed only in bits and pieces of 'Counsel' in the Plays and Poems. By his Invention we find a thorough overhaul of Elizabethan History. At stake is the legitimacy of Oxford's birth, his parentage, and his place in the line of English Royal Succession. Had Queen Elizabeth been married? To what degree was her monarchic rule ceded to a *de facto* Regency of the Suffolk-Tudor Privy Council? Was the unsanctioned marriage of Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour and Elizabeth Tudor to be judged by Catholic or Protestant Canon Law? Catholics usually accepted clandestine marriages; Protestant reformers strongly rejected them. Dubious 'Vi-Curs' might rule: "Truly, she must be given, or the marriage is not lawful", and mar the sacred text (MARTEXT, *AYLI III. 3 66).* Were ~ *God's creatures to be nicknamed ~ (cognomen'd).* Were there to be:

HAMLET   … **no [Maur] marriages.** Those that are

married already—**all but one shall live**—the rest shall keep   "**all but one**" — Th. Seymour

as they are. To a **nunnery** go." *(Hamlet III. 1 145-49)*   **nunnery**, *(Latin) monachium—wp monarchy*

Without 'Maur' marriages, Thomas Seymour would die, and Elizabeth might accede to the throne.

Was William Cecil a loyal servant, or a sly fox … and a Welsh Fairy under the direction of Queen Mab? 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 at,

Yet is it true, sir." *(Cymbeline I. 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, 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* I. 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. 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**"? the state of being *(Fr) néant:* ~ **not Maur** ~ : 'Nothing'.

Much of the argument between Prince Tudor (PT) enthusiasts and Looney Oxfordians can be reconciled by shifting from the well-known PT 1 & 2 ideas, 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—the "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, Tout à l'heure…*

➤ *FRANCIS, (Fr) franc: Vere*, insists on correcting PRINCE HAL each time his name is called — it is not FRANCIS/*i.e.* Vere, but **Tudor**.

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

Neither Edward Oxenford nor Mary Browne-Wriothesley were in a position to admit their illicit sexual relationship. The Second Earl Southampton's suspicion of "one Donesame, a common (ço'Mmon : 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. As "The Epistle Dedicatorie" of Heminge & Condell makes clear, the masterpieces of Oxford are, in fact, mere "trifles", "trifles", "trifles"—*(L) Summaria*—St Maur'ia. 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 potential state separates HAMLET and LAERTES, Oxford is both "**th' occurrents, more and less**" … St Maur and Leices, *(Hamlet V. 2 340), wordplay ~ Au' couronne, Maur et Leices* ~ . 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.

      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 Wriothesley 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 idealogical 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*—contributes to his 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 reasons for writing obscurely, and therefore his meaning. 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 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 you do not *a'Mour* him, surely, *(Latin) nimirum:* '**no wonder**!' you are in some manifest danger—some 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 such readers we wish him.**"
 (Heminge & Condell, *First Folio*). I say, no matter who you are, you'll need their help.