

Edward de Vere's "hidden treasures": Lengthy Signatures/Authorizations, #9

by Michael Stepniewski, from web-site: devereshakespeare.wordpress.com

10/15/13

Coriolanus V.1 1-15 In which 'Seymour' is characterized as COMINIUS, and 'de Vere' as MENENIUS.

Those familiar with my essays on *Venus and Adonis* or of Shakespeare's plays, know that I believe de Vere employed metonymy in the manner of John Lyly. Both men—if they are not the same secretive writer—identified persons of Elizabeth's Court using 'substitute' names (the Queen herself called them 'nicknames'). These metonymic 'characters' identify a very select group of nobles and courtiers who are, most repetitiously and surreptitiously, the subject of his writings.

The following is an example of wordplay and metonymy from *Coriolanus*. It is developed by retracing from the essential admonition and theme of II.14-15: "Till he had forg'd himself a name o' the fire of burning Rome." More—de Vere's favored surname fragment—is clearly an anagram r-o-m-e.

This 'signature', and scores of others like it, ought to confirm the author of 'The Canon'; by his own hand, and by agreement with the historical record, he must be 'Edward the Bastard'.

Original

~ *Gloss* ~

MENENIUS

- 1 No, I'll not go. You hear what he hath said *hear: (L) auris, (wordplay) gold, ore (L) aureas*
~ *No, I'll not go. You 'Aur' what he hath 'Sey'd' ~*
- 2 Which was sometime his general, who loved him *general, race, stock, family, origin: (L) generalis, genus*
~ *[The matter] 'Witch' was Once his 'stock': who loved him ~*
- 3 In a most dear particular. He called me father. *dear: bearing a high price*
~ *In the cherished particle 'More'. He called me father. ~*
- 4 But what o' that? Go, you that banished him; *Go: (wordplay) 'to fare'; to pay O': (initial; name fragment) = Oxford*
~ *But what [Oxford] that [parentage]? Go, you that banished him; ~*
- 5 A mile before his tent fall down, and knee
~ *A thousand before his tent let fall, and crawl ~*
- 6 The way into his mercy. Nay, if he coyed *way, by-way: (L) deverticulum mercy: (wordplay) seamer, Seymour*
~ *The way into his 'mer-Sea'. Nay, if 'still'* *coy: 'still', (L) quietus; alt.: (L) vērēcundus: Latin 'ashamed'*
- 7 To hear Cominius speak, I'll keep at home. *comminus: Latin 'close at hand' keep, stay: moor*
~ *Tu [d]aur', closely 'Sey', I'll moor (at home).*

COMINIUS

- 8 He would not seem to know me.
~ *He would not 'Seym' to know me. ~*

MENENIUS

Do you 'hear'?

~ *Do you 'aur'?* ~

admonition: Dost thou attend?

COMINIUS

- 9 Yet one time he did call me by my name. *"Yet one time" = (wordplay) Still the same hour, Still Seymour*
~ *Yet 'Some' 'hour', he did call me by my name. ~*
- 10 I urged our old acquaintance, and the drops
~ *I urged 'our' old acquaintance, and the diminution ~*
- 11 That we have bled together. "Coriolanus"
~ *That we have blood-loss together. "Heart of the Ring" (Cor-io-I'anus)*
- 12 He would not answer too, forbade all names.
~ *He would not complete 'Tu', spoken before [Roy]al names.*
- 13 He was a kind of Nothing, Titleless,
~ *He was a 'child of Nothing', Titleless,*
- 14 Till he had forg'd himself a name o' th' fire. *till, to turn aside: (L) devertio o': out; alt.: [Oxford] fire: smelting furnace*
~ *DeVer'ted, he had fabricated himself a name out the furnace ~*
- 15 Of burning Rome.
~ *Of disintegrating 'More'. *anagram: Rome/More**

Caius Martius did not earn a second title for himself by burning Rome, but retained the name he had won from his victory at Corioles. That calls this imagined ‘history’ into question. If not Coriolanus, *who* forges his name from the conflagration of disintegrated R-o-m-e? Ah... the M-o-r-e—Edward Tudor-Seymour! ‘The One *with More*’—a latter day Henry V. Throughout the ‘Shakespeare’ canon the writer identifies himself as that ‘More’ to surpass the great *Une sans plus*: ‘*One* without More’ motto of Henry V.

The entire exchange between Menenius and Cominius is shot through with Tudor-Seymour/de Vere’s self-identifying metonyms and ‘surname fragments’; this existential focus obviates speculation that Caius Martius may represent Drake or Essex. The ‘supra-text’ surely concerns the writer himself.

Take this selection as a dialogue between the spirits of two noble kings-men—Tudor-Seymour and de Vere—who together can explain the divided soul of a unique *genus*... a sole survivor and a ‘tender heir’. We know him as Vere but he is ‘More’.

The key words and metonyms that frame *Coriolanus* V.1 1-15 have special meaning—again—throughout ‘Shakespeare’. These are part of a distinctive glossary and metonymy that *is* de Vere’s signature. To distinguish the art of de Vere it is essential to learn the all important metonyms; these provide the ‘proper’ context so that ‘correct’ semantical and grammatical choices can be realized. This ‘proper’ context becomes the ‘supra-context’—the writers subject above the apparent.

Also note ‘reader’s advisories’, or ‘consilia’ see *Rom&Jul. Chorus + I.I 1-30*; de Vere uses these to ‘highlight’ certain passages or particular literary elements. For more information on de Vere’s method, visit my website: devereshakespeare.wordpress.com

Notes: Each word is examined for possible wordplay. He is a Latinist—a Latin dictionary is essential.

- 1 **said**: homonym, say’d, ‘surname fragments’ Sey’d + Aur: heraldry, ‘surname frag.’ ore, gold; i.e. Sey-dor, Cedar, Seymour-Tudor.
hear: Latin wordplay *auris*: to hear; *aureas*: gold, ore; also to hear, to heir.
- 2 **which**: metonym, Old English *hwilc*: who + the same, alike, i.e. ‘who [is] The Same’; equality with the crown, consort.
sometime: ‘once*’; ‘formerly*’; wordplay Some/Seym + hour = Some-hour (with reference to attainder).
general: ‘belonging to a kind’; ‘race, origin’; ‘surname frag.’ [Wood]stock.
- 3 **most**: wordplay greatest more.
dear: ‘beloved, cherished*’; ‘bearing a high price*’; ‘precious, valuable*’; ‘inmost, vital’.
particular: single (special), metonym ‘One’, ‘first in rank*’, ‘first in an hierarchy*’.
- 4 **o’** (example Versutiloquus: a ‘sly jest’): ‘Q[xford]’; jest on non-parentage of John de Vere, 16th Earl Oxford.
banish: ‘to drive away*’, remove; i.e. the identity of de Vere banishes Seymour.
- 5 **mile**: Latin mille, thousand; one-thousand.
knee: ‘genuflection, prostration*’; ‘to go on knees*’.
- 6 **mercy**: favor, heavenly reward; wordplay, ‘surname frag.’ (L) *mer[us]*: ‘pure, unmixed’ + (L) *se*: reflexive proper ‘himself’.
- 7 **coyed**: ‘quiet, reserved’; wordplay still Ed./quiet Ed. [Seymour]
- 8 **seem**: ‘surname fragment’ Seym.
hear: ‘surname frag.’; wordplay *aur*: [Tud]or, ore, gold; *aureas*: golden; wordplay *aura*: air, breath, echo, heaven.
- 9 **yet**: ‘now, by this time*’; ‘still*’; ‘after all*’; ‘nevertheless*’; = may be specific to Seymour identity.
one: ‘a unity’; ‘some particular person’; ‘the first in a hierarchy’.
time: ‘a space or point of duration*’
- 10 **our**: ‘surname frag.’; wordplay Seym[our]; “our old acquaintance” = ‘Ore’ former mutual knowledge.
acquaintance: ME ‘mutual knowledge’; fellowship.
drops: ‘make or become lower, weaker, or less’.
- 11 **bled**: loss or reduction of ‘family background, descent or lineage’.
Coriolanus: (probably incidental meaning) *Cor*: ‘heart’ + *io*: exclamation of pain (Oh!) + *I*: definite article + *anus*: ‘ring’.
- 12 **too**: ‘surname frag.’ Tu[dor]
forbade, forbid - for: ‘before’; alt.: ‘say, speak’ + bid: ‘offer, tender’
all: metonym [Roi,Roy]al; core metonym indicating the Royal family.
- 13 **kind**: ‘generic class, race*’, family, child; alt.: ‘not degenerate and corrupt; as a thing or person ought to be*’.
nothing: Latin *nihil*: nothing; *nulla res*: nothing object, nothing matter; *filius nullius*: no one, bastard.
titleless: ‘having no name*’; having no official claim.
- 14 **till**: Latin *deverti*: ‘to turn aside’.
forged: Latin *fabricare*: ‘to manufacture an object’.
fire: ‘conflagration*’, destruction, disintegration.
- 15 **burning**: ‘to consume with fire*’; ‘to be spoiled, or consumed by fire*’.
Rome: anagram, ‘surname frag.’ More, M-o-r-e; see Ant.&Cleo. I.I 33 “Let Rome in [Tevere] melt...”

It will indicate one of many recurring themes; they are so specific and personal—in fact, so biographical—that they alone should identify the writer.

Several prominent Oxfordians have hamstrung ‘the movement’ by eschewing interpretation. The ‘reading’ of tea leaves and tarot *should* be avoided; *knowledge*, however, would be nowhere without it. Could the sciences: Paleontology, Anthropology, Linguistics, Biology, Theoretical Physics... survive the loss of interpretation?

The fear of interpretation is partly a fear of imprecise metaphor; but ‘*whoever understood Shakespeare, understood him not by interpretation?*’ Can we say his meaning is self-evident? At times he is given to the profoundest aphorisms—yes, he can be precise; but more often the words are as obscure as they are beautiful.

How do we reconcile such divergence of style? Isn’t figurative language at odds with precision? Why should de Vere need this ‘change of bearing’ (*metaphor*); why deviate from orthographic language when his purpose was so plain? What would be the use of figurative meaning to this ‘particular’ man—if we have identified ‘de Vere’ rightly—who is apparently at the eye of the Tudor political and religious Tempest. If ever Man had reason to speak clearly, or employ concise rhetoric for the common weal, it is ‘Our’ man; the *ancien régime* was literally disintegrating around him.

Under an apparently submissive Elizabeth R, the contending powers represented by Dudley and Cecil (obliquely termed by de Vere: the “Region Cloud”, i.e. Regency) could have used a strong, moderating hand. With the example before him of Henry VIII’s extramarital son Henry FitzRoy 1519-36, Duke of Richmond and Somerset, it is no wonder that a Tudor-Seymour/de Vere’ child harbored hopes of accession.

It should be our business to consider how and where de Vere used metaphor—or even to discover he chose not to use it. Indeed, if ‘*the man we call Edward de Vere*’ is the writer, we will be alert to new or unexpected literary elements better able to communicate concise meaning. Because he was manifestly proud of his literary ‘invention’, it shouldn’t surprise us to find he had developed means other than metaphor to express himself... else, where *is* the ‘invention’; and because we believe ‘Shakespeare’ to be a pseudonym, it shouldn’t surprise us if the works contain politically dangerous information.

Caius Martius is a character struggling to discover his name is one such advisory; it’s de Vere to a ‘T’[ittle].

there are that; He fairly dares us to be More like “See-ly jeering idiots R[egius]” *Lucrece* l.1812-15 that you may realize “deep policy” disguised in “sportive words” and the utterance of “foolish things”... perhaps it’s not such a “shallow habit” after all.

I appreciate that some, or all, of my reading may be in error—‘more’ the fool I.