WHY THE BISHOPS BURNED THE BOOKS

The bishops' book-burning of June 1599 is extensively investigated in Cyndia Susan Clegg's Press Censorship in Elizabethan England. Clegg relates the Nashe-Harvey ban to the suppression of John Hayward's The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IV, twice confiscated and burned in 1599, the second instance concurrent with the bishops' action of 1–4 June. Hayward's book was seen to have touched (perhaps seditiously) on matters of 'State'. It was dedicated to Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex (1565–1601), and detailed the deposition of Richard II by Bolingbroke; anecdotally, Elizabeth is said to have identified with poor Richard, and the Earl was believed to harbour royal pretensions. Perhaps Hayward's intentions were to encourage Essex in that direction. But why would the same net sweep up a sundry group of satirists, pamphleteers, and epigrammatists? Clegg's suggestion that certain of the latters' doggerels could be closely read as comments on Essex's desultory military campaign in Ireland and/or his royal ambitions only tends to emphasize the scattershot nature of the bishops' ban.

A more reasonable explanation could be that Elizabeth, incensed by her own and others' interpretations of Hayward's Henrie and its link to Essex, baited her bishops into a radical act of suppression. After both Queen and Essex were dead, Francis Bacon published an Apologie, in Certain imputations concerning the late Earle of Essex, which included this tale: 'For her Majesty being mightily incensed with that booke which was dedicated to my Lord of Essex ... thinking it a seditious prelude to put into the people heads boldnesse and faction, said she had good opinion that there was treason in it, and asked me if I could not find any places in it, that might be drawne within case [lead to a prosecution].'

Bacon claims he laughed the old Queen out of it, telling her he found no treason in Hayward's book, only theft (plagiarism) from Tacitus. That Elizabeth even contemplated a formal prosecution illuminates the height of her dudgeon. Indeed, Hayward – 'an unlikely traitor and a victim of "strong" reading' – was interrogated in Star Chamber, threatened with the rack, and slapped into prison.

Given the tenor of Elizabeth's response to the book, it's certainly possible that she could have prodded her bishops to (a) order the dedication to Essex removed (February 1599) and (b) confiscate and destroy the dedication-free second edition (after 28 May). Either as cover for these acts, or in the bishops' desire opportunistically to make a one-time clean sweep, they issued their ban on 1 June which netted Harvey, Nashe, et al., and lit their conflagration. In any case, the ban was an extraordinary act of censorship, one bound to be remembered by London writers for years to come.

SHAKESPEARE'S BAD TIMING

Bad timing may be the simple explanation for Shakespeare's Oldcastle–Falstaff gaffe. When Henry Carey died on 23 July 1596 he had been patron of Shakespeare's company for two years and Lord Chamberlain for a dozen. Carey's son George inherited the former distinction and politicked hard for the latter; he was disappointed. On 8 August 1596 Elizabeth gifted the lucrative and influential post to William Brooke, member of the Privy Council and Warden of the Cinque Ports. But young Carey did not brood long; Brooke died after only seven months in...
 Recovering Shakespeare's link between of the deaths of Falstaff and Brooke is a task of constructing a plausible scenario out of two poems: The Life of Henry V and The Comedy of Errors. As Falstaff lies dying the pair come near the end of a long search for rewards at the whorehouse - two dubious prizes. Their squabbling may have been inspired by events surrounding the death of Brooke. Shakespeare's admired discretion would intentionally — or very publicly — twit a powerful court official upon whose good will his own career and the fortunes of his friends depended.

On 21 February, Whyte writes to Sydney that Cecil 'went on Saturday to blackfriars [sic] to see my Lord Chamberlain grow weaker; his eldest son earnestly sues [the Queen] for his father's offices.' On 1 March Whyte reports the death of Brooke 'brashe [sic] into the hands of His Majestie, and Brooke's appointment as Lord Chamberlain came as an awkward surprise to Shakespeare as it did to George Carey. Regarding the 'Brooke' alias in The Merry Wives of Windsor, if (as we've been told) this play was written in haste for the occasion of George Carey's induction as a Knight of the Cinque Ports.' On 1 March Whyte's letter begins, 'The following day, it is now held certain Lord Cobham cannot live.' On that day Whyte reports: 'Mr. Henry Brooke, Sir Ed. Wooton and the two Lords Buckhurst and Hunsdon have declared their candidacy for warden of the Cinque Ports.' On 6 March Whyte reports the death of Brooke 'My Lord of Hunsdon [post], the Court is full of Lord Cobham.' On 28 February: 'My Lord Chamberlain grows weaker; his eldest son earnestly sues [the Queen] for his father's offices.' On 18 February 1597 Rowland Whyte reported, 'My Lord Chamberlain will dy.' On that day Whyte reports: 'Mr. Henry Brooke, Sir Ed. Wooton and the two Lords Buckhurst and Hunsdon [have declared their candidacy for warden of the Cinque Ports].' On 25 February, Whyte writes to Sydney that Cecil 'went on Saturday to blackfriars [sic] to see my Lord Chamberlain grow weaker; his eldest son earnestly sues [the Queen] for his father's offices.' On 25 February, Whyte writes to Sydney that Cecil 'went on Saturday to blackfriars [sic] to see my Lord Chamberlain grow weaker; his eldest son earnestly sues [the Queen] for his father's offices.' On 25 February, Whyte writes to Sydney that Cecil 'went on Saturday to blackfriars [sic] to see my Lord Chamberlain grow weaker; his eldest son earnestly sues [the Queen] for his father's offices.' On 25 February, Whyte writes to Sydney that Cecil 'went on Saturday to blackfriars [sic] to see my Lord Chamberlain grow weaker; his eldest son earnestly sues [the Queen] for his father's offices.'

Though commentators have gamely struggled to divine the sense of Shakespeare's clock twice striking one o'clock, none has cracked (or even dented) this crux. But the extraordinary transformation; when the play appeared in the Folio the identity of the blikeness(es) is not clear. By resignation if he live, for his body is to weake to stand for the burden of the place [post].7 London society - conspiracy of the dying, swarms of noblemen and arrivistes were shamelessly opportunists included the Earl of Essex, young Brooke, George Carey, Sydney, Whyte, and others. Whyte's letters amply convey the machinations. Shakespeare's Eastcheap rivals personify the drama.

One cannot but wonder why a man of Shakespeare's adrriration would intentionally — or very publicly — twit a powerful court official upon whose good will his own career and the fortunes of his friends depended.

BROOKE'S DEATH AND PISTOL

Recovering Shakespeare's link between the deaths of Falstaff and Brooke is a task of constructing a plausible scenario out of two poems: The Life of Henry V and The Comedy of Errors. As Falstaff lies dying the pair come near the end of a long search for rewards at the whorehouse - two dubious prizes. Their squabbling may have been inspired by events surrounding the death of Brooke. The first appears in 1 Henry IV (1596), wherein Shakespeare had assumed the title Baron Cobham on his marriage to the widow of Lord Brooke. Sir John had assumed the title Baron Cobham on his marriage to the widow of Lord Brooke. Hezekiah, sometime King of Judah (ca. 715–686 BC), was a religious zealot and reformer. In 2 Kings 19:6–11, Hezekiah finds his prophecy incredible and demands a sign. Isaiah replies, 'This signe shalt thou haue of the Lord; that I will bring againe the shadowe ten degrees backe by the degrees by whereby it had gone downe' (2 Kings 20:8–11).

The function of Shakespeare's clock twice striking one o'clock is to convey to his auditors that it's not some pagan Destiny but the divine hand of the Old Testament God that is moving the play's characters. The Old Testament God that is moving the play's characters. The Old Testament God that is moving the play's characters. The Old Testament God that is moving the play's characters. The Old Testament God that is moving the play's characters. The Old Testament God that is moving the play's characters. The Old Testament God that is moving the play's characters. The Old Testament God that is moving the play's characters. The Old Testament God that is moving the play's characters.
So oft it chauises in particular men
That for some vicious mole of nature in them
As in their birth wherein they are not guilty,
(Since nature cannot choose his origin)
By the ore-growth of some complexion
Oft breaking downe the pales and forts of reason,
Or by some habit, that too much ore-leavens
The form of plausible manners, that these men
Carrying I say the stamp of one defect
Being Natures livery, or Fortunes starre,
His vertues els be they as pure as grace,
As infinite as man may undergoe,
Shall in the generall censure take corruption
From that particular fault the damp of age

SHAKESPEARE’S NASHE ON THE ILLEGITIMACY OF

In A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe, Charles Nicholl
Nashe's physical presence: small, skinny, mercurial, piquant
well-educated 10 Then there is Armado's epithet for Moth,
and again in Act III, where Moth is a most acute luvenall. This
luvenall, that byting Satyrist, punning on juvenile and Juver
worth, since young luvenall is one of the scholers Green

Having satisfied himself with the Thom–Moth connection,
Nashe, his master, the ridiculous Armado, is surely Harvey:
Armado the bragart is the Harvey whom Nashe calls a "p:"
boasting and "horrible insulting pride". Holofernnes calls
Nashe also calls Harvey "this Thraso" in Strange News, and
play, Armado repeatedly reveals himself as a pretentious
that makes sport To the Prince and his Book-mates'. And
of his argument. I abhorre such phanatical phantasims, such

Anyone who has troubled to read Harvey's published works
his G. Harvei gratulationum Valdensium libri quatuour
with the word 'Chirrah!', a corruption of the Greek 'hello'
Harvei χαϊςε, vel Gratulationes Valdinensis Liber Primus'. But
describes Harvey's appearance as having a 'Mediterranean-
Italian' 13 Shakespeare may have translated Harvey's Italian

ON THE ILLEGITIMACY OF

Elsewhere I have noted that Hamlet Q2 contains a passage
who have read law. As a consequence, the passage has been
be extravagant to say that Hamlet's monologue in 1.3 is a
as in David Farr's 2013 production at the Royal Shakespeare
charge of lèse-majesté; Shakespeare's meaning would have
law and remembered De Laudibus Legum Anglie of Sir John

In Hamlet Q2 1.3 Shakespeare provided the prince with a
anticipates a confrontation with the Ghost of his father. A
The night is shattered by the trumpets and ordnance of the
my mind, though I am native here And to the manner born.
and the Folio Hamlet's speech ends here and 'observance'
the allusion to his birth, Hamlet continues with a speech a
'particuler' man from a prior exchange with Gertrude:

Ham: I Maddam, it is common.
Quee: If it be
Why seems it so particuler with thee? (Q2 1.2.74–6)

In case we missed that particular–Hamlet connection, the
Like quils upon the fearfull Porpentine’ (1.5.19–20). Hamlet
Hamlet alleges that 'some vicious mole of nature ... in the ‘habit’ which inevitably brings them to ill repute. Yet the nature is, his parentage or the circumstances of his conception a ‘one defect’ so virulent that were all his other virtues ‘pure corruption From [be damned by] that particular fault’.

What form of obloquy could cause a man in utero to forfeit one — and it is described in Deuteronomy, an Old Testament — shall not entrate into the Congregation of the Lord: even to his tenth

When Shakespeare wrote this speech ‘vicious had not acute bad’ (OED). Applied to persons, it meant ‘addicted to vice of human skin ... a fault.’ But it also identifies the familiar small qualities, that is, whose (physical or mental) vision is defected in Q2 1.5.161 the prince addresses the Ghost of his father; unshirkable as livery, indelible as Fortune’s star (destiny); even by the sacrament of baptism. Hamlet’s meditation of crux in Shakespeare ‘the dram of eale Doth all the noble the offspring is tainted with ‘doubt’ and scandalized by the fluid. What fluid in such a small quantity could exert this definitive OED cites, ‘O God, that one borne noble should be so basely eale’ is surely a recondite reference to semen, an ill-place: One needs to remember that Hamlet is replying to Horatio is drawn from associated jargon. Elsewhere, Shakespeare quibbles with the word in an ethical sense: dram = scruple = compunction ‘dram’ in the sense of a fluid meaning of ‘bastard’, ‘born out of wedlock, illegitimate,’ its sometimes any kind of sweetened wine (OED), including F ‘Score a pint of bastard(e) in the Half-moon’ (2.4.30).

Bastarde wines differ from varietals by what the French call sugar or honey, as an aid to fermentation. A wine thus added a ‘bastard(e).’

As to the etymology of the mysterious ‘eale’, the word is a tree. Elders produce the elderberry, from which wine has elderberries, winemakers invariably ‘bastardized’ the ferment.

Shakespeare would have known that the elderberry had eastern England from York to London ruled by Danish invaders Saxo Grammaticus’s tale of Amelth, is set during this period derived from a tradition that the elder sprang up in place: the Old English word ‘elffrn’ (OED). Clearly, Shakespeare used the name ‘elder’ derives from ‘elfr’ – and so would certain members of Hamlet’s first audience. But if four centuries of scholars have found Hamlet’s ‘dram’ understood it? The answer is: those who had read law and the law of England [because] the sinne of the firste carnal accion [pre] the childe borne out of matrimonye, the lawe of Eng. lawfull [because] the sinne of the firste carnal accion [pre] oneleye judge the childe so gotten to be illegitimate but al foregone. Fortescue then asserts the intransigent stain of bastardy, even if the parents subsequently marry:

If a bastard bee good, that cometh to him by chance, that thought that the base child draweth a certein corruption ‘vicious mole’ is ‘not guilty’ since he ‘cannot choose his origin’, that is, ‘vicious mole of nature’ pollutes him subsequently marry:

‘Scandale’ points to a fault of sexual corruption From [be damned by] that particular fault.

From that particular fault: the dram of eale
Doth all the noble substance of a doubt
To his own scandle. (1.5.23–38)

This passage shares an extraordinary run of vocabulary with without his own fault, known with God (‘generall censure’, privie mark in their soules’. Indeed, Hamlet’s speech reads...
What does this tell us about Hamlet's right to royal succes? If Fortescue explains that although Roman civil law does not permit a child to be born out of wedlock but legitimated by the marriage, he adds that "the substantiamentum of the substantiamentum, or if his substance be, the author thereof, must be present before the marriage."

But English law differs significantly from Roman civil law. A bastard born of the remarriage of either father or mother could not inherit the property of his father, Fortescue quotes a miserable doggerel:

To whom the people father is, to him is father none and a beggar-like he is known.
To whom the people father is, to him is father all.

It makes perfect sense to Fortescue that a latter-born sibling, born of the remarriage of either father or mother, would not inherit. It were therefore unreasonable that a child afterwarde be disherited, and that a childe whiche knoweth no father shoulde be heir to the other, where the eldest sonne only enjoieth the fathers inheritance.

By this logic, any child born in wedlock to Claudius and Gertrude would take precedence over a firstborn natural child: 'popped in between th' election and my [Hamlet's] hopes'. Shakespeare's England under the childless Elizabeth.

Though opaque to generations of playgoers and commentators, Fortescue, Hamlet's soliloquy is unmistakable as a meditation on his bastardy. But why did Shakespeare choose, in 1599, to make of Claudius the childless King? Royal legitimacy was not a subject any Elizabethan dramatist wished to interrogate openly.

To support his legal claims to the throne of Denmark, the King claimed to be haunted by a wife in whom he finds 'uncleanesse', formed a pillar of Henry's appeal to Pope Clement VII to form a commission to review the validity of his marriage to his half-sister: 'A man is not to be relieved of his dower because a child, conceived out of wedlock but legitimated by the subsequent marriage, is born of the remarriage of either father or mother – should take precedence in heritance over a firstborn natural child: 'The Civile law doth legittimate the childe cannot inherit because, Fortescue explains that a bastard cannot inherit, "arguments Fortescue quotes a miserable doggerel:"

It makes perfect sense to Fortescue that a latter-born sibling, born of the remarriage of either father or mother, would not inherit. It were therefore unreasonable that a child afterwarde be disherited, and that a childe whiche knoweth no father shoulde be heir to the other, where the eldest sonne only enjoieth the fathers inheritance.

By this logic, any child born in wedlock to Claudius and Gertrude would take precedence over a firstborn natural child: 'popped in between th' election and my [Hamlet's] hopes'. Shakespeare's England under the childless Elizabeth.

Though opaque to generations of playgoers and commentators, Fortescue, Hamlet's soliloquy is unmistakable as a meditation on his bastardy. But why did Shakespeare choose, in 1599, to make of Claudius the childless King? Royal legitimacy was not a subject any Elizabethan dramatist wished to interrogate openly.
I was wondering how you could change particular notes to be longer or shorter without changing any similar notes. I am not fully aware of how this works, I just now that it works off of a library and can play several cool songs. The goal here is to be able to put in long notes and short notes in a specific formation to do morse code before the song. byte default_dur = 4; byte default_oct = 6; int bpm = 63; int num; long wholenote; long duration; byte note; byte scale; // format: d=N,o=N,b=NNN: // find the start (skip name, etc). June 30, 2015 Longer Notes

2015-07-30T06:17:24+00:00 
Tools & Utilities Gadgets. This small application designed to look like a sticky note looks like it has been upgraded because it is longer than most sticky notes. This allows people to place more items on the note. The position of the note can be placed anywhere on the screen making it easy for people to see this windows 10 gadget. Multiple sticky notes can be created without having to open various windows from the program. Longer Notes! is a small app designed to display longer sticky notes than the default widget provided by Windows Vista. It may be easily installed and configured. The interface of the tool is based on a small frame which resembles a long, yellow sticky note. Its position can be changed to any spot on the screen, with the help of the mouse cursor. So, you can create as many sticky notes as you want (without creating multiple instances of the program) and easily switch through them by using two arrow-like buttons.