

THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP

STACKS

Quarterly

The Shakespeare Fellowship was founded in London in 1922 under the presidency of Sir George Greenwood.

VOL. XIX

SUMMER, 1948

NO. 2

Oxford vs. Other "Claimants" of the Edwards Shakespearean Honors, 1593

By CHARLES WISNER BARRELL

IN THE PRECEDING ISSUE of the QUARTERLY the first serious attempt was made to analyze the personal allusions to the author of *Venus and Adonis* in Thomas Edwards' 1593 "L'Envoy to Narcissus." That we succeeded in proving the poet-playwright Earl of Oxford to be Edwards' nominee for the authorship of the "Shakespeare" poem is the opinion of several well-versed Elizabethan scholars to whom our analysis has been submitted.

Let us now anticipate the skepticism of those who may wish to suggest a candidate other than the Earl of Oxford as the poet-playwright described by Edwards.

It appears indisputable that this *one whose power floweth far* and whose *purple robes distained* identify him with the *stately tropes rich conceited* of the *masking Adon*, as well as with the writing of satirical comedy for Blackfriars Theatre production, is at the same time signified as of the royal circle *at the Center of this cline*.

What poet-playwright of contemporary renown occupied an Elizabethan Court position comparable to Edwards' specifications in 1593?

Could it be William of Stratford?

Not even his most vehement partisans will seriously advance such a claim for the reported butcher's apprentice and horse-groom from Warwickshire.

Was it Francis Bacon then?

There is no record of Bacon having written a line of first-class poetry or drama during the lifetime of Elizabeth. His acknowledged experiments in verse speak for themselves—with mediocre flatness. Any lines less "Shakespearean" would be difficult to find in the dust-bin of literary oblivion.

Moreover, Francis Bacon was not of the purple-veined nobility. His forbears were lawyers and professional scholars, several of them extremely able, but distinctly middle-class. Bacon himself remained plain "Master" Bacon until Elizabeth's successor came to the throne. In 1593 this gifted young commoner was frantically pulling wires to secure some governmental post which would assure him leisure to pursue his philosophical studies—and that with notable non-success. When he came to Court it was as a supplicant or an intelligence agent. The only real influence he exerted during the latter decade of Elizabeth was as the private adviser of Essex, until he turned upon his benefactor to advance himself over the unfortunate Earl's dishonored corpse.

The fatal weakness of the so-called "Bacon-Shakespeare" authorship claims resides in the fact that it is absolutely impossible to certify Bacon as a personal participant in the rise of the creative art of the Elizabethan drama by any contemporary testimony. The "claims" of his advocates are primarily based upon "cryptograms" and "ciphers"—long since exploded as childishy unreliable.

Could Edwards, perchance, be referring to the 6th Earl of Derby as the author of *Venus and Adonis*?

Hardly, inasmuch as William Stanley was chiefly notable for his absence from Court circles when Edwards wrote. The general belief is that he spent most of his time in foreign travel. He was a younger son, then on the "outs" with his relatives, and certainly occupied no position of any demonstrable power whatever at the Court of Elizabeth. Neither is there any direct evidence during the early 1590's that he was considered an influential and experienced poet or dramatist. There are later references to Derby—then Oxford's son-in-law—as a writer and producer of "comedies for the common players". But these are not dated before 1599. They indicate that Derby's interest in playwriting and theatre production gained headway through intimacy with Lord Oxford. And distinctly so as his father-in-law's bodily powers waned. My own opinion is that Derby is not to be discounted as a possible collaborator with Oxford in certain Shakespearean enterprises. At least, he can be accurately documented through recent research as Ben Jonson's active patron, and provides an authentic personal connecting link between Jonson and the real "Shakespeare."

Finally, to recapitulate Oxford's fitness for the Edwards' identification:

As one born in the purple and related to many of the ablest and most highly cultivated families in English history, Oxford is the only nobleman of great prestige in 1593 who can be thoroughly documented by his contemporaries as a poet and playwright of genius.

His honorary office of Lord Chamberlain of England and his ancient lineage gave him precedence over all other Earls of the realm. And the royal Sword of State, of which he had the disposition, by right of office, symbolizes the delegated authority of the reigning sovereign. That this poet-playwright could be accurately described as *one whose power floweth far*, both in Court circles and in Elizabethan literary affairs, admits of no question. There is definite proof, also abundantly available, that his great name was sullied by intimate association with "lewd" writers of the Shakespearean creative circle. Nash's satirical address to Oxford as "*Gentle Master William Apis Lapis*," the Sacred Ox of contemporary letters, in the 1593 dedicatory epistle of *Strange News*, verifies every-

thing in this connection that the statements of Lord Treasurer Burghley, Spenser and Sir George Buck suggest.

We have already noted that the dedication of Nash's *Strange News* to his patron proves that Oxford's literary nickname was the same as that borne by the "Gentle Master William" of the immortal plays. Furthermore, this playwright nobleman's ownership of a favorite manor on the River Avon in Warwickshire, and the historical record of his appearance as an actor in a spectacular show given on the same stream for the Queen's pleasure, certify Oxford's right to be considered the subject of Jonson's metaphorical reference to "Shakespeare" as *Sweet Swan of Avon*.

In the space now at our disposal, it would be impossible to digest all realistic evidence to the same effect. Such evidence has been detailed in many books and pamphlets, beginning with Looney's "*Shakespeare Identified*" (1920), and continuing throughout the eight previous volumes of this periodical.

I will only say that the lavish praise of Lord Oxford as poet, playwright and voluminous creative worker by such critical authority and fellow writers of his day as Webbe; the anonymous author of *The Arte of English Poesie*; Angel Day; Spenser; Nash; Meres; Harvey; and Henry Peacham, cannot be matched in the case of any other candidate for Shakespearean authorship honors who was living when Thomas Edwards wrote his *Narcissus*—and who at the same time meets all *personal requirements* of this remarkable description of the creator of *Venus and Adonis*.

Associations of the Earls of Oxford And Members of Edwards Family

The identity of the Thomas Edwards who in 1593 wrote the exceedingly rare and historically important *Cephalus and Procris (and) Narcissus*, which contains the description of the 17th Earl of Oxford in his pseudonymic role of "Shakespeare," does not seem to have been settled up to this time.

The British Museum catalogues him as "The Poet" to distinguish him from other Thomas Edwardses of about the same era; while the editors of the Dictionary of National Biography languidly view the problem with the remark that "Edwards is a common name."

All known circumstances considered, however, I would venture to suggest that this little known poet and Shakespearean commentator was a member of the family of Richard Edwards, the Elizabethan poet, musician and playwright who composed and staged *Palamon and Arcite* and *Damon and Pithias*.

A native of Somersetshire, Richard Edwards was born about 1523, and is said to have died toward the end of 1566. A scholar of Corpus Christi, Oxford, he received his M.A. degree in 1547. Later he studied law at Lincoln's Inn, and was appointed a Gentleman of the Queen's Chapel and Master of the Children of the Chapel about 1561. His skill in music and dramatics is frequently mentioned by his contemporaries. Edwards trained selected groups from the boys of the Royal Choir in several successful dramatic offerings, including his own plays. The Queen is said to have encouraged this, expending more than a thousand pounds a year to maintain the Chapel's musical and acting forces.

The most humanly interesting account extant of Elizabeth's enthusiasm for the stage is to be found in a contemporary manuscript in the Harleian collection. It is written by the Oxford scholar Neal and tells of the Queen's visit to that university in September, 1566, when Edwards and his youthful actors gave their first performance of *Palamon and Arcite* before Elizabeth, her courtiers, and the whole university personnel. The production was so graphically enacted that many of the younger undergraduates present who had never seen a play were entirely carried away, shouting directions to the players in some of the hunting scenes. This so amused the Queen that she applauded them on from her box, crying

"Oh, excellent! These boys in very troth are ready to leap out of the windows to follow the hounds."

The young Earl of Oxford, then several months past his sixteenth birthday, was one of Elizabeth's personal attendants on this occasion, and was among those who received an honorary M.A. degree from the university, following the two days devoted principally to Edwards' dramatic offerings.

There can be no doubt that young Oxford was personally acquainted with Richard Edwards, for they had marked mutual interests in music, acting, writing and the stage. Also eight of Oxford's early poems appear in a famous Elizabethan anthology entitled *The Paradise of Dainty Devices* which

Edwards is credited with having collected "for his private use" from the writings of "divers learned Gentlemen." The first edition of the volume is dated 1576, whereas Edwards was buried in 1566. Therefore, if the statements of Henry Disle, editor-publisher of the *Paradise* can be accepted at face value, the poems by Oxford included therein must all have been composed *before the Earl was seventeen years of age*. Several of these signed lyrics of his are, nevertheless, of outstanding spirit and felicity. In fact, some of their lines have been accepted as of genuinely adult Shakespearean composition by eminent professors of English. For such tests, a *pot-pourri* has been arranged by Dr. L. P. Benezet, consisting of an admixture of the Oxford lines (unidentified) with others taken from the songs and sonnets of "William Shakespeare."

It is not merely an "accident," either, it would seem, that one of Richard Edwards' songs, beginning "When griping grief the heart doth wound" provides a tunefully mirthful interlude in *Romeo and Juliet*.

As has been previously noted, some years after Richard Edwards' death, the boy actors company which he had organized at Westminster was combined with a similar group at Windsor to create the professional troupe for the Blackfriars Theatre. As the backer of this enterprise, Oxford's own theatrical interests can thus be seen to be a direct continuation of an important Elizabethan stage movement, pioneered by Richard Edwards.

These are the main reasons why I think it not unreasonable to suggest that the poet Thomas Edwards, who was in touch with contemporary creative writing and obviously knew something of the Blackfriars Theatre group of satirists, was either a direct or collateral descendant of the author of *Palamon and Arcite*. Edwards may be "a common name," but a facility for poetry and an interest in stage affairs was certainly not held in common by many Elizabethans answering to the cognomen. In fact, family tradition could very well be a determining factor—according to the immemorial English point of view—to justify such a remarkable departure by the Thomas Edwards of 1593.

I would also venture to suggest that he was probably the Thomas Edwards who is recorded as a scholar of Queen's College, Cambridge, from which he received the degrees of B.A. in 1579 and M.A. in 1582. Queen's was the college at which Edward de Vere (then known by the title of Lord

Bulbeck) originally matriculated as an "impubes" fellow-commoner (before his ninth birthday) in November, 1558. Thomas Edwards of Queen's, according to the Dictionary of National Biography, became in 1618 Rector of Langenhoe, Essex, one of the parishes in Lord Oxford's native county.

And now for a final piece of authenticated documentation from the public records, which indicates a relationship between members of the Edwards family and that of the poet Earl of Oxford, continuing from the days of Richard Edwards, the playwright, on into the period immediately succeeding the publication of Shakespeare's First Folio.

It is to be found in the records of the Exchequer of James I, filed in *The King's Remembrancer*, No. XVI, where are listed "Licenses to pass from England beyond the Seas." Under date of "23 Oct. 1624" appears this entry:

George Parsons, 24, silkweaver, resident in Hackney (the London suburb where the 17th Earl of Oxford had his home during the final decade of his life) to the Leager (Lowlands) about c'ten his affaires with ye Earle of Oxford (the poet's son, Henry de Vere, 18th Earl). In the room of this partie went on(e) Richard Edward(s) 68, resident in Hackney, whose pass was made & dated in (for) Nov. 1624.

This Richard Edward(s) who accompanied Parsons to the Lowlands on "*affaires with ye Earle of Oxford*" appears to have been born about 1556. In point of years, therefore, he could have been a son and namesake of the 1523-1566 playwright Edwards, whose literary and dramatic activities overlap and notably highlight those of the youthful Edward de Vere with constructive significance.

Whether the Thomas Edwards who wrote the 1593 commentary on Lord Oxford as "Shakespeare" was closely related to this 1624 Hackney resident has not yet been determined. But, while it is reasonable to argue that the author of "L'Envoy to Narcissus" had believable opportunities to acquire personal knowledge of Oxford's career as most powerful concealed poet-playwright of the age, no evidence of any associations of any type can be found to connect the Stratford-on-Avon native personally with a single person named Edwards throughout his entire lifetime.

Another Disputed Authorship

By HAROLD FELDMAN

THE HISTORY of early Spanish literature discloses an authorship dispute which has interesting similarities and contrasts to the Shakespeare case. The question is: Who wrote *Lazarillo de Tormes*? This brief fiction is not only the original of the picaresque novel and the first work in plain and unaffected Spanish prose, but a masterpiece of 16th century civil life.

For over three hundred years the writer of the novel was supposed to be Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (1503-1575). Mendoza, like the Earl of Oxford, was descended from the oldest, ablest nobility. Precociously gifted, he also completed university training at an early age. Having mastered Latin, Greek and Arabic, he went on to perfect himself in ecclesiastical, civil and military law. Serving with the Spanish armies in Italy, he made good use of his leisure in attending lectures by the great Renaissance historians and philosophers. He also collected many Greek manuscripts. As Governor of Siena, he represented the Emperor Charles V at the Council of Trent. When, at the age of fifty, he returned to Spain, Philip II treated him so shabbily that he retired to Granada and the immense library he had installed there. He became not only the *beau ideal* of Iberian scholars, but—again like Oxford—the patron of scholars. The chronicles of Josephus were first printed complete from his manuscript copies. In his last years he wrote the fascinating *Guerra de Granada*, modeled upon Sallust, which did the Moors such justice that it could not be printed until long after his death.

Those very qualities of the courtier, soldier and scholar—the same qualities which distinguish Edward Earl of Oxford from Shakespeare of Stratford—finally convinced Spanish critics that Mendoza was the least likely of known writers of the day to have created the lowlife rogueries of *Lazarillo*. The little book abounds in monstrous, but amusing, perversions of grammar, style and plot, while the classical knowledge implied is meagre. Above all, the work shows such familiarity with the disreputable street life of Salamanca and Toledo, down to its most intimate details, that it seems strange today that anyone should ever have credited a great intellectual such as Don Diego with its composition. Characterizations

drawn from the prideful gentry and high nobility are conspicuous by their absence. While the book appeared in 1554, there is evidence that it was written at least a decade or two earlier. It was not included in any collection of Mendoza's signed works, nor did his biographers mention it after his death. Every reference to Don Diego as the author, as in the case of Stratford Will, is posthumous. Nevertheless, for some three hundred years the professors spoke of Mendoza as the anonymous author of *Lazarillo de Tormes*.

However, the obstacles to realistic literary research in Spain do not appear to be buttressed by such vested interests as those which bar the Oxford movement. Moreover, it is noteworthy that, as the Mendoza-Lazarillo theory began to collapse, it was English rather than Spanish scholarship which seems to have been the more reluctant to be guided by the facts. For instance, Sir Clements Markham, author of that excellent work, *The Fighting Veres*, to explain the early writing of *Lazarillo*, says Mendoza wrote the book as a boy, and explains its vivid details of vagabond life as the imaginings of the little aristocrat! He gives the aristocrat fanciful acquaintance with the shifts and dodges of Iberian slum-dwellers just as all approved Stratfordians credit lower-middle-class William with a faultless gift for evoking the emotional reactions, etiquette and speech of the Tudor nobility.

The authorship of the Spanish picaresque classic has not yet been determined with certainty, although Mendoza is no longer seriously considered in this connection. Many scholars now grant probability of authorship to Sebastian de Orozco who spent his life collecting adages and common folklore, reporting in rich detail incidents such as enliven *Lazarillo's* adventures in Toledo and elsewhere. The next favored candidate is Lope de Rueda, a popular dramatist of the times, whose recorded life presents many remarkable parallels to incidents in *Lazarillo*. The first English translation bears the name of David Rowland and the date 1586 on the title-page. It is dedicated to Sir Thomas Gresham, the great merchant-adventurer, who is mentioned by editors of *The Merchant of Venice* as the man whose career the author had in mind when he drew the character of Antonio. We are also told by competent authority that Sir Thomas had personal dealings with the literary Earl of Oxford, and during the 1570's handled some of the Earl's more profitable investments.

One of the best known incidents in *Lazarillo* is alluded to in Act II, Scene 1 of *Much Ado* when Benedick says:

"Ho! now you strike like the blind man; 'twas the boy that stole your meat, and you'll beat the post."

Indeed, many famous Spanish scholars such as Dr. Joseph de Perott, the late Martin Hume, Editor of the Spanish Papers in the Public Record Office, and others, have been convinced that the Bard had an extensive knowledge of Spanish literature—which he read in the original versions. Their evidence is too extensive to detail here, but it is convincing enough for all but the most stubborn of Stratfordian pundits who deny every obvious accomplishment which they feel is inconsistent with the illiterate background of their idol. Maybe it is too much to hope that the parallels we have pointed out between the disputed authorship of the masterpiece of Spanish vernacular and the authorship of the great English plays and poems will add one more little beam to the searchlight of truth Oxfordian workers have erected.

THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP QUARTERLY

—A Continuation of the NEWS-LETTER—

VOL. XIX SUMMER, 1948 No. 2

President

Louis P. Bénézet, A.M., Ph.D.

Vice-Presidents

James Stewart Cushman Flodden W. Heron
T. Henry Foster Mrs. Elsie Greene Holden

Secretary and Treasurer

Charles Wisner Barrall

Official organ of The Shakespeare Fellowship in the U.S.A., the QUARTERLY is the only publication now printed which is devoted chiefly to the perpetuation of documentary evidence that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford (1550-1604) was the real creative personality behind the plays and poems of "Mr. William Shakespeare."

Meetings of The Shakespeare Fellowship for educational and allied purposes will occasionally be held, in which members will be asked to cooperate. Membership dues are \$2.50 per year—U.S.A. money—which sum includes one year's subscription to the QUARTERLY. Special rates of subscription to the publication which do not include membership in The Fellowship may be arranged for student groups and libraries.

The Shakespeare Fellowship executives will act as an editorial board for the publication of the QUARTERLY, which will appear four times a year, i.e., in January, April, July and October.

News items, comments by readers and articles of interest to all students of Shakespeare and of the acknowledged mystery that surrounds the authorship of his works, will be welcomed. Such material must be of reasonable brevity. No compensation can be made to writers beyond the sincere thanks of the Editorial Board. Articles and letters will express the opinions of their authors, not necessarily that of The Shakespeare Fellowship as a literary and educational corporation.

The Editors
The Shakespeare Fellowship
Quarterly

Telephone
PLAZA 5-1127

17 East 48th Street,
New York 17, N. Y.

Some Unusual Words in Shakespeare

COLLECTED BY HENRY DAVIDOFF

Editor and Compiler of *The Pocket Book of Quotations* (1944) and *A Book of Proverbs* (1946)

It is surprising that though Shakespeare is said to have employed about 20,000 words in all his works, there are no more than two hundred or so that are not in modern use. Most of these will be found in the following list. Of course, there are hundreds of words used by Shakespeare in meanings that are different from those in English today. Thus "addition" may mean "title" in some cases. These words are not included here.

A

ABODEMENTS forebodings. *Hen. VI*, Pt. 3, IV, 7.
 ABY to atone, *Mid.-S. N. D.* III, 2.
 ACCITE to summon, *Tit. And.*, I, 1.
 ACTURE performance, *Lov. Comp.* 185.
 AFFY to betroth, *Hen. VI*, Pt. 2, IV, 1.
 AGLET-BABY a small figure cut on the point of lace,
Tam. of S. I., 2.
 AGNIZE to confess, *Oth.* I, 3.
 ALLOTTERY portion, *As Y. L. It.*, I, 1.
 AMERCE to fine, *R. and J.*, III, 1.
 ANTRE a cavern, *Oth.* I, 3.
 "AROINT THEE!" be gone, *Macb.* I, 3.
 ATOMY atom, *As Y. L. It.*, III, 2.

B

BALLOW a cudgel, *Lear* IV, 6.
 BAVIN made of brushwood, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 1, III, 2.
 BEGNAW to gnaw, *Rich.* III, 1, 3.
 BERGOMASK a rustic dance, *Mid. N. Dr.*, V, 1.
 BETEEM to allow, *Ham.* I, 2.
 BEWRAY to disclose, *Lear* II, 1.
 BIGGEN a nightcap, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 2, IV, 5.
 BILBO a Spanish rapier, *Merry Wiv.*, I, 1.
 BISSON dim sighted, *Cor.* II, 1.
 BONA-ROBA a harlot, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 2, III, 2.
 BOTS small worms in horses, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 1, II, 1.
 BRACH a bitch hound, *Lear*, I, 4.
 BRAWL (sic!) a French dance, *Lov. L. L.*, III, 1.
 BUNG a pick-pocket, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 2, II, 4.

C

CADDIS worsted lace, *Wint. T.*, IV, 2.
 CALIVER a musket, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 1, IV, 2.
 CALLAT a trull, *Oth.* IV, 2.
 CARLOT a peasant, *As Y. L. It.*, III, 5.
 CATLINGS fiddle-strings, *Tr. and Cr.*, III, 3.
 CAUTEL stratagem, *Ham.* I, 3.
 CESS ("Out of all cess") immoderately,
Hen. IV, Pt. 1, II, 1.
 CHAPE the metal end of a scabbard, *All's Well*,
 IV, 3.
 CHARNECO a kind of wine, *Hen. VI*, Pt. 2, II, 3.
 CHEWET a chough (or a pie), *Hen. IV*, Pt. 1, V, 1.

CITAL account ("recital"), *Ibid.* V, 2.
 CITTERN a guitar, *Lov. L. L.* V, 2.
 CLINQUANT sparkling (with gold or lace),
Hen. VIII, I, 1.
 CLOUT the bull's eye of a target, *Lov. L. L.*, IV, 1.
 CORANTO a lively dance, *All's W.* II, 3.
 CORKY shrivelled, *Lear* III, 7.
 CRANTS [cf. Ger. "Kranz"] a garland, *Ham.* V, 1.
 CRARE small fishing-boat, *Cymb.* IV, 2.
 CRESSET portable beacon, *All's W.*, Pt. 1, III, 2.
 CULLION a base fellow, *Hen. V*, III, 2.
 CUTTLE a bully, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 2, II, 4.

D

DARRAIGN to set in order, *Hen. VI*, Pt. 3, II, 2.
 DAUBERRY false pretense, *Mer. W.* IV, 2.
 DERN secret, *Peric.* Prolog.
 DOUT to extinguish, *Hen. V*, IV, 2.
 DOWLAS coarse linen, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 1, III, 3.
 DRAB a strumpet, *Ham.* II, 2.
 DRAFF dregs, *Mer. W.* IV, 2.
 DUCDAME nonsensical burden of a song,
As Y. L. It., II, 5.
 DUP to open ("to do ope"), *Ham.* IV, 5.

E

ESCOT to pay for, *Ham.* II, 2.

F

FADGE to turn out, *Lov. L. L.*, V, 1.
 FAP drunk, *Mer. W.* I, 1.
 FERE consort (wife), *Tit. And.*, IV, 1.
 FIGO an expression of contempt, (with thumb be-
 tween second and third fingers),
Hen. V, III, 6.
 FLEWED with hanging chaps, *Mid. N. Dr.*, IV, 1.
 FLUXIVE flowing with tears, *Lov. Compl.* 50.
 FOURRA an expression of contempt,
Hen. IV, Pt. 2, V, 3.
 FRUSH to bruise, *Troil. & Cr.*, V, 6.
 FUBBED OFF put off with excuses,
Hen. IV, Pt. 2, II, 1.
 FULLAM kind of false dice, *Mer. W.*, I, 3.
 FUST to grow fusty, *Ham.* IV, 4.

G

- GAD a pointed instrument, *Tit. And.* IV, 1.
 GALLIARD a lively dance, *Tw. N.* I, 3.
 GALLIMAUFRY hotch-potch, *Wint. T.*, IV, 4.
 GALLOW to scare, *Lear* III, 2.
 GALLOWGLASSES foot soldiers of Ireland,
Macb. I, 2.
 GARBOIL uproar, *Ant. & Cl.* I, 3.
 GECK a dupe, *Tw. N.* V, 1.
 GEMINY a pair, *Mer. W.* II, 2.
 GEST the period of stay, *Wint. T.* I, 2.
 GIB a tom-cat, *Ham.* III, 4.
 GIMMORS contrivances, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 1, 1, 2.
 GLEEK to scoff, *Mid. N. Dr.*, III, 1.
 GLIB to geld, *Wint. T.*, II, 1.
 GRAYMALKIN spirit in the shape of a cat, *Macb.* I, 1.
 GRIZE a step, *Tw. N.* III, 1.
 GUST taste, *Tw. N.* I, 3.

H

- HEBENON the yew tree (?), *Ham.* I, 5.
 HENT a grip, *Ham.* III, 3.
 HOY a small coasting vessel, *Com. of E.*, IV, 3.

I

- IMMANITY savageness, *Hen. VI*, Pt. 1, V, 1.
 IMPONED laid as a wager, *Ham.* V, 2.
 INKLE coarse tape, *Lov. L. L.* III, 1.

J

- JUNKETS sweetmeats, *Tam. of S.*, III, 2.
 JUVENAL a youth, *Lov. L. L.*, I, 2.

K

- KAM crooked, *Cor.* III, 1.
 KEECH a lump of tallow, *Hen. VIII*, I, 1.
 KERN foot soldier of Ireland, *Macb.* I, 2.
 KIBE a sore on the heel, *Temp.* II, 1.
 KICKY-WICKY a spirited horse, or mistress,
All's Well, II, 3.
 KICKSHAWS a trifle, *Tw. N.* I, 3.
 KNAP to break off short, *Mer. of V.* III, 1.

L

- LAVOLT a dance, (like a waltz), *Tr. and Cr.* IV, 4.
 LEER complexion, *As Y. L. It.* IV, 1.
 LEET a manor court, *Tam. of S. Induct.*
 LOCKRAM a coarse linen, *Cor.* II, 1.
 LOGGATS a game like bowls, *Ham.* V, 1.
 LOWN a base fellow, *Oth.* II, 3.
 LYM a bloodhound, *Lear* III, 6.

M

- MACULATION stain, *Tr. and C.* IV, 4.
 MAMMET a doll, *Rom. and J.* III, 5.
 MAMMOCK to tear in pieces, *Cor.* I, 3.
 MODULE a mould, *All's W.* IV, 3.
 MOLDWARP a mole, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 1, III, 1.
 MOY a small coin, *Hen. V*, IV, 4.

- MURE a wall, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 2, IV, 4.
 MUSET the track of a hare, *Ven. and Ad.* 683.

N

- NEAF a fist, *Mid. N. Dr.*, IV, 1.
 or NEIF
 NOUSLE to nurse, *Peric.* I, 4.

O

- OEILLADES amorous glances, *Mer. W.* I, 3.
 OUCHES settings of jewels, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 2, II, 4.
 OUPHES goblins ("elves"), *Mer. W.* IV, 4.

P

- PALLIAMENT a robe, *Tit. And.* I, 1.
 PANTLER servant in charge of pantry,
Wint. T., IV, 2.
 PASH to smite, *Tr. and Cr.* II, 3.
 PAVIN a stately dance, *Tw. N.* V, 1.
 PEISE to weigh down, *Mer. of V.* III, 2.
 PELTING paltry, *Mid. N. Dr.* II, 1.
 PERIAPTS amulets, *Hen. VI*, Pt. 1, V, 3.
 PFLCHER a scabbard, *Rom. and J.* III, 1.
 POMANDER a ball of perfume, *Wint. T.* IV, 4.
 POMEWATER a large sweet apple, *Lov. L. L.* IV, 2.
 PRENZIE demure, prim, *Meas. for M.*, III, 1.
 PRINCOX a saucy fellow, *Rom. and J.* I, 5.
 PRODITOR a traitor, *Hen. VI*, Pt. 1, I, 3.
 "PROFACE" "Much good may it do you!"
Hen. IV, Pt. 2, V, 3.

- PUGGING thievish, *Wint. T.*, IV, 3.
 PUISNY unskillful, *As Y. L. It.* III, 4.
 PUNTO a stroke in fencing, *Mer. W.* II, 3.
 PUTTOCK a kite, *Hen. VI*, Pt. 3, III, 2.
 PUZZEL a drab, *Ibid.* Pt. 1, I, 4.

Q

- QUAT a pimple, *Oth.* V, 1.
 QUEAN a wench, *Mer. W.* IV, 2.
 QUOIF a cap, *Wint. T.* IV, 4.

R

- RABATO a kind of ruff, *Much Ado*, III, 4.
 RAMPALLIAN a term of abuse, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 2, II, 1.
 RERE-MICE bats, *Mid. N. Dr.* II, 2.
 RIGGISH wanton, *Ant. and C.* II, 2.
 ROYNISH coarse, *As Y. L. It.* II, 2.
 RUDDOCK the redbreast, *Cymb.* IV, 2.
 RUBESEY a rude fellow, *Tam. of S.* III, 2.

S

- SACKBUT a trombone, *Cor.* V, 4.
 SCRIMER a fencer, *Ham.* IV, 7.
 SESSA an exclamation urging speed, *Lear* III, 4.
 SHENT scolded, *Tw. N.* IV, 2.
 SHIVE a slice, *Tit. And.* II, 1.
 SHOTTEN having shed its roe, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 1, II, 4.
 SHOUGHS shaggy dogs, *Macb.* III, 1.
 SNEAP a reprimand, *Hen. IV*, Pt. 2, II, 1.

SOLIDARE a small coin, *Tim. of A. III*, 1.
 SPLENITIVE impetuous, *Ham. V*, 1.
 SPRAC lively, *Mer. W. IV*, 1.
 SQUINY to look askint, *Lear IV*, 6.
 STANIEL a kind of hawk, *Tw. N. II*, 5.
 STOCCADO a thrust in fencing, *Mer. W. II*, 1.
 STOCKISH insensible, *Mer. of V. V*, 1.
 STOVER fodder for cattle (in winter), *Temp. IV*, 1.
 SWINGE to beat, *Tam. of S. V*, 2.

T

TARRE to set on dogs to fight, *Tr. and Cr. I*, 3.
 TERCEL the male goshawk, *Ibid. III*, 2.
 TESTRIL a sixpence, *Tw. N. II*, 3.
 TILLY-FALLY an exclamation of contempt,
Hen. IV, Pt. 2, II, 4.
 TOAZE to disentangle (as wool), *Wint. T. IV*, 4.
 TUCK a rapier, *Tw. N. III*, 4.

V

VAWARD the vanguard, *Hen. V, IV*, 3.
 VENTAGES apertures, *Ham. III*, 2.

W

WALL-NEWT a lizard, *Lear III*, 4.
 WANION ("With a wanion") with a vengeance,
Peric. II, 2.
 WAWL to cry as an infant, *Lear IV*, 6.
 WHIFFLER an official who went before a proces-
 sion to clear the way; *Hen. V, V*, chor.
 WITTOL a contented cuckold, *Mer. W. II*, 2.
 WOMBY hollow, *Hen. V, II*, 4.

Y

YARELY briskly, *Temp. I*, 1.

Libel Suit Grows Out of Fellowship's Annual Meeting

AN UNSCHEDULED OCCURRENCE at our Annual Meeting held April 30, 1948 in the auditorium of the N. Y. Genealogical Society, started a chain of events which has resulted in the filing of a libel suit by our Secretary against an executive of the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D. C.

The distractions and extra-curricular work occasioned by pursuit of this legal cause has hindered pursuit of THE FELLOWSHIP'S business with normal efficiency. Hence the deplorable delay in getting out the QUARTERLY during the past year, for which dereliction apologies are hereby made.

The Annual Meeting started auspiciously enough. Mrs. Arthur F. Schermerhorn was our hostess, and due to her excellent management, more than two hundred attended, including members and guests.

Talks were heard on various aspects of the Oxford case. President Benezet opened with a vigorous address in his best style. He was followed by Mr. Siegfried Hartman, well known member of the New York bar and an Oxford advocate of long standing. Mr. Charlton Ogburn then covered a number of constructive points effectively; while Mr. Barrell closed the meeting with an illustrated account of direct connections between Ben Jonson and Oxford's children.

It was in the midst of Mr. Hartman's speech that a gentleman guest of mature years arose and began a denunciation of the Oxford arguments as unworthy of credence. With dramatic emphasis he declared that he knew they were false because he had been so assured in a letter from a real authority.

When finally quieted, the interrupter identified himself as Mr. Meredith Underhill, a teacher of Shakespeare, and a direct descendant of the Underhill who sold the New Place property to William of Stratford. Mr. Geoffrey Hellman of *The New Yorker*, who was present, and whose version of Mr. Underhill's startling remarks is the highlight of a report of the meeting in the May 15th issue of *The New Yorker*, quotes them as:

"I have a letter from the President of Harvard College stating that all this stuff is bunk."

The "stuff" would thus appear to be the Oxford evidence in general.

But when interviewed later, Mr. Underhill declared that he had been misquoted regarding the alleged statement by "the President of Harvard," and that the "letter" he referred to had been written him by Dr. Giles E. Dawson, Curator of Books and Manuscripts at The Folger Library. The Dawson letter, then produced by Mr. Underhill, does indeed contain statements which would seem to justify Mr. Underhill's outbreak at our meeting. In particular, it charges Mr. Barrell with having "doctored up" the X-ray and infra-red analytical negatives which he made some years ago of two "life portraits of Shakespeare," owned by the Folger Library. The graphic under-surface evidence indicating Lord Oxford as the original subject of these "Shakespeare" paintings which Mr. Barrell published in an article for *Scientific American Magazine* is thus branded as fraudulent. In answer to this charge, Mr. Ogburn on July 1st entered suit against Dr. Dawson on behalf of Mr. Barrell, claiming malicious libel, and asking damages in the sum of \$50,000.