

## Edward de Vere: Translator of Johan Sturm's *A Ritche Storehouse or Treasure for Nobilitie and Gentlemen*?<sup>1</sup>

Richard M. Waugaman, M.D.

 Edward de Vere hid his authorship behind such pen names as William Shakespeare; Ignoto; Anomos; and E.K. Did he simply sponsor the publication of Bedingfield's translation into Latin of *Cardanus Comfort*, or did de Vere write the translation himself? We do not know yet. We do have evidence from the secretary of the Earl of Essex that Essex asked Fulke Greville to allow him to sign a document written by Essex as "F.G."<sup>2</sup> Essex's motives included a wish not to appear too self-congratulatory in this, well, self-congratulatory account of his role in the 1596 battle of Cadiz. So here is valuable evidence of another earl using a veiled allonym.

The 1570 English translation of Johann Sturm's Latin *A Ritche Storehouse or Treasure for Nobilitye and Gentlemen* is a small, octavo edition of merely 96 pages. This was one of Sturm's few Latin works to be translated into the vernacular during the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The title page names the translator as "T.B.," and its dedicatory epistle is signed "Thomas Browne." But I will present multiple lines of evidence suggesting that Edward de Vere was its actual translator.

Colin Burrow, in his survey of Shakespeare's relationship with the Latin classics, speculates that this very book by Sturm "is just the kind of aspirational work which Shakespeare might have *read*" (26; emphasis added).<sup>3</sup> He surmises that "Shakespeare may have known *A Rich Storehouse* as early as the mid 1590s, since T.W. Baldwin notes an 'amusing parallel' between Holofernes' use of the word 'peregrinate' to describe an imported word and Sturm's treatise." Burrow adds that Donna B. Hamilton discusses the relationship of *The Tempest* with the same treatise (250 n. 8).

Elsewhere, Burrow writes,

A tiny clue in the text of *Troilus* may also indicate that Shakespeare had recently read and thought afresh about the theory and practice of literary imitation. Hector makes a famously anachronistic comment that his brothers have spoken like “young men, who Aristotle thought/Unfit to hear moral philosophy” (2.2.166-7). Aristotle (4<sup>th</sup> century BC) could not have been read by a Homeric hero who was fighting at Troy during the Bronze Age....Shakespeare’s error could have come from a number of sources, but one possibility is Johann Sturm’s *Nobilitas Literata* (1549), which was translated into English in 1570 as *A Rich Storehouse or Treasure for Nobilitye and Gentlemen*. This includes an extended discussion of how one author should imitate another, in the course of which Sturm declares that imitation is not a childish activity, but is indeed suitable only for grown-ups: “as Aristotle did exclude young boys from his *Ethics*: so I also remove from this artificial practice [of imitation] not only children and boys, but also those men which know not the precepts of rhetoric.” That embeds Aristotle’s remark in a rhetorical setting that fits the formal *disputatio* between Hector and Troilus in 2.2. Sturm was an unusually enthusiastic advocate of a kind of imitation that has been called “dissimulative,” in which “an imitator must hide all similitude and likeness.” (608)<sup>4</sup>

Translating Sturm may have provided de Vere with further encouragement for continuing his “dissimulative” practice of hiding his authorship of most of his literary works.

We do know something of de Vere’s relationship with Johann Sturm (1507-1589). De Vere thought so highly of him that he went out of his way to visit him in Strasbourg during his 14-month trip to the Continent in 1575-76 (that is, some five years after the translation was published). De Vere and Sturm were part of a network of eminent intellectuals in England and on the Continent. Sturm’s friends included John Calvin, Andreas Vesalius, and Guillaume Budé. His former student Petrus Ramus became a renowned logician. Queen Elizabeth’s tutor Roger Ascham was so friendly with Sturm that he named a son Johannes Sturm Ascham, and he corresponded with Sturm for 18 years. The Queen herself also greatly admired Sturm’s work. A 1590 edition of poems in Sturm’s honor was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth.

Sturm wrote to Roger Ascham in 1551, praising the learning of some English noblemen. Spitz and Tinsley report that Ascham “was a devoted disciple of Sturm’s educational and humanist writings.”<sup>5</sup> Anderson notes that one of de Vere’s servants said he “had a most high opinion” of Sturm. Sturm staunchly defended the French Protestants, harming himself financially through large loans to their cause. He was a liberal, tolerant humanist, whose efforts to build bridges among the Lutherans and Calvinists eventually led to his losing his academic position. He devoted much of his

life and many of his writings to education. We might recall that Edward de Vere's grandfather founded a grammar school at Earls Colne in Essex, and that de Vere served as guardian of that school, appointing its schoolmaster.<sup>6</sup>

This article will present evidence that the 20-year-old de Vere admired Sturm's 1549 treatise on rhetoric so much that he translated it from Latin to English, hiding his role behind that of "T.B.," ostensibly Thomas Browne.<sup>7</sup> What do we know of Thomas Browne? There is no consensus as to his identity. We have not a single other work that he published. The brief *ODNB* article on him, by L.G. Kelly, has virtually no sources of information about him other than this 1570 translation. The article begins, "Brown, Thomas (*fl.* 1570), translator, was a member of Lincoln's Inn. He was either the Thomas Brown admitted on 13 October 1562, or Thomas Brown of London, admitted on 6 August 1565. The second of these could have been 'Thomas Browne of London', admitted to the Inner Temple in November 1575. He was not one of the myriad Thomas Browns in the university lists." I am skeptical of these inferences, given Marcy North's important work on the prominent role of anonymous Elizabethan authorship. Scholars who write articles about obscure Elizabethan authors for the *ODNB* need to consider the possibility that some of these authorial names are pseudonyms (or alioyms).

The 1570 translation is dedicated to the 13-year-old Philip Howard (1557-1595), who then had the honorable title of Earl of Surrey. Under the circumstances, dedicating a work to the son of Thomas Howard in 1570 was a bold act, possibly hinting at disloyalty to the Queen. The more reckless the act, the greater the likelihood that de Vere was its perpetrator. Philip Howard's father, Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk (1538-1572), was de Vere's first cousin, descended from their grandfather, the 15<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford, through Howard's mother, Frances de Vere. Lord Howard fell under suspicion of treason when he pursued possible marriage with Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. This placed him in a faction that was directly opposed to de Vere's guardian and future father-in-law, William Cecil. Howard was placed in the Tower from October, 1569 to August, 1570, then under house arrest in Howard House, London. He was finally executed for treason in June, 1572. Philip Howard himself was to spend the last ten years of his own life in the Tower, also for treason.

How important was rhetoric to de Vere? It was central to his vision of writing, whether in his private letters; in his prose works (most notably, I believe, in *The Arte of English Poesie*)<sup>8</sup>; in his poetry; and in his plays. Quentin Skinner's *Forensic Shakespeare*<sup>9</sup> shows that "over and over again, Shakespeare's characters follow to the letter the instructions of the rhetorical handbooks....The hidden pattern within the plays, their close dependence on the ancient art of rhetoric, was perhaps intended for his eyes only" (from review by David Wootton, *TLS*, December 12, 2014, pp. 3-5). In my review of Skinner's book,<sup>10</sup> I wrote,

One of the many reasons that I find Skinner's book so fascinating is that it dovetails with the likelihood that de Vere wrote the 1589 *Arte of English Poesie*. As Skinner points out, its third part deals extensively with rhetoric, especially figures of speech. By the

way, Angel Day's 1586 *The English Secreterie*, dedicated to de Vere, included marginal glosses highlighting rhetorical figures.<sup>11</sup> It is noteworthy that Day uses the word "coined" in the sense that de Vere seems to have coined it in 1570:<sup>12</sup> "Such odd coyned tearmes," referring to an example of a "preposterous and confused kind of writing." (39). Further, in 1592 Day seems to have been the second author, after de Vere in the *Arte*, to use the term "hendiadys" in English. In his 1592 edition, Day included a new section on rhetorical figures.

The hypothesis that de Vere wrote *The Arte of English Poesie* gains support from the connections between Quintilian and the Shakespeare canon, because the *Arte* twice mentions Quintilian by name. Recall that the *Arte* is only the sixth book in EEBO to cite Quintilian. In the second chapter of Book 3, its author recommends the use of figures of speech. In that context, he says "I have come to the Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon, & found him sitting in his gallery alone with the works of Quintilian before him, in deede he was a most eloquent man, and of rare learning and wisdom, as ever I knew England to breed" (224).<sup>13</sup> And, in chapter 9 of Book 3, the author says that "the learned orators and good grammarians among the Romans, as Cicero, Varro, Quintilian, and others, strained themselves to give the Greek words [for figures of speech] Latin names" (241). Further, according to editors Whigham and Rebhorn, the *Arte* uses some 70 of Quintilian's terms for figures of speech.

Skinner convincingly demonstrates that Shake-speare had a deep interest in and familiarity with rhetoric, even though past scholars overlooked his acquaintance with any books on that subject. Skinner shows that Shake-speare quotes from Cicero's rhetorical work *De inventione*; from *Rhetorica ad Herennium*; and that he cites Thomas Wilson's 1554 *Arte of Rhetorique*. Notably, Wilson received help with an earlier book from Sir Thomas Smith, Edward de Vere's later tutor. Skinner shows that past discussions of Shake-speare's rhetoric misleadingly place central emphasis on *elocutio* (including wordplay), whereas Shake-speare's real interest was primarily in *inventio*. The 1570 book's epistle to the reader states the "wish that the vulgar speech of commending might be kept until some worthy matters were *invented*..." (emphasis added).

Why has de Vere's central interest in rhetoric been downplayed in the past? Perhaps because of the misleading implications of the traditional authorship theory, that portray Shake-speare as a relatively unschooled, native genius. Even Oxfordians have not escaped from the influence of this misconception, perhaps making us loath to think of de Vere showing an intense interest in the rhetorical skills that underlay his works of literary genius. The image of an unschooled Shake-speare clashes with Skinner's description of Shake-speare working with treatises of rhetoric at the forefront of his mind, and possibly open on his desk. He contends that Shake-speare even draws attention to the role of artifice in his art.

If we accept Skinner's revised picture of Shake-speare—and I believe we should—it makes it all the more likely that Shake-speare is the author of the

anonymous 1589 *Arte of English Poesie*, and of the 1570 translation of Sturm. Among the many ways that the Sturm translation influenced de Vere's later *Arte* is the fact that Sturm wrote his treatise to the Werter brothers in the second person, just as the anonymous author of the *Arte* addressed much of it to Queen Elizabeth in the second person. Both works emphasize that words can be misused to deceive. Both works use unusual drawings to schematize different structures in poetry.

David Wootton, in his review of Skinner, concludes that Shakespeare follows the rules of rhetoric "precisely because he was aware that that art could not deliver the proof that [courtroom] decisions of life and death required. There is something wrong with the rules themselves....Shakespeare's courtroom scenes show an author not enamoured of rhetoric, but frustrated by it" (5). Yet the recognition that rhetoric could be used to deceive is central to Sturm, as it is to the *Arte*. In the translator's epistle to the reader, he speaks disparagingly of "painted wordes and smooth Rhetoricke," in contrast with "good and precious" matter. So we might instead say that Shakespeare's courtroom scenes demonstrate just how deeply familiar with rhetoric he was, not that he idealized it as a foolproof way of ascertaining the truth. After all, the ancient stoics were controversial because they trained their students to win arguments, whether or not the truth was on their side.

Skinner emphasized that Shakespeare's primary interest in rhetoric is *inventio*. Coining new words is one well-known Shakespearean instance of *inventio*. *A Ritche Storehouse* coined, in fact, "to *coin* a word" in its introductory section, "To the friendly reader": "I of necessitie must either *coyne* newe wordes, the auncient already being employed on lewde and peradventure wicked matters..." (1; emphasis added). Note the translator's justification for coining this use of the verb "to coin," and other words, as something he is compelled to do. This is 19 years before the first example of the verb "coin" in this sense given in the OED. For our purposes, it is significant that this later 1589 use is in an anonymous work I have previously attributed to de Vere, the *Arte of English Poesie*.

"Unfyled" is here newly coined in the dedicatory letter in the sense of "unpolished, rude." The OED erroneously states that Spenser coined that meaning of "unfiled" in his 1590 *Faerie Queene*. But it actually appeared 20 years earlier. The creative energy brimming in this 1570 work embodies the author's desire to make the English language suitable for great literature. He is saying, as it were, "anything Greek and Latin can do, English can do better!"

There are at least twelve other newly coined words in the short *A Ritche Storehouse*. The author introduces the coinage "concauses" [co-operating causes] by adding "or joined causes." "Sensentence" looks like a misprint, but it may have been de Vere's attempt to English the Latin "sententia," meaning opinion or maxim. "Sensentence" actually appears three more times in EEBO, though it failed to make the cut for the OED. "Turquif[y]ing" is a coined word that flopped, never to be used again. It meant "transforming"; as early as 1560, "turkish" could be a verb meaning "to transform." Transformation of ancient texts into new works that imitate them in a disguised way was central to the humanist literary project.

Another coinage that never got off the ground was “captaynecke.” It is a quirky translation of “virumque” in the opening words of the *Aeneid*. The translator is here enacting the advice he gave two sentences earlier, that literary imitation should create in place of the original “a thing eyther as good or better” (40r). So he experimented with an English equivalent (“ecke,” or “eke”) for the Latin suffix “-que,” both meaning “also.” Virgil famously wrote “Arma virumque cano”; de Vere translates this, “of armes, and of a captaynecke I doe indite [meaning to write, to compose a tale]” (39v). “Peregrinity,” borrowed from Latin and from Rabelais, means “foreignness.” The translator indicates he is coining a word when he writes, “a certayne peregrinitie, if I may so terme it” (35r; emphasis added). The OED erroneously gives its first use as by G. Fletcher, in 1591. De Vere’s younger sister Mary married Peregrine Bertie (1555-1601) in 1578. He lived in William Cecil’s home as a teenager, so it is possible that de Vere had him in mind when he coined “peregrinity,” especially because Bertie was named as an allusion to his Protestant parents’ years spent living on the Continent during the reign of Queen Mary.

EEBO<sup>14</sup> gives *Ritch Storehouse* as the first use of “patavine” (“related to Padua”). “Counterchaunge” is also first used as the English word for the Greek rhetorical term “antimetabole” in this work. Its first use in EEBO is just three years earlier, in 1567, in the generic sense of “exchange of one thing for another.” The OED incorrectly gives its first use as a term of rhetoric in the *Arte*. Naturally, it is significant that this translation of antimetabole appears in both the 1570 as well as the 1589 works that I attribute to de Vere.

Both EEBO and the OED give the 1585 T. Washington translation of a French book as the first instance of “defiguration,” but it was apparently coined fifteen years earlier, in *A Ritch Storehouse*. Spitz and Tinsley translate a passage as “sketches... let our drawings be called...schematisms” (150). De Vere translates it as “figurative draughts, or if I might so terme them, *defigurations*” (24r; emphasis added). De Vere also introduced the word “aposchematisms” into the English language, transliterating the Greek word used by Sturm. This coinage did not catch on — it is the only instance of it in EEBO. “Schematism,” but *not* “aposchematism,” is in the OED. “Whuzzing [wind]” is the first of only two uses of “whuzzing” in EEBO; “whuzz” appears in the OED as a spelling variant of “whiz.”

*A Ritch Storehouse* also coined new phrases, not just new words. For example, “envious emulation” is the first of 31 uses of this phrase in EEBO. A prominent Elizabethan meaning of “envious” was “malicious” in general. So the phrase plays on emulation as not only a desire to equal another, but also rivalry, and a dislike of those who are superior.

One theme in *A Ritch Storehouse* is secrecy and disguise. G.W. Pigman observes, “Of all the theorists of imitation Sturm is the most insistent on dissimulation” (11)<sup>15</sup> The word “hidden” occurs six times in this work; “hide” four times; “hider” once; “hyding” once; “secret” four times; “cover” in the sense of “conceal” four times; “covertly” once. Most of these words are in contexts that allude to the need to imitate the style of a great writer, while concealing this imitation—

We must...follow these waies and rules that I have shewed: that nothing be done or placed without a cause: and *yet after such maner, that the common sorte may not perceive it.* For as it is to be wished that our speeche maye please all men, and as we ought speciallye to indevor to obtayne the same: so also we must take great heede, that Arte, and Imitation, and the similitude and likeness *be not espied.*

(46r-v; emphasis added)

Court insiders knew of de Vere's literary activities, while "the common sort" were probably taken in by his use of anonymity, pseudonymity, and allonymity. Significantly, Sturm includes the Greek word κερυμμενον, or "hidden." De Vere uses a triple repetition to emphasize the importance of this word for him, translating it as, "that is as much as hidden, close, or secret" (35v). If I am correct in concluding that de Vere disguised his translation of this work, all these passages would have spoken to his early — as well as to his lifelong — authorial self-concealment. So this may be one of Sturm's more profound influences on de Vere's career.

As I have noted, this translation anticipates the anonymous 1589 *Arte of English Poesie*, which I consider to be de Vere's own extensive treatise on rhetoric. The word "figure" appears 10 times in *Ritch Storehouse*, and 87 times in the *Arte*, reflecting de Vere's close study of rhetorical figures. Sturm says of figuration, "the varietie of these bringeth delight & taketh away sasiety" (38r). "Sasiety" is the spelling here of "satiety." The former spelling occurs only one other time in EEBO, in 1579.

In the first three paragraphs of this work, "wit" is spelled three different ways: "wytte," "witte," and "wyt." Alan Nelson, a paleographer, has emphasized de Vere's pattern of spelling one word multiple ways, more than did his contemporaries. "Hand D" in the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* is said to be that of Shakespeare. Hand D spells silence "scilens." De Vere similarly includes an "sc" in his spelling of "necesassarye" (sic).<sup>16</sup> *Ritch Storehouse* also misspells "unnecessary" as "unnessarie." Further, EEBO has no other instances of its quirky phrase "easiest and necessariest." It includes the word "apploying" for "applying"; this is the unique occurrence of the former spelling in EEBO.<sup>17</sup> The work includes "cowpling" for "coupling," "howres"<sup>18</sup> for "hours," and "pawse" for "pause."<sup>19</sup> De Vere usually preferred "owt" to "out" and "fowre" to "foure" in his letters, at a time when the former spellings had become unusual. It is helpful to recall that "w" stood for and was at the time sometimes printed with a double "v," and "v" and "u" were somewhat interchangeable. De Vere often doubled vowels at a time when most spelling had dropped one of them ("adoo" for "ado," etc.).

### **Hendiadys in A *Ritch Storehouse***

We know that de Vere favored the Virgilian rhetorical figure of hendiadys ("one through two"), or two related words connected by a conjunction (usually "and"). The figure was never described by classical authors, but was first described

by Susenbrotus, in 1562. The 1589 *Arte of English Poesie* states, “Ye have yet another manner of speech when ye will seem to make two of one not thereunto constrained, which we therefor call the Figure of Twins, the Greeks *hendiadys*” (261). The 1592 edition of Angel Day’s *The English Secreterie*, dedicated to de Vere, defines “hendiadis” as follows:

when one thing of it selfe intire, is diversly laid open, as to say *On Iron and bit he champt*, for on the Iron bit he champt: And *part and proye* [prey] *we got*, for part of the proye: Also *by surge and sea we past*, for by surging sea wee past. This also is rather Poeticall then otherwise in use (89; Day’s emphasis).

It would be fitting if de Vere was the first English author to describe hendiadys, and also the one who most employed it. Likening it to twins reminds us that Shakespeare’s source for *The Comedy of Errors* included just one pair of twins, which de Vere doubled to two pairs of identical twins in his version of the play. A twin brother and a sister appear in *Twelfth Night*. The word “two” appears 574 times in Shakespeare;<sup>20</sup> “double” appears 82 times; “pair,” 41 times; “twain” (two) 39 times. The basic metrical unit of de Vere’s poetry was the two-syllable iamb, another instance of doubling. The Greek etymology of “hendiadys” as “one through two” is reflected in de Vere’s poetry about love. Sonnet 36 begins, “Let me confess that we two must be twain [“two,” or “a couple,” but also “asunder, separate, estranged”],/ Although our undivided loves are one.” “Let the bird of loudest lay,” probably written about Queen Elizabeth’s love for the Earl of Essex, after their deaths, includes the stanza, “So they lov’d, as love in twain/ Had the essence but in one;/ Two distincts, division none:/ Number<sup>21</sup> there in love was slain.”

De Vere learned languages such as ancient Greek and Anglo-Saxon that still retained the “dual number” of nouns and verbs, that existed in proto-Indo-European. There are traces of this old form in modern words such as “both,” “either,” and phrases such as “you two.” The two words in the dual number were related, which may have provided another source of de Vere’s interest in hendiadys.<sup>22</sup>

Hendiadys may also reflect de Vere’s pivotal image of mirrors and mirroring.<sup>23</sup> Hamlet was speaking of the entirety of de Vere’s literary work when he said the purpose of art is to hold a mirror up to nature. Early modern mirrors did not reflect the exact likeness of today’s mirror; in that sense, one word in hendiadys roughly — but not precisely — mirrors its twin. In addition, a foundational, implicit word pair for Renaissance humanists such as Sturm and de Vere was “now and then” — that is, the fundamental fact that the present can be informed and enriched by a deeper understanding of the classical past and its literature. Like other humanists, de Vere deliberately avoided simple imitation of classical models. Renaissance humanists consistently transformed<sup>24</sup> these classical models into their own creations. Their sense of time differed from that of their medieval predecessors, who felt they were essentially living in the same historical era as the ancient Romans and Greeks.

George T. Wright helped draw attention to the fact that Shakespeare used this figure of hendiadys more than 300 times.<sup>25</sup> Examples that have entered common

use include “sound and fury,” “slings and arrows,” and “lean and hungry.” Wright excludes from his use of the term what he derisively calls Shakespeare’s “ceremonious parading of synonyms,” that is, two closely related words, “without any significant increment, usually for an effect of expansion or elevation” (174). If we follow Wright in his derogation of insufficiently complex word pairs, we will deprive ourselves of taking the full measure of de Vere’s lifelong fascination with word pairs, and the growth and development that his use of them underwent in his writing career. They tell us something important about his mind and spirit. One thing reminded him of another, and he linked them with a conjunction. One word alone often did not suffice, and in pairing it with a second, he drew a line that gestured toward meanings and connotations that went beyond mere words.

Wright does observe that, from the beginning, paired words are used “to give a feeling of elevation or complexity” (173), a description that is apt for *Ritch Storehouse*. What Wright considers true hendiadys, in its best examples, “make[s] us feel...that some structural situation we had become ready for...has jumped and become a different structural situation...” (175). One is reminded of the many jolting syntactical pivots in the *Sonnets*. In the present article, I do not presume to ascertain and judge what is an acceptable “figure of twins,” and what is a “mere parading of synonyms.” I believe we can better study and appreciate the development of de Vere’s use of hendiadys by casting a wider net than does Wright. Doing so also allows us to see just how many word pairs de Vere coined and invented in this early work. Later writers paid tribute to many of them by borrowing them, in some cases dozens of times.

Wright observes that “Shakespeare’s examples are dazzlingly various; the *developing* playwright appears to have taken this odd figure to his bosom and to have made it entirely his own” (169; emphasis added). We have a misleadingly limited picture and understanding of Shakespeare’s development if we remain unaware of his earlier work, that has not previously been attributed to the same author.

Wright finds that Shakespeare’s hendiadys “is always somewhat mysterious and elusive” (176). Wright speculates that “It may at times betoken [Shakespeare’s] teeming mind” (173). At other times, he senses that it suggests “an oddly empty, discordant, and disconnected feeling...normal unions are disassembled” (175). Hendiadys “serves to remind us how uncertain and treacherous language...can be” (176) as it expresses “deceptive linking” (178). Wright is brilliant in perceiving the way de Vere increasingly used hendiadys to construct the extreme and enigmatic complexity of his writing—“hendiadys, far from explaining mysteries, establishes them...hendiadys resists logical analysis” (169), and it serves “at once to deny and to extend the adequacy of linguistic forms to convey our experience” (183). As Wright notes, the usual conjunction in hendiadys is “and,” but in de Vere’s use, it thwarts our expectation that we will be given a clear parallelism, which is “among our major instruments for ordering the world we live in” (169). Wright says Shakespeare’s hendiadys can be “estranging” (173), and that it “usually elevates the discourse and blurs its logical lines, and this combination of grandeur and confusion is in keeping

with the tragic or weighty action of the major plays” (171); “hendiadys is often characterized...by a kind of syntactical complexity that seems fathomable only by an intuitional understanding of the way words interweave their meanings” (171).

The psychoanalyst James Grotstein offered a startlingly similar observation about the way his own analyst Wilfred Bion made interpretations to him: he decided they were deliberately obscure, the better to evade his defenses, and thus speak directly to Grotstein’s unconscious mind. So, here is another example of de Vere anticipating the discoveries of psychoanalysis by four centuries. Further, we might compare the verbal doubling of hendiadys with our binocular vision, which allows us to perceive the three-dimensional world in greater depth; so does hendiadys help us penetrate beneath the surface of language and its meanings, while our conscious mind is mesmerized by the shimmering tensions between the paired words. Cognitive psychology has expanded our understanding of memory, by distinguishing between two major memory systems—implicit and explicit. They are served by different neuroanatomical structures. At one level, language activates the explicit, more conscious memory system. But good creative writers use words to evoke our less conscious and less verbal feelings, linked with implicit memory. De Vere was a master of this use of complex language to appeal to both parts of our minds. Hendiadys assisted him in doing so.

One of the several categories of hendiadys is the use of the second word to amplify the first. *Amplificatio* is a central rhetorical device, enacted in miniature form in hendiadys. The Psalms characteristically use repetition for intensification. They profoundly influenced de Vere, and probably contributed to his use of hendiadys for amplification and intensification. In addition, Wright discovers that Shakespeare sometimes uses the device for “an interweaving, indeed sometimes a muddling, of meanings, a deliberate violation of clear sense that is in perfect keeping with Shakespeare’s exploration...of ‘things supernatural and causeless’” (173).

One thinks of Richard II’s extraordinary prison soliloquy, when he wonders how he can possibly compare his prison cell to the wide world, alone as he is. He famously concludes that “My brain I’ll prove the female to my soul,/ My soul the father; and *these two* beget/ A generation of still breeding thoughts,/ And these same thoughts people this little world” (V.v.6-9; emphasis added). Four lines later, he says that the “better sort” of thoughts “do set the word itself/ Against the word” (V.v.13-14). Literally, the sometimes seemingly contradictory words of the Bible. More broadly, though, the generative potential of “word against word” reminds us of de Vere’s continual use of the figure of hendiadys, throughout some forty years of his literary career.<sup>26</sup> This generative genius of hendiadys forms close connections with the mind, and brain, of the reader and audience of de Vere’s work, so that we ourselves become the “female” to de Vere’s soul. It is known, for example, that listening to Shakespeare’s poetry activates more parts of the brain than does listening to other poets. An ambiguous stimulus, whether a visual inkblot or its verbal equivalent, is most effective in drawing out the unconscious contents of our own mind, which we project onto that uncertain prompt. De Vere is ever elusive and complex, and he seduces us into a collaborative partnership with his language, as we “hammer out” how we will

people our minds with the still-breeding thoughts that de Vere engenders in us.

Wright is disappointed that Shakespeare scholars have shown so little interest in Shakespeare's style, especially "those stylistic devices that make for elusiveness...Hendiadys is too confusing, too disorderly...Critics...often take little interest in the figurative devices that seem merely decorative" (172). If these critics realized that "Shakespeare" also wrote the *Arte of English Poesie*, and translated *A Ritche Storehouse*, they would have more reasons to re-examine Shakespeare's use of rhetoric.

Hendiadys is characteristic of the Latin poetry that had such a profound literary influence on de Vere. The 1570 translation is chock full of hendiadys, starting with its very title. "A Ritche Storehouse or Treasure<sup>27</sup> for Nobilitye and Gentlemen" translates Sturm's title, "Ad Werteros Fratres, Nobilitas Literata." So, from the title on, de Vere doubles Sturm's more terse original, with de Vere's Mercutio-like effervescence and exuberance. Centuries before Hemingway and the restricting influence of his spare style, de Vere delighted in his expansive use of the English language. The dedicatory epistle is titled, "To the Right Honorable, vertuous, and my singuler good lord, Lord Philip Howard Erle of Surrey, all *felicitie and happiness*."<sup>28</sup> A third hendiadys, and we still have not gotten beyond titles (in both senses)!

The body of the dedicatory letter includes some seventeen further instances of hendiadys (six of them in the first sentence, and the other eleven in the letter's second and final sentence): "zeal and desire" [a commonplace] "service and duty" [5 earlier uses in EEBO], "more *excellent and precious* than *long or tedious*" [11 earlier uses], "infinite and exceeding" [one or two earlier uses], "reading and study" [8 earlier uses], "golden and honorable" [*unique use* until 1633], "noble and high" [9 earlier uses], "evil and unskillful" [*unique use*], "good and praiseworthy"<sup>29</sup> [*unique use* before 1600], "precious and goodly" [2 earlier uses], "pain and travail" [a commonplace, which occurs in the plural in de Vere's Ovid, line 910 of Book One], "pleasure and pastime" [a commonplace], "good and ample" [the *first* of 24 uses], "fruit and commodity" [a commonplace], "tedious or troublesome,"<sup>30</sup> and "rude and unfiled"<sup>31</sup> [the *first* of two uses in EEBO]. The last pair listed introduces a new meaning of "unfiled" as "not reduced or smoothed by filing; unpolished, *rude*," and does so twenty years before the first use of this meaning listed in the OED (in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*). De Vere may sometimes use hendiadys to suggest the meaning of his newly coined words.

Some of these pairs hint at a contrast between subjective and more objective states — "my *payne and traveyle* to be but *pleasure and pastime*." Subjective pain turns to pleasure; travail (which could mean a literary work at the time) turns to recreation, if and when the dedicatee finishes reading this work. I have quoted two examples of "paired" hendiadys, where the first and second words of the first pair contrast with the first and second words of the second pair, respectively.

"Evil and unskillful" is intriguing. At first glance, it seems to pair "wicked" with "inexpert," which jars a bit, especially in the context of the author's description of his own translation. But one OED definition of "evil," going back as early as 1530, is in fact "unskillful," in which case we would have exact synonyms. Here, there is

ambiguity as to which meanings of “evil” are active. Just a few lines earlier, de Vere described the dedicatee as “vertuous,” twice. “My evil...handling” also contrasts with the dedicatee’s “good and praiseworthy desire,” mentioned later in the same sentence. So this example illustrates the sort of disorienting complexity that Wright finds in Shakespearean hendiadys. Also intriguingly, de Vere’s uncle Arthur Golding (or de Vere himself?) used the phrase “savage and unskillfull” in his 1565 translation of Caesar’s *Martial Exploits in Gaul*, just five years before the present work.

De Vere’s introductory “To the friendly reader” (which follows the dedicatory epistle) also overflows with hendiadys. The fourth sentence alone has five such word pairs: “But our time (alas) is so inclined, and as it were naturally bent to bestow upon barren<sup>32</sup> and dishonest fruites,<sup>33</sup> precious and golden<sup>34</sup> names, that neythere can vertuous and prayseworthy<sup>35</sup> workes enjoye their due and deserved<sup>36</sup> tytles, being forestauled and defrauded by the evill, neythere good deedes possesse their owne, and worthy termes being prevented by the meane.”

Wright’s subjective criteria might not deem all of these doublings to be true examples of hendiadys. On the other hand, Wright felt that more complex use of hendiadys grew over time out of Shakespeare’s earlier “parading of synonyms.” And we must remind ourselves that de Vere was about twenty years old when he translated the work at hand.

Naturally, the dedicatory letter was de Vere’s own, not a translation from Sturm. But in comparing de Vere’s translation of Sturm with that of Spitz and Tinsley, we can see de Vere’s addition of hendiadys. There are several examples of word pairs on every page. For example, where the latter write simply “the practice of learned men,” de Vere expands this to “the use and custome of the learned.” Where our recent translators say of the Werter brothers that they have “a great similarity in talent,” de Vere expands both nouns into “twins”: “a great agreement and similitude in disposition and wytte.” The former refer to the “diligence of your teacher”; de Vere, to “the indeavor and example of your teacher.” Where they say “a special degree of happiness,” he writes “the chiefest step and degree of felicitie.” They write “temperance in desires”; he puts it “temperaunce and an honest measure in delightes.” Instead of “I shall prescribe,” de Vere says “I wyll appoynt and prescribe.” When they simply say “bipartite,” de Vere writes “bypartite and double.” Where they use “collected,” de Vere writes “gather and dispose.”

Later in the translation, there are countless more word pairs. Here, I omit the many examples that were commonplaces at the time. Instead, I focus on those that were first coined in *A Ritche Storehouse*. For example, the noun pair “use and practice” is the first of hundreds of uses in EEBO.<sup>37</sup> “Painful [i.e., painstaking] and industrious” is the first of 108 uses.<sup>38</sup> Significantly, the second use was in Angel Day’s 1586 *The English Secretary*, dedicated to his employer, Edward de Vere.<sup>39</sup> “Store and varietie” is the first of 71 uses. “Store and choice,” by the way, was the second of 15 uses. I mention it here because it was first used in the translation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* that many of us attribute to de Vere himself. “Acceptable and welcome” is the first of 65 uses.

“Servile or slavish” is the first of 57;<sup>40</sup> “servile and slavish” was not used until 1572. “Slavish” suggests an intensification of “servile,” as with the contrast

between slave and servant. “Manners and inclinations” is the first of 53 uses;<sup>41</sup> it seems to suggest a contrast between learned “manners” and natural “inclinations.” “Rules and bounds” is the first of 30. “Learned and politic” is the first of 23 uses,<sup>42</sup> including Robert Green in his 1592 *Repentance*. “Noble and commendable” is the first of 22 uses.<sup>43</sup> “Name and commendation,”<sup>44</sup> and “pawse [pause] or staye” are the first of 14 uses [“pause *and* stay” first appears in 1578]. “End and form” is the first of 13 uses.<sup>45</sup> “Art and language” is the first of 9. “Things and matter” is the first of nine uses; “using and handling” and “things and matter” the first of eight uses; “purpose and reason,”<sup>46</sup> “gardien [I assume “garden” was a misprint] or keeper,” and “assay and attempt” are the first of six; “wisely and commendably,”<sup>47</sup> “adventures and travails [which also meant “travels”],” and “unapt and foolish”<sup>48</sup> are the first of four; “elocution or utterance,”<sup>49</sup> and “nature and comliness”<sup>50</sup> are the first of three; “writing and utterance,” the first of two; as are “handling and writing,” “comparing and applying” “addition and ablation,” “devising and writing,”<sup>51</sup> “gather and dispose,” and “letters and voyces.” “Praiseworthy and earnest,” “virtue and fealty [feudal fidelity toward one’s lord],”<sup>52</sup> “endeavour and example,” “abate nor faint,” “gravity and fullness,”<sup>53</sup> “gravity and beautification,” “oration or work,” “comelinesse and delectation,” “handle and polish,” “plentiful and neat [elegant],” “bipartite and double,” and “arte and similitude” do not appear elsewhere in EEBO. Significantly, most of these unique word pairs describes ideal rhetoric, inspiring de Vere’s “inventio.”

Earl Showerman has drawn attention to the influence of the Greek tragedians on de Vere. *A Ritche Storehouse* advises, “a maker of Tragidies [must] take Euripides, or Sophocles to be his pattern.” In general, Sturm stresses the importance for any writer to emulate the good models of prior writers. This emphasis may have been one reason de Vere decided to “English” this very work—taking it as a model for a discussion of rhetoric.

In 1569 appeared a poem subscribed “A.G.,” which I have also attributed to de Vere.<sup>54</sup> How does the pattern of hendiadys in that poem compare with *A Ritche Storehouse*, published merely a year later? It has a few examples, in the latter portion of the poem—“just and trew” [a commonplace]; “faithfulness and right” [unusual]; “great and long” [a commonplace]; and “weale and welfare” [first EEBO use is in 1600]. The first and third pair modify the word “accounts,” as it is a commendatory poem on bookkeeping. De Vere’s “Young Gentleman” poem includes “range and seeke” [the unique use recorded in EEBO until 1672]; and “carcke and care” [a commonplace].

In conclusion, I have presented evidence that Edward de Vere was probably the translator of the 1570 work, *A Ritche Storehouse or Treasurie for Nobilitie and Gentlemen*, written in Latin by Johann Sturm. It is an important precursor of the anonymous 1589 *Arte of English Poesie*, which I have attributed to de Vere. It shows the deep interest in rhetoric in general, and *inventio* in particular, that is also reflected in the works of Shakespeare. I devote special emphasis to the parallel fascination in the 1570 translation with the figure of hendiadys—“one through

two”—that also characterizes the works of Shakespeare. The study of de Vere’s previously unattributed early literary work deepens our understanding of his development as the world’s greatest writer.

### Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Colin Burrow for his helpful suggestions for this article.
- <sup>2</sup> See Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, 179.
- <sup>3</sup> *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- <sup>4</sup> Colin Burrow, Chap. 27, Shakespeare. In Patrick Cheney and Philip Hardie (eds.), *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature*. Vol. 2 (1558-1660). Donna B. Hamilton, *Virgil and the Tempest: Politics of Imitation*, (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press) also discusses Sturm in connection with Shakespeare (11-18).
- <sup>5</sup> Lewis W. Spitz and Barbara Sher Tinsley, *Johann Sturm on Education*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1995.  
p. 374 note 64.
- <sup>6</sup> Cf. Robin Fox, *Shakespeare’s Education: Schools, Lawsuits, Theater and the Tudor Miracle*. Bucholz, Germany: Laugwitz Verlag, 2012.
- <sup>7</sup> In their valuable edition of Sturm, Spitz and Tinsley refer to the translator merely as “T.B.,” and do not speculate as to his identity. They call his translation “charming” (133), and they quote several lines of it.
- <sup>8</sup> For extensive explanations for this attribution, please see Richard M. Waugaman, “The Arte of English Poesie: The Case for Edward de Vere’s Authorship.” *Brief Chronicles: The Interdisciplinary Journal of the Shakespeare Fellowship* 2:121-141 (2010); and Response to letter from Mike Hyde, *Brief Chronicles: The Interdisciplinary Journal of the Shakespeare Fellowship* 2:260-266 (2010).
- <sup>9</sup> Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- <sup>10</sup> *The Oxfordian* 18:175-182 (2016).
- <sup>11</sup> See Robert Sean Brazil, *Angel Day: The English Secretary and Edward de Vere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford*. Seattle, WA: Cortical Output, 2013.

- <sup>12</sup> In his English translation of Johann Sturm's *A Ritche Storehouse*.
- <sup>13</sup> Edited by Frank Whigham and Wayne A. Rebhorn. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- <sup>14</sup> Early English Books Online.
- <sup>15</sup> G.W. Pigman, "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance." *Renaissance Quarterly* 33:1-32, 1980. I am grateful to Colin Burrow for bringing Pigman's article to my attention.
- <sup>16</sup> Nelson calls this particular spelling "wildly egregious" (65). (Tut, tut, Shakespeare!)
- <sup>17</sup> "Apploy'd" was used once, in 1643.
- <sup>18</sup> "Howre" is found twice in de Vere's letters.
- <sup>19</sup> The ever helpful Nelson writes that "Many [spelling] variants [in de Vere's letters] result from the substitution of 'w' for 'u' (64)." E.g., cowl'd, showld, and wowl'd.
- <sup>20</sup> Sometimes, in a long series, such as "Between *two* hawks, which flies the higher pitch;/ Between *two* dogs, which hath the deeper mouth;? Between *two* blades, which bears the better temper;/ Between *two* horses, which doth bear him best;/ Between *two* girls, which hath the merriest eye" (*1 Henry VI*, II.iv.11-15).
- <sup>21</sup> De Vere did not consider one to be a number.
- <sup>22</sup> Ancient Hebrew also has the dual number. For example, the dual form of the verb, rather than the plural, is used when speaking of a person's two legs (Rabbi Joshua Habermann, personal communication, July 2, 2016).
- <sup>23</sup> I am grateful to Elisabeth P. Waugaman for this observation.
- <sup>24</sup> Cf. de Vere coining the word "turquify" as meaning "transform," as described above.
- <sup>25</sup> See "Hendiadys and *Hamlet*." *PMLA* 96(2):168-193, 1981. I am most grateful to Colin Burrow for directing me to this classic article, and for his suggestions on the work of Sturm.
- <sup>26</sup> In a future work, I will show abundant and original examples of hendiadys in the translation of the first four books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in 1565, and I will show why I believe de Vere was the translator.
- <sup>27</sup> The second of 34 instances of this word pair in EEBO.
- <sup>28</sup> The third of 275 instances in EEBO.
- <sup>29</sup> Cf. "good and virtuous" in *Macbeth* IV.iii.23; "good and loyal" in the same play, IV.iii.97; "good and gracious" in *Timon* I.i.68; "good and galant" in *Tempest* V.i.269.
- <sup>30</sup> The first of 22 uses, but "tedious *and* troublesome" was a commonplace. Still, an instance of de Vere fashioning something new out of old material.
- <sup>31</sup> Cf. "rude and shallow" in *Henry V* I.i.57; "rude and wildly" in *Comedy of Errors* V.i.90; "rude and merciless" in *2 Henry VI* IV.iv.33; "rude and savage" in *LLL* IV.iii.233; and "rude and bold" in *MV* II.ii.174.
- <sup>32</sup> Later, he writes "barren and void," the third of 27 uses in EEBO.
- <sup>33</sup> Unique in EEBO. There are no instances of the related "barren and dishonest."

Shakespeare coined more than 300 words beginning “un-.” Cf. “barren and be-reft” in *Richard II* III.iii.86.

<sup>34</sup> First of 18 uses in EEBO.

<sup>35</sup> First of three uses in EEBO.

<sup>36</sup> Third of 145 uses in EEBO. Cf. “due and just” in *Pericles* V.iii.98; “due and wary” in *MM* IV.i.37; “due and forfeit” in *MV* IV.i.38.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. “use and counsel” in Shakespeare’s *1 Henry IV* I.iii.20; “use and liberty” in *MM* I.iv.66; “use and wearing” in *Timon* V.i.157; and “use and fair advantage” in *TGV* II.iv.63. Likewise, “art and practise” in *MM* I.i.12; “device and practise” in *HVIII* I.i.238; “baits and practise” in *Coriolanus* IV.i.35.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. “dern [concealed, solitary] and painful” in *Pericles* III, Prologue, 15.

<sup>39</sup> It is possible that some of the works dedicated to de Vere were actually written by him—another use of an allonym.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. “slavish weeds and servile thoughts” in *Titus*, II.i.18.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. “manners and beauty” in *Othello* II.i.249; cf. “state and inclination” in *RII*, III.ii.195.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. “learned and well-beloved” in *HVIII* II.iv.256; “learned and valiant” in *TN* I.v.241; cf. “politic and safe” in *King Lear* I.iv.323.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. “noble and natural” in *Cymbeline* III.v.160; “noble and renowned” in *MM* III.i.232-233; “noble and well-warranted” in *MM* V.i.277; “noble and true-hearted” in *King Lear* I.ii.121; “noble and approved” in *Othello* I.iii.87; “noble and chaste” in *1 Henry IV* I.ii.28. In each case, another favorable adjective highlights and intensifies the positive connotation of “noble.”

<sup>44</sup> Cf. “name and fame” in *2 Henry IV* II.iv.70; “name and quality” in IV.i.90 of the same play; “name and birth” in *Cymbeline* I.i.32; “name and power” in *2 Henry VI* I.iv.26; “name and credit” in *Shrew* IV.ii.112; “name and estimation” in *1 Henry IV* V.i.99. As with “noble,” “name” leads to positive associations for de Vere.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. “manner and form” in *LLL* I.i.201, 204; “degree and form” in *Henry V* IV.i.242; “shapes and forms” in *T&C* V.iii.13.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. “judgment and reason” in *TN* III.ii.12.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. “wisely and truly” in *JC* III.iii.15-16.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. “old and foolish” in *Lear* IV.vii.97; “gross and foolish” in *WT* III.ii.214; “foul and foolish” in *Othello* I.i.154 and 155 (i.e., repeated in these two lines, not enjambed).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. “voice and utterance” in *JC* III.i.281.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. “Nature and Fortune” in *KJ* III.i.52

<sup>51</sup> Note that three of these pairs including the word *writing*.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. the nearly identical hendiadys “virtue and obedience” in *Shrew* V.ii.130, and also in *King Lear* II.i.122. Cf. also “virtue and nobility” in *Titus* I.i.93;

<sup>53</sup> Cf. “gravity and learning” in *Henry VIII* III.i.82 and in *MWW* III.i.51; “gravity and patience” in the latter play, III.i.48; “gravity and stillness” in *Othello* II.iii.190.

<sup>54</sup> “A New 1569 Poem by Arthur Golding, Re-attributed to Edward de Vere.” *Shakespeare Oxford Society Newsletter* 49(1):9-10 (2013).