

## Oxford's Spellings of "Halfpenny" Are as Diverse as Shake-Speare's

by Richard M. Waugaman, MD

In his deeply flawed 2003 book about Oxford, *Monstrous Adversary*, our friend and collaborator Alan H. Nelson uses various lines of specious attacks on Oxford in an unintentionally comical effort to discredit him. Among other slanders, he claims that Oxford's spelling was too flawed for him to have written the Shakespeare canon. For example, Nelson complains that "Oxford had no settled way of spelling many common words: thus he could spell 'halfpenny' at least eleven different ways" (63).

Nelson failed to compare Oxford's spellings with how Shake-speare spelled "halfpenny." A quick perusal of the First Folio (in the Norton facsimile) shows that Shake-speare uses the word eight times in the plays collected there (actually, seven times, but I'm adding an example from Quartos 1 and 2 of *Henry V*). And Shake-speare uses eight different spellings!

Here is a list:

Halfpeny	<i>Hamlet</i> II.2.282
Halfe pennie	<i>Love's Labours Lost</i> III.1.149
Halfpenny	<i>LLL</i> V.1.77
Halfe-penie	<i>LLL</i> V.2.563
Halfe-penny	<i>Merry Wives of Windsor</i> III.5.149
Hapence	<i>Henry V</i> III.2.47 [in QQ 1 and 2; not in FF] <i>As You Like It</i> III.2.372
Half pence	<i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> II.3.147
Halfpence	

I have long pondered Nelson's critique of Oxford's spellings. I thought of Nelson when I noticed that each of Oxford's marginal manicules (pointing hands) in his copy of the *Whole Book of Psalms* is distinctly different. In sharp contrast, William H. Sherman, in his 2009 *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*, writes that it was characteristic of Elizabethan readers to use a regular manicule that was as distinctive as their signatures. Instead, Oxford celebrates creative diversity, in his spellings as in his manicules.

Thank you, Professor Nelson, for continuing to build the case for Oxford's authorship of Shakespeare's works!



## A Clear Declaration in 1606 That Prince Tudor Existed

by Robert Prechter

*Albions England* was a twenty-year project recounting English history in verse, published in stages from 1586 to 1606 under the name William Warner. Chapter 107 of Book 16, the final chapter in the series, was published three years after the death of Elizabeth. In it, the writer fires a salvo indicating that Elizabeth Tudor had secretly had a child, and that it was a son.

Warner recounts that King Edward I got the Welsh to agree to his appointing as their prince someone who was "Borne in their Countrie, and could not one word in English say." After they agreed, he displayed to them his infant son (later Edward II), newly born in Wales. The Welsh held to their agreement, after which all English princes thereafter were denoted Prince of Wales. Warner concludes his narrative with this stunning bombshell:

Hence Englands Heires-apparent have of Wales bin Princes, till Our Queene deceast conceald her Heire, I wot not for what skill.

Warner thus reports that Queen Elizabeth had a male child who survived until at least 1603 ("her Heire") and would have been known as Prince of Wales had she not concealed the fact of his birth. Reasons why she would have "conceald her Heire" are clear: Elizabeth was not married, so the boy was a bastard and would have been an embarrassment, and besides, she had tremendous political capital in her status as the Virgin Queen. Warner took a risk in publishing these lines, but the Queen was three years gone, and as a historian he probably felt obligated to state the truth.

Warner's statement indicates that he knew of one male heir. This is not to say that Elizabeth had only one child; an earlier child could have been female; it could have died before Elizabeth became Queen; or she could have had a child Warner did not know about. But with respect to his statement, it seems that one should look for a male who was alive in 1603.

To my knowledge, no one else has noticed these lines. The reason must be that few people have the stamina to suffer the tedium of reading Books 13-16 of *Albions England*, whose author is different from the talented composer of the first twelve books. He is, however, an educated chronicler in possession of detailed knowledge of the history of England and, apparently, its Queen.

