

The Shakespeare Fellowship News-Letter

APRIL 1953

★

EDWARD DE VERE THE SEVENTEENTH EARL OF OXFORD.



From the portrait at Welbeck Abbey. Presumably the one painted in Paris by an unnamed Flemish painter in 1575 just before Lord Oxford's 25th birthday and sent to his wife about March of that year. Reproduced by kind permission of His Grace the Duke of Portland.



From the portrait painted by Marcus Gheeraerts about 1586, when Lord Oxford was 36. Reproduced by kind permission of His Grace the Duke of St Albans.



"Man clasping a hand from a Cloud." Miniature painted by Nicholas Hilliard in 1588. The colouring, as in the Welbeck portrait, is: fair skin, hazel eyes and chestnut hair. Enlarged and printed in reverse for clearer comparison with the known portraits of EDWARD DE VERE, THE SEVENTEENTH EARL OF OXFORD. This portrait, painted when the Earl was 38, in the year of the Armada, is identified by Mrs. Kathleen Le Riche as a portrait of "Shakespeare". The inscription "Attici Amoris Ergo" Of Attic Love Therefore has a special significance for an English dramatist. Now at the Victoria and Albert Museum, and reproduced by their kind permission. Crown copyright. A similar portrait was formerly at Castle Howard. See inside for details.

The Shakespeare Fellowship News-Letter

APRIL 1953.

★

NOTICES

On Tuesday, 21st April, 1953, at 8 p.m., Dr. John R. Mez (who for a second time will receive a most cordial welcome from the Fellowship on his visit to England) at Bedford College, Regent's Park will give a lantern lecture illustrating the case for Edward de Vere as Shakespeare. All members of the Shakespeare Fellowship are urged to attend and to bring with them as many friends as possible.

On Thursday, 23rd April, the Annual Dinner will be held at the English Speaking Union, Charles Street, Berkeley Square. Time: 6.45 p.m. for 7.30 p.m. Tickets, price 15/-, should be obtained from the Treasurer.

On Saturday, 25th April, Mr. William Kent, F.S.A., will conduct a Shakespeare Ramble on behalf of the Fellowship. The party will meet outside Blackfriars District Station at 2.45 p.m. It will be free to members; non-members one shilling.

EDITORIAL NOTES

MARJORIE BOWEN

The death in December 1952, as the result of an accident, of Mrs. Gabrielle Long, better known as "Marjorie Bowen," was a sad loss to the Shakespeare Fellowship. Once, members will recall, she gave an address to a large audience at the City Literary Institute on her conversion to the Oxford case. There also she presided over a discussion between the Baconian, R. L. Eagle, the Editor of the *News-Letter*, and Miss S. D. Neill. On another occasion she presided for the Editor when he was lecturing at Conway Hall.

There was a long obituary notice in *The Times* but, of course, no mention of Mrs. Long's heresies, which were religious as well as literary. She published well over a hundred books, commencing with *The Viper of Milan*, a remarkable production for a girl of seventeen. Her autobiography, *The Debate Continues* (1939), revealed a hard upbringing and a most trying experience with her first husband, but she was writing all the time. Best known as "Marjorie Bowen," other pseudonyms of Mrs. Long were "George R. Preedy" and "Joseph Shearing." Under the former name she wrote a biography of John Knox. Miss Dorothea Crompton truly said in a letter to *The Times*:

"Her success was both instantaneous and phenomenal. She never looked back, and her

capacity for work was immense, resulting in an enormous output, but her innate modesty was never touched by adulation."

Lt.-Col. M. W. Douglas, one of our former Presidents, sent the Editor the following tribute: "Owing to the sad death of Mrs. Gabrielle Long, the Fellowship deeply regrets the loss of a valued member and eloquent supporter of the cause of Edward de Vere, Lord Oxford as the main author of the Shakespearean works. Members who attended our Dinners will remember her presence more than once on the right of the President as the distinguished guest. On one occasion Mrs. Long stated her views as a member briefly and to the point. It was difficult to realise in the quiet charm of her personality the authoress of so many volumes of history, fiction and general literature, with a command of modern languages. I sent Mrs. Long a copy of my book *Lord Oxford and the Shakespeare Group*. She replied as follows:

'Thank you so much for sending me a copy of your book; I am buying some other copies to send to possible converts; I have tried in vain for years to interest people in this subject and to get some publicity for it; but it seems hopeless. I do think that this neglect is a disgrace to British scholarship. You put the case in a masterly manner and I do not see how anyone could fail to be convinced who has an open mind. (I should have written before but I have been in hospital with a broken arm.)

Again thank you, I remain yours sincerely,
(signed) GABRIELLE LONG.'

I wrote to tell her of the progress of the book, notably its inclusion in the library of the Oxford Union, but my letter remained unanswered.

The above letter of the 4th August speaks for itself and Gabrielle Long will be remembered as a firm believer in the Oxford-Shakespeare case, and a loyal and devoted friend of the Fellowship."

Admiral Holland, our present President, also sent an appreciation.

THE "NEWS CHRONICLE" AND "SHAKESPEARE"

MORE GUYING OF SHAKESPEARE HERETICS

Mr. R. J. Cruikshank, Editor of the *News Chronicle*, has published a charming little book entitled *The Humour of Dickens*, the occasion being the jubilee of the Dickens Fellowship. There is a Foreword which—on Dickens—is admirable. Strangely, however, Mr. Cruikshank saw fit to drag in Shakespeare, of whom obviously he knows but little.

"There are moments when one wishes that as little was known about Dickens, the man, as is known about Shakespeare, the man. There is at least one good thing about the infatuated partisans who believe that Bacon wrote Shakespeare's plays, or that Lord Oxford did, or Lord Pembroke, or the Lord High Executioner. They do drive us back to the poetry, even if it is only to hunt through it for cryptograms, or code messages to the secret service popped in by Sir Francis Walsingham. More people to-day might be actually induced to read *David Copperfield* and *Little Dorrit* if instead of contemplating Dickens as a remarkable medical case history we could have rousing brawls in the Athenaeum or National Liberal Club as to whether Mr. Gladstone or Queen Victoria, or Charles Darwin, or General Booth really wrote the novels. We might at least concede that it seemed highly probable from internal evidence that Mr. Gladstone wrote the first chapter of *Martin Chuzzlewit*, and that only Queen Victoria could have produced the death of Little Paul in *Dombey and Son*."

The Editor wrote to Mr. Cruikshank, putting such questions as he would offer if he were in a position to cross-examine. There was a courteous acknowledgment, but no replies were forthcoming. It was suggested that "infatuated partisans" applied more to Stratfordians than to any others.

Suggestions made were for a debate between the Editors of the *News Chronicle* and the *News-Letter*—a large audience would have been assured—or two letters of a thousand words each supporting our respective causes. These suggestions were all declined.

Mr. Alan Dent, the *News Chronicle's* dramatic critic, also expressed strong confidence in the Stratford case. It was also suggested that he might welcome a debate, but there was again nothing doing in this direction.

A MAGNUS OPUS

This Star of England, by Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn, a book of nearly 1,300 pages, is indeed a monumental work. Henceforth it will be paired with Thomas Looney's *Shakespeare Identified*. It is reviewed by Mr. Percy Allen and Dr. J. R. Mez on other pages.

A few editorial comments are perhaps permissible.

The writers are not up to date regarding the Stratford bust. Like Spielmann, they refer to Vertue's engraving and assume that the bust was altered in 1747. As has been shown in these columns, the bust, much as it now is, is in an edition of Shakespeare's works published in 1725.

It is not fair to Sir Edmund Chambers to quote him as saying that "the last word for a self-respecting scholarship can only be that of nescience" as if he was writing of the whole career of

the Stratford Shakespere. He was referring only to his boyhood and youth.

On a passage in *As You Like It*, where Rosalind says: "I will weep for nothing like Diana in the fountain" we are told: "During 1586 Bartholomew Yonge translated Montemayor's *Diana* which tells of a clear 'fountain' into which she continuously wept." It is much more likely an allusion to a fountain in Cheapside, erected in 1596, which Stow said "consisted of a curious-wrought tabernacle of grey marble, and in the same alabaster image of Diana, and water conveyed from the Thames prilling from her naked breast". The authors, very generously, have presented two copies to the Shakespeare Fellowship and these can be borrowed from the library. Postage is 1/3d.

NOTES AND QUERIES

The Editor of the *News-Letter* had a whole page article in *Notes and Queries* on the Shakespeare bust arising out of a contribution which, like the Ogburns, implied that the alteration was made in 1747. There has been no reply. Another contributor discussed the identity of W. H. without mention of William Hall. The Editor's contribution on this subject has also gone unanswered.

Lord Wakehurst

The Shakespeare Fellowship congratulates John de Vere, Lord Wakehurst, on his appointment as Governor of Northern Ireland. It will be remembered that in 1950 he spoke at the Quatercentenary Dinner. Subsequently he joined the Fellowship.

Shakespeare Bibliographies

Dr. J. R. Mez has prepared a most useful bibliography of Oxfordian and anti-Stratfordian books.

The National Book League has published a much longer bibliography—1/6 for non-members. It was an agreeable surprise to find the last section headed "Authorship Controversy", all the preceding titles being of orthodox works. There are six books mentioned: *The Case for Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, as William Shakespeare*, by Percy Allen; *Bacon is Shakespeare*, by Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence; *Sous le masque de "William Shakespeare"*, by Abel Le Franc; *Shakespeare Identified*, by J. T. Looney; *Alias William Shakespeare*, by C. W. Sykes; *The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, 1550-1604, from Contemporary Documents*, by B. M. Ward. The last book is described as "The case for Oxford, presented in detail by a leading exponent." The Editor of the *News-Letter* wrote to the National Book League, pointing out that this was most inaccurate, as only half a page of a lengthy volume was devoted to the theory, and even then not endorsed by the author, although he did accept it. He suggested that in substitution, in any reprint, should be Lt.-Col. Douglas's book, recently revised. The reply from Miss Muriel

Harris, Publications and Exhibitions Officer, was as follows:

"As you know the Book List was compiled for the National Book League by the Society for Theatre Research under the general editorship of Katharine J. Worth. She still feels that the book *The 17th Earl of Oxford, 1550-1604, from Contemporary Documents*, by B. M. Ward, a leading authority, was a useful one to include and adds that the book which you recommend would be considered for inclusion should there be a further edition."

The Editor replied that it seemed evident that Miss Worth had not seen the book she recommended, but was guessing. There was no reply.

Another Shakespeare Portrait!

The following is an extract from *The Listener* of 2nd October, 1952.

"G. WILSON KNIGHT, a Shakespearean scholar, who has been giving a series of lectures in South Africa, recently saw in a country house not far from Cape Town a collection of pictures belonging to Captain D. M. K. Marendaz, an art connoisseur, and in this collection is a work said to be a contemporary portrait of Shakespeare. Mr. Wilson Knight broadcast in 'Radio Newsreel' a description of this painting which, he said, may be the only life portrait of Shakespeare in the world.

"'Captain Marendaz,' he said, 'is a collector of wide experience, and is satisfied that the portrait was executed about the time of Shakespeare's maturity. He attributes it to a Dutch artist, who was in England at the time, Paul van Somer. Van Somer has left us a portrait of the wife of Shakespeare's patron, the Earl of Southampton; and there would be nothing surprising in his having done a portrait of Shakespeare.'

"Our knowledge of Shakespeare's appearance is derived from two works made soon after his death. One is the memorial bust at Stratford, and the other is the engraving by Droeshout, set as frontispiece to the first collected edition of Shakespeare's works, known as the First Folio, in 1623. Both were accepted by people who knew and respected Shakespeare as accurate enough to be allowed to perpetuate his memory. But they did not, it seems, appear until after his death, and both remain unsatisfying in that their expressions are lifeless. The main features which they have in common are the high forehead and the dome-like formation of the partly bald head."

The Editor of the *News-Letter* wrote to the Editor of *The Listener*, pointing out that G. Wilson Knight seemed quite unaware that the Stratford bust had been altered, and giving briefly the story. The letter was not published.

A New Shakespeare Magazine

The Editor has received several issues of *The Shakespeare Newsletter*, now in its second volume.

It is published in New York, the editor being Mr. Louis Marder. It is orthodox, but space is given to heresy, and Miss Gwynneth Bowen's pamphlet on *The Tempest* has been reviewed in its columns. It is published at 749 Franklin D. Roosevelt Dr., New York 9, and the subscription (for six issues) to English subscribers is 9/-, which should be sent to the London agent, William Dawson & Sons, Canon House, Macklin Street, London, W.C.2.

One of the contributors is Mr. Calvin Hoffman who, when in this country recently, got a good press for his theory that Christopher Marlowe was the real "Shakespeare". He did not seem to be aware that this theory was to be found in Gilbert Slater's *Seven Shakespeares*, published so long ago as 1931; neither was Alan Dent, the *News Chronicle* dramatic critic.

MEETINGS

The Annual General Meeting was held at the Alpine Club, 74 South Audley Street, at 3 p.m., on Saturday, 11th October, 1952, the Chair being taken by Mrs. M. H. Robins. Apologies were received from the President, Rear-Admiral H. H. Holland, and two of the Vice-Presidents, Mr. T. L. Adamson and Miss Eggar. About twenty-four members were present.

The Minutes of the last meeting and the Secretary's Report were read by Miss Bowen; the Treasurer's Report by Mr. Atkinson; and a Report on the work of the Study Circle by Miss Wainwright.

The President and Vice-Presidents were all unanimously re-elected.

The office of Hon. Treasurer having been left vacant by the resignation, owing to ill-health, of Mr. J. Shera Atkinson, Mr. Adamson, who had been deputising for him, was unanimously elected, and a vote of thanks was proposed to Mr. Atkinson. All other officers were unanimously re-elected.

Since the last Annual General Meeting, Mr. John Russell had resigned from the Committee owing to pressure of other work, and Miss Wainwright had been co-opted. The Chairman said no other nominations had been received, and the Committee was then unanimously re-elected.

The first lecture of the season was given on 8th November, by Mr. Ridgill Trout, who, under the title, "The Development of the Stratford Myth", traced the beginnings of bardolatry, and entertained us with a description of the first Stratford Festival, arranged by David Garrick.

On 13th December, Mr. E. R. Wood, a somewhat "unorthodox" Baconian who had kindly accepted an invitation from the Fellowship, gave a talk on "The Problems of Being a Heretic", treating the subject in a general way, not from a specifically Baconian point of view.

On 10th January, 1953, Mr. Percy Allen gave us his own reminiscences and a résumé of the work of the Fellowship in a lecture entitled—"Thirty Years an Oxfordian".

7 years
4/12

As a result of illness, Mr. Kent was unfortunately not able to prepare his lecture on "Lord Burghley and 'Shakespeare'" for 14th February, and though he attended the meeting, his place was taken by Miss Bowen, whose subject, "Hamlet: an Abstract of the Time," dealt, among other things, with the parallels between Lord Burghley and Polonius. The Hon. Secretary's paper was heard with great pleasure by the members.

A PORTRAIT OF SHAKES-PEARE?

BY KATHLEEN LE RICHE

Turning over the pages recently of a book on the Tudor Renaissance, my eye was arrested by the reproduction of a miniature by Nicholas Hilliard (1537-1619), goldsmith, carver and portrait painter to the court. It was entitled "Man holding a hand from a Cloud", and inscribed Attici Amoris Ergo, Ano. Dm. 1588. This note was printed underneath: "The identity of the subject and the meaning of the motto are unknown. A similar miniature . . . was formerly at Castle Howard. Transferred from the British Museum (Sloane No. 272). Damaged."

After close examination and comparison with the known portraits of Edward de Vere, the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, my first impression was strengthened that this Unknown Man was indeed the man the Shakespeare Fellowship acknowledge as the greatest poetic genius of all time. But I preferred to do some impartial research before submitting it for the consideration of other members. I went to the Victoria and Albert Museum where the original miniature is held and made a note of the colouring, which is: (allowing that red has faded from the older miniatures) fair skin, chestnut, curly hair, and hazel eyes. The hat is blue-grey, its feather white. The collar is white; the doublet is grey-black with warm, grey highlights giving the impression of rich, near-black velvet.

Some correspondence with the Duke of Portland who owns the "Welbeck" portrait, brought this information from Mr. J. R. D. Needham, his ex-Librarian who, visiting Welbeck Woodhouse, very kindly refreshed his memory by examining the portrait of Edward de Vere again. His letter to me is dated 15th February, 1953, and he writes: "I looked at the picture this morning, and think (allowing for slight browning caused by the varnish) that he is shown as having a fair skin and hazel eyes. Only one small tuft of hair shows, but it is clearly chestnut—i.e. bright brown with a suggestion of red."

Ten years before Mr. Looney published his discovery identifying the true Shakespeare, and thirty years before Mr. Wisner Barrell published in *The Scientific American* his X-ray photographic proof that the "Ashbourne" portrait of Shakespeare in the Folger Library, Washington, is a disguised portrait of Edward de Vere. Mr. M. H.

Spielmann described the "Ashbourne" portrait in *The Connoisseur* of April-May, 1910:

"The doublet is of black, or grey-black, material approximating to velvet with warm grey lights on the folds . . . Upon the left-hand thumb, a member of unusual length, is a gold signet ring . . . The hands are delicate in form, and correspond in character to the elegance and ideality of the head with its refinement, its almost effeminacy of expression, plaintive, sad and rather startled in its look. It is the presentment of a handsome, courtly gentleman, well formed and of good bearing, and apparently of high breeding, thoughtful and contemplative."

The date of the miniature, 1588, when Edward de Vere was 38, was the year when his first wife, Anne Cecil, died. It was also the year of the Armada when Lord Oxford occupied such a prominent place in the victory procession when he most probably "bore the canopy". It was two years after the Queen had made over to him by Privy Seal Warrant a grant of £1,000 a year "unto our right trusty and well beloved Cousin the Earl of Oxford". This is of especial importance in view of the slanderous accusations of Lord Oxford's treacherous "friends" during 1580-81. These facts, as well as the delicate elegance of the slender feminine hand from the cloud, give validity to the assumption that the hand clasped in the miniature is that of the Queen.

The motto, "ATTICI AMORIS ERGO" in Hilliard's white writing against the blue background (Of Attic love therefore) may symbolise Lord Oxford's fidelity to the Queen and her protection of him. A further significance is suggested by the deep affinity our poet had with the greatest dramatists of ancient Athens. Even a third implication may be understood when we remember Lord Oxford's intellectual tie with Cicero. Cicero's letters to his friend Atticus show how dependent he was on his friend's esteem. During Lord Oxford's youth, rhetoric was one of the important studies at Cambridge University where he matriculated as an "impubus" fellow-commoner of Queen's College. In the account book for the years 1569-70 we find that Lord Oxford was charged with the purchase of "Tully's and Plato's works in folio". Tully was the name by which, until recent times, scholars referred to Marcus Tullius Cicero. In the Charles Arundel accusations against Edward de Vere, we read, "His third lie" (parodied in *As You Like It*) concerns "certain excellent orations he made, as namely to the state of Venice, at Padua, at Bologna . . . being reputed for his eloquence another Cicero." The unusual word "Ergo" used for "therefore" is found a number of times in the plays of Shakespeare.

Although the Dictionary of National Biography lists Edward de Vere as one of those whose portrait Nicholas Hilliard painted, the sources I have been able to consult so far fail to reveal one. The art

authorities I have been able to question agree to this and assert that no miniature known to them resembles the known portraits of Edward de Vere. Also, they state that Hilliard painted personalities, not masks, and that John Donne was right when he wrote in his poem "The Storm" (1597):

"A hand or eye
By Hilliard drawne, is worth an historie
By a coarse painter made."

Dr. Dale wrote to Lord Burghley about the portrait painted of Lord Oxford when he was in Paris (the Welbeck one) in 1575 by the Flemish painter: "It seemeth to us that he hath done my Lord of Oxford well."

We may therefore compare these portraits with confidence, as well as the St. Albans portrait painted two years before the miniature, and the "Ashbourne" portrait painted later, possibly, since it bore the Trentham coat of arms of Lord Oxford's second wife.

The similar miniature, formerly at Castle Howard, differs in that the background is of a brighter blue and the hat is purple. It is at present in the possession of Viscount Morpeth. Oxfordians will find interest in the fact that it comes from Castle Howard—in the North Riding of Yorkshire—which was built for the third Earl of Carlisle, one of the titles of the Howard-Norfolk family. Edward de Vere's aunt, Frances, herself a writer of verse, married Henry Howard, the Earl of Surrey whose *Songs and Sonnettes* were published in 1557. In *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (I. i.) it must be this very publication to which Slender refers when he says: "I had rather than forty shillings, I had my book of Songs and Sonnets here."

It would be reasonable to assume that these two miniatures by the same artist were originally in the possession of Lord Oxford as well as of his cousins, the Howard family.

In Volume 1 of Horace Walpole's *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (Wornum Edition, page 173) I find this information:

"Hilliard's portrait, done by himself, at the age of thirteen, was in the cabinet of the Earl of Oxford . . . Charles I had three portraits of (Queen Elizabeth) by him; one a side face in the clouds."

This appears to me to be important evidence of Edward de Vere's relationship with this miniaturist. I would point out, however, that Walpole gives Hilliard's birth as 1547, whereas Hilliard's self-portrait dated 1574 gives his own age as 37. We must assume, therefore, that the self-portrait above referred to was when Hilliard was 23, not 13, and Edward de Vere, a later patron, 10 years of age.

(NOTE.—I am indebted to Mr. Francis L. Nichols, a member from Oxford, for the making of the blocks.)

"THIS STAR OF ENGLAND": "WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE"; MAN OF THE RENAISSANCE

By DOROTHY AND CHARLTON OGBURN,
New York, 1952, Coward McCann Inc.,
1,297 pp., \$10

(Reviewed by Percy Allen)

For all Oxfordians it is an encouraging and significant fact that recently, within a few months, there have been published, in New York and London respectively, two outstanding books on Oxford as *Shakespeare*—one of some 1,300 pages, containing about 600,000 words, and the other, by Lt.-Col. M. W. Douglas, of 160 much smaller pages, reviewed elsewhere in this *News-Letter*.

The large volume, *This Star of England*, with the sub-title, *William Shakespeare, Man of the Renaissance*, by Dorothy and Charlton Ogburn, of New York, is an impressive achievement to which I cannot do full justice in this brief review; for it recounts, at length, Edward Oxford's life, while showing, at the same time, the integral connection of the plays and poems, not only with that life, but with the Earl's own intimate personality, and the personalities of those who, from Queen Elizabeth downwards, make up the *milieu* in which de Vere lived and worked. An examination of the poems, and a chapter shewing, conclusively, the impossibility that Will of Stratford could have written the sonnets, or the plays, are also included. There are several full-page illustrations, and a good index and bibliography.

Much erudition, and long research, have gone into this work; and most of the more important Oxfordian books, from *Shakespeare Identified* onwards, have been, with due acknowledgment, laid under contribution, together with many orthodox books, whose authors have made, unwittingly, statement after statement which have been, by the Ogburns, quoted with devastating effect, against obstinately held Stratford beliefs. Many orthodox books of recent years have hurt their case far more than they have helped it.

Bearing in mind, as we must, that his plays and poems were contrived by Oxford with the deliberate, and typically Elizabethan, intention of creating a mystery, while simultaneously providing clues for its elucidation, throughout the Folio plays and the poems, it follows inevitably that every individual interpretation of these vast and complex matters must, and will, differ widely in detail, though with general agreement upon the case, as a whole. With this outstanding book before me, I am in basic accord, especially in regard to its more crucial chapters, such as those on *Hamlet* among the plays, and the sonnets among the poems; and I include in this concurrence that vitally important conclusion, that the "Fair Youth" of the sonnets was the third Earl of Southampton, Lord Oxford's son by Queen Elizabeth—an identity arrived at by myself ne

later than 1929. I agree also with the Ogburns' opinion, that very much of the matter in the Earl's output is aimed directly at his Queen; thus providing the only solution of the "dynastic" quality of, e.g., many of the sonnets, as even orthodox commentators have admitted—a fact which is meaningless, if those wonderful poems were by Will of Stratford.

It is argued in this book, that, excepting parts of *The Tempest* Oxford wrote practically the whole of the Shakespearean output; but with that view I am at variance. I believe that Raleigh had a large hand in *The Tempest*—Ariel is an anagram for "Ralei"—and, after long investigation, I am satisfied that Fletcher after Oxford's death in 1604 played a large part in completing, with clever imitations of Oxford's style, most of the plays of the late period, including *Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, *Winter's Tale* and *Henry VIII*. The two first-named of these contain many ingenious imitations of well-known passages in well-known Shakespeare plays—a device that Oxford himself would never have fallen to. *Cymbeline* alone—a profoundly symbolical play—contains imitations of no less than a dozen of the best known Shakespearean plays! Nor can I agree that *Titus Andronicus* is by Oxford; but am with Dugdale Sykes in holding it to be mainly Greene's. The play is a kind of semi-burlesque travesty of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, with all the exquisite beauties of that masterpiece, including the classical capital, the forest, the black baby, and the two pairs of lovers, all ruthlessly turned to hideous, though dramatically effective, ugliness.

But enough of disagreement! Upon page after page of this book the reader will find many close links between Oxford's own life and his plays, all culled with much learning and skill from many sources, and building up a case unassailable in its main arguments; though sometimes I think the authors have been somewhat too venturesome, especially in the matter of early Oxfordian versions of the plays; but I would particularly commend the use, made too seldom by Oxfordians, of Jonson's plays, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, and *Cynthia's Revels*, which contain conclusive evidence that Ben, as also Chapman, knew the whole story of Oxford's secret authorship, and of his relations with the Queen, all of which I have detailed in several of my books. The Ogburns pay well-deserved tribute to Miss Winstanley, whose books show so conclusively the influence of Scottish and French history upon *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *King Lear*.

Well, here is my space at an end; and I have had to omit very much that ought to be said. *This Star of England* is a book which will repay careful study, and should be prominent upon all our reference shelves. What sort of reception it has had in the U.S.A. press, I do not know; but how any hitherto orthodox scholar, with honest and open mind, can read this volume from cover to cover, and then, looking one in the face, deny

that Shakspeare is here dethroned and that the case for Oxford has *not* been established passes my comprehension. No theory of multiplied coincidences makes sense. There is unity in truth; none in untruth. The orthodox commentators in face of the two books above mentioned will no doubt, continue their now habitual policy of silence, thus preferring victory to truth; and consequently condemning themselves, in the end, to achieve neither. I add, in conclusion, my opinion that there was some degree of secret collaboration between Lord Oxford and Will Shakspeare.

(Reviewed by Dr. J. R. Mez)

This is the most comprehensive book so far on Edward de Vere as "Shakespeare". Charlton Ogburn is a well-known New York lawyer, a graduate from Harvard University. Mrs. Ogburn is a highly cultured lady, expert in literary matters and a brilliant authoress. Both have for many years, as members of the New York Shakespeare Fellowship, devoted much time and energy to the study of the Oxford thesis, and have now been able to present their findings in this well-written and monumental work, culminating in a magnificent, composite portrait of the poet Edward de Vere. The authors have, of course, been able to draw on the numerous, but widely scattered and practically unobtainable, findings of such students of this fascinating subject as J. T. Looney, Greenwood, Ward, Allen, Holland, Douglas, Phillips, Rendall, Eva T. Clark, etc., which they have enriched by many discoveries and daring new interpretations of their own. They have cleverly and adroitly adopted the methods of some of their forerunners in using the poet's own words, in hundreds of citations, as their mouthpiece; they have penetrated into his sensitive nature, his noble character, his hopes and disappointments, his devotion to his country and his Queen, his profound education, his philosophy, his amours, and the betrayals to which he was subjected; they have followed this ambitious and noble courtier from his prime to his premature retirement through all phases from triumph to disaster, and thus depict their tragic hero, as if in a tremendous romance, in such a way as they have come to see and to sense him, after having followed his footsteps with profound compassion and understanding.

It is inevitable that a book of this novel and pioneering character should impress the reader at first with a certain sense of awe and amazement: exacting critics may find many passages too subjective or personal in their interpretations or conclusions; some references may seem too far-fetched in their connotation, etc., but I should warn them not to smile too easily: when J. T. Looney had published his book, many people dismissed it with a very superior air!

In a controversy of this import there is bound to be disagreement of opinions: whether Lady Anne Vavasour was the "Dark Lady" of the

Sonnets, as the Ogburns claim, is hard to prove or to disprove. The same applies to the statement that the third Earl of Southampton was the son of Queen Elizabeth and the poet, as we are being informed, not quite for the first time. In the course of time, such questions as these will be clarified. There are other, many other, extravagant claims put forward in this book. But it may be well to leave criticisms of minor details to the others who still believe in William of Stratford.

For the moment, let us congratulate the Ogburns for their admirable work; we have every reason to be glad that a book such as this on the *de Vere* thesis could have been written at all and found a publisher of note, at a time when a whole world of antagonists is anxious to ignore or to defame Looney's great discovery.

"THIS STAR OF ENGLAND"

By G. W. PHILLIPS

The authors of this book maintain that a son was born to the Earl of Oxford and the Queen in June 1574, either at Havering or some place unknown. They support this chiefly by inferences from poems, especially Gascoigne's, and from plays.

The direct evidence offered (beginning at p. 821) is contained in Allen and Ward's pamphlet, to which reference should be made. They interpret it thus. In May 1574, the Queen's anxiety was due, not to "grave matters of State", as recorded, but to expectation of the birth of a child. She went to Havering of the Bower for the purpose of concealing that birth; and (they say) we do not know how long she stayed there, nor where she was until 28th June. Oxford's flight to the continent before 18th July was due, they think, to fear of the consequences of his misbehaviour.

Due consideration of the evidence, however, will show that the Queen's movements were, in fact, as follows:

- May Leicester told Shrewsbury that the Queen had, for many days, been much troubled about some weighty causes of State, and was doubtful what to do about them.
- May 10th Talbot wrote to Shrewsbury that on Saturday week (i.e. 19th-22nd May) the Queen was to go to Havering of the Bower, meaning to stay there till she began her progress to Bristol.
In the latter end of May she passed six days in retirement at Havering, and was meditating a longer progress.
- May 24th There was some talk of a progress to Bristol, but there was great opposition to her going so far. Hatton, being ill, wanted to go to "the Spawe" instead.
- June *She returned to Court.* This is evident, because (a) Talbot, "*here at Courte*" wrote to Shrewsbury that "Her Matie styrreth litell abroad". He could not say this if she was in Essex or on a progress; (b) Talbot and Leicester wrote, *from Court*, that she

remained sad and pensive during the month of June. They could not know this if she was absent; (c) She was afraid of some danger (to the State, presumably) arising during her absence, and therefore told Burghley, through Walsingham, not to wait upon her at Woodstock, as she had intended, but to stay in London; (d) Hatton now got leave to go to the Spaw, with Dr. Julio. If the Queen was away, he could not have done this; (e) She now dealt with a suit by Oxford, which she did not favour, "and hereupon his behaviour before her gave her some offence". Talbot, at Court, could know this only if the Queen and Oxford were also there. Probably the suit was for leave to travel. (To go from Essex to Bristol, it would in any case be necessary to pass through London, and certainly it would be from Havering, which is just beyond Romford.)

- July She began her progress to Bristol, and arrived there on 14th August.
- Aug. Oxford, returning, from his unlicensed absence abroad, joined her on her progress.
- Aug. He was pardoned, and attended her till 7th 16th September.

The matter, therefore, is quite simple. The Queen went to Havering for a short rest from her worries, and then returned to her duties till July. There is no vestige of evidence of the birth of any child, or of any connection of Oxford with the Queen, except that she refused his suit.

The authors next maintain that the son born to the Countess of Southampton in October 1573 was either a five months child, who died, or else illegitimate; and that the son of Oxford and the Queen was substituted for him, and became the third Earl, Henry Wriothesley. They base this on the following facts:

- June The second Earl was arrested for complicity in the Ridolphi plot. He was kept 1570 in the custody of Sir William More till October 1571.
- Oct. He was committed to the Tower. 1571
- April He was returned to the custody of Sir 1573 William More at Loseley. In July, he was released.
- Oct. The second Earl wrote to More that "this 1573 present morning" his "wife was delivered of a goodly boy".

On 5th May, 1573, his wife was permitted to visit him; but no evidence is given that this was the only time when she did so and the assumption that this was a five months child is contradicted by his father, who said he was "a goodly boy". The assumption that he died as a result of premature birth is therefore unfounded. We are not offered any record of his burial. Even if he were not the Earl's child, evidently the Earl accepted him (gladly, it would seem), and so he would not be illegitimate.

On the assumption (already shown to be false) that Oxford had a son by the Queen, one might well ask why she should choose as the keeper of her secret, and foster-father of her child, a Catholic nobleman who had just been imprisoned for complicity in a plot to dethrone her? And why, if the boy was not his own, should the Earl go out of his way to let More know it?

I will add two reasons (convincing to me) why Southampton cannot be the Fair Youth, whether he was the son of the Countess, or the (imaginary) son of the Queen. They are that the mother of the Fair Youth was certainly dead before the Sonnets were begun, and that he and the poet were living in the same home for a number of years. (See also Supplement to the *News-Letter*, April 1939.)

"LORD OXFORD AND THE SHAKESPEARE GROUP"

By LIEUT.-COL. M. W. DOUGLAS, C.S.I., C.I.E.

(Reviewed by T. M. Aitken)

The Fellowship is much indebted to one who might now be called our Elder Statesman for the publication of this book, the result of long and careful study of the evidence for and against practically all of those who have been put forward as possible authors of the Shakespeare literature.

Since our ex-President retired he has never ceased to keep up the keenest interest in the controversy, and in this book he shows that he is now a convinced groupist.

That the Folio plays are not the work of any one person seems now to be almost generally accepted. It is not long since Professors from nearly all over Europe met at Stratford to discuss six "doubtful" plays, and recently that pillar of orthodoxy, Dover Wilson, has broadcast his opinion that much of *Henry VI* was really the work of other dramatists. But after all, surely the first groupist was Ben Jonson himself. He undoubtedly knew the facts as to authorship, and in his subtle foreword in the Folio says:

"But stay I see thee in the Hemisphere
Advanc'd and made a Constellation there."

Surely this means a group of stars, and we all know that Ben Jonson was a master of "double entendre".

Is it not therefore reasonable to claim that Jonson was the first groupist, the greatest of these being our own first President, Sir George Greenwood, who summed up the case in his striking phrase—"Many pens and one Master Mind"?

This book is a summary of the case for a group with the Earl of Oxford as leader and, as the late Dr. Rendall said of an earlier edition, no other volume of the same compass provides so lucid and compact a résumé of the results so far obtained.

The case for Oxford being the author or editor of the Plays and Poems is put forward in such terms that any unbiassed reader is bound to be

impressed, and it might be added, will find it difficult to refute.

That some of those suggested by Colonel Douglas had any material share in authorship will of course be questioned, but that is only to be expected in the present state of our knowledge. As for the sonnets, that these were by Oxford personally and never for a moment meant for publication seems to be definitely proved beyond a peradventure.

The book has been brought up to date with the results of researches not only by scholars in this country but in France, America and elsewhere.

As one reader has put it, no serious student of the authorship problem can afford to be without a copy of this book for reference.

The author gives the traditional case very fairly, followed by the life and personality of Lord Oxford and the evidence in the poems, plays and sonnets.

As the *Morning Post* said of a previous edition, Colonel Douglas "performs his task with an admirable moderation and an absence of rancour", his appeal being to reason free from prejudice, and readers will find it hard to dispute the case for Oxford as the real Shakespeare behind the façade so skilfully built up by the sponsors of the First Folio, which has so successfully blinded our orthodox scholars ever since its publication in 1623.

The book has been printed in Oxford, and the distributors are Simpkin Marshall Ltd., 242 Marylebone Road, N.W.1.

The price is 8/6 from any bookseller or 8/10 by post.

"THE LIFE AND TIMES OF EDWARD ALLEYN"

(Reviewed by H. Cutner)

Under this title, Mr. G. L. Hosking has written an interesting and detailed account of the well-known actor and founder of Dulwich College. All who are students of the Shakespeare problem will find the book worth studying, if only to find out why Henslowe, who was Alleyn's father-in-law, never mentioned in his famous Diary the name of Shakespeare though, according to Halliwell-Phillips, Shakespeare had written a number of plays for Henslowe or his theatre: Mr. Hosking steers clear of such dangerous ground.

There are, however, two passages worth noting here for Oxfordians. Mr. Hosking, in the only reference he makes to the "unorthodox" position, tells us that, among other things, Shakespeare was very careless "or, more likely", ignorant of geography—and, as if it had never before been mentioned, gives us the usual comment made by Jonson about the men being shipwrecked in Bohemia. "Such lapses," says Mr. Hosking, "(and they are countless) would seem to confute the claim to the authorship of the plays made for Bacon, Rutland, Derby or Oxford." Thus all the books written in support of these claims are disposed of in a sentence. Yet, if Mr. Hosking would

go to some of the famous works of art, he would find the complete answer to his "confutation". Would he say, to give just one example, that Paul Veronese did not know that the guests at the Marriage Feast of Cana could not possibly have been dressed in Venetian costumes of the Renaissance? Did Veronese really care two hoots about this "anachronism" when he painted his masterpiece?

One of the queries most frequently put to Oxfordians is, why did not Oxford put his name to the plays if he wrote them? Well, without referring to Oxford, of course, Mr. Hosking gives us the reason: "The plays (including translations), written or produced during the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods numbered more than thirteen hundred, the work of some two hundred, dramatists. *Some were men of rank who preferred anonymity. Playwriting carried a certain stigma, it was the business for the most part of men who wrote for money. And to write for money, was degrading.* "To evaporate their thoughts in a sonnet" was the way of most noblemen and courtiers. "Letters were the ornaments of life, not a means of livelihood." [My italics.]

This paragraph might well have been written by an Oxfordian. That it was written by a stout orthodox defender of Shakepere (of Stratford) proves that even he has to admit the soundness of our reply to the ever-recurring question.

E.O.

The earth was shaken with a golden spear
 When sonnet, poem, and star-revealing play
 So burned an altar-heart that men revere
 Still wondering, the sin that knew not day.
 The mask, the mummer's robe, was unremoved,
 The world unknowing praised a barren stage.
 The lord of England, by his land beloved,
 In silence wrote and sealed his heritage.
 Men knew him not who, in the human mind
 Moved as a god, all frailty forgiven,
 And proffered to his only heirs, mankind,
 A hand in darkness on the road to heaven.
 Truth ever true will in the end unfold
 And even on the breath of pain be told.

T. C. H.

PROFESSOR ABEL LEFRANC

Born in 1863 near Noyon, in the north of France, Professor Abel Lefranc died in Paris in November last. His life had been one of constant literary labour, darkened by grievous losses, rewarded by high appointments: as a Professor to the "Collège de France" in 1904; as a Member of the "Institut" in 1927.

His indefatigable efforts and unerring flair led him to the discovery of important unpublished MSS. by Marguerite de Navarre, Maurice de Guérin, André Chénier, Ernest Renan.

After an exhaustive study of the early life of Calvin, he concentrated several years of his

attention on Rabelais. His leading principle has become that too much stress had so far been laid by romantic criticism on fanciful creation in a work of genius, overlooking the direct, if hidden, testimonies of the personal experience of the author.

The application of a new method of research on the works of Rabelais led Lefranc to a complete renovation of our intelligence of those texts. From 1915 onward he then tackled the Shakespearian problem. Very quickly convinced that no serious link did exist between the commonplace Stratford actor and the refined author of the immortal plays, Lefranc in several books and pamphlets stated his reasons for proposing William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby, as the most probable candidate to the Shakespearian succession. His attempts were pioneer work, often of course submitted to base attacks on the part of conceited incomprehension. He never would consent to lower himself to controversy on such terms. But his mind remained to the very last open to all serious, dispassionate argument. A collaboration of Derby with Oxford he never thoroughly discarded, and readily acknowledged that much remained to be found on the lines and through the methods he had so masterly and successfully advocated.

G. L.

The following article, by a member of the Shakespeare Fellowship in Capetown (formerly Professor at the University of California) had been accepted by the Editor of the *News-Letter* before the death of Professor Abel Lefranc had been announced.

THE SENSE OF SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS

By FRANK L. SCHOELL

Such is the title of a small but pregnant book, by Professor Edward Hubler, of Princeton University, recently published by the Princeton University Press. Its seven chapters deal with the main themes of the poet's concentrated meditation: love and lust, love and friendship, reputation, the fleetingness of life, beauty promised to decay and death, etc., and these themes are aptly related to kindred ideas expressed by the same writer in his dramatic works.

But the readers of this *News-Letter* will be chiefly interested in the Appendix, printed as a concluding chapter under the title "Evidence and Two Shakespearian Fallacies". One of these fallacies is, as could be expected, "Baconianism", somewhat oddly used by Mr. Hubler as a generic term to apply to "all persons who hold that the works of Shakespeare were written by someone else".

It cannot be claimed that Mr. Hubler fights that fallacy with altogether new or really murderous weapons. But it cannot be denied that he scores one or two palpable hits when he humorously asserts about "the Baconians of passionate

conviction by whom one is cornered at dinner parties and on shipboard", that "almost without exception they are not historians of any species, except in as far as they have become historians to support their belief".

So far so good, for it is probably true that the average "Baconian" (in Mr. Hubler's comprehensive meaning) has not, as a young man, gone through the same post-graduate scholarly training as the average Stratfordian university professor. And that can be a serious handicap in research.

But when Mr. Hubler descends to specific examples, he seems himself to forget that he is a trained historian relying only on ascertained facts. The particular "rebel" whom he had in mind when he mentioned the very few men "who were historical scholars before they were Baconians" is no other than Professor Abel Lefranc, the author of *Sous le Masque de William Shakespeare* (2 vol., 1919) and *À la découverte de William Shakespeare* (2 vol., 1945 and 1950). Indeed he assumes (p. 143) that there are two Lefrancs: the reputable historical scholar of before 1919 and the disreputable "Derbyite" of 1919 and after.

The trouble, the historical trouble, is that Professor Lefranc had been seriously shaken in his belief that the London actor wrote the Shakespeare plays long before 1919, i.e. at the time when he was giving a tremendous impulse to the study of such French Renaissance writers as Calvin, Rabelais and Marguerite de Navarre. The further trouble, the further historical trouble, is that even after Professor Lefranc turned publicly "Baconian" (1919) he continued to remain a reputed scholar in the field of Renaissance research. His students of the Collège de France and of the Ecole des Hautes-Etudes (Paris) continued flocking to his stimulating courses until he retired in 1937. He remained the erudite editor of the *Revue du XVI^e siècle* until 1933. His monumental edition of Rabelais was completed only in 1931. In 1938 he published a valuable book on Ernest Renan and another on *La vie quotidienne au temps de la Renaissance*. 1941 saw the publication of another study of his on the author of Jean de Paris . . . or does Mr. Hubler perhaps think that Professor Lefranc has two minds or two methods, a sound one when his research work keeps him south of the English Channel, and an unsound or amateurish one when his investigations take him to England?

But it would be unfair to take undue advantage of Professor Hubler's misinformation about Mr. Lefranc's scholarly credentials. The author of *The Sense of Shakespeare's Sonnets* has two great merits. First he has at least had the curiosity to read the first volume of Lefranc's *À la découverte* . . . And, second, he somewhat surprisingly agrees that the book is occasionally illuminating. This statement seems to imply that, even in the view of an orthodox Stratfordian, the non-conformist approach to Shakespeare of an intelligent non-Stratfordian can flash some new light on one or another facet of Shakespeare's work.

And that shows that Professor Hubler is a thoroughly honest scholar who is not unaware that there is ample room for some sort of co-operation between the two rival Shakespeare factions.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

SHAKESPEARE'S FAREWELL

Dear Sir,

Referring to some remarks of mine about J. T. Looney's chapter on *The Tempest*, Mrs. Le Riche says: "It is unwise to accuse those who follow Mr. Looney's careful deduction from facts as laying themselves open to the charge of wishful thinking."

In case of misunderstanding, let me say at once that I have not myself accused anyone of wishful thinking. I merely tried to point out that this was the obvious retort of the Stratfordians to an argument on which so much depends, and which itself relies upon the poetic perception (to borrow Mrs. Le Riche's own phrase) of one individual as against the poetic perception of others. I would not underestimate the importance of poetic perception, and do not deny that it was this faculty which led Looney to the discovery of Edward de Vere as a possible "Shakespeare", but, even to convince himself, he had to find grounds "more relative" or, as we should say, more objective than this. As far as his main theory goes, he found them in plenty, but there was one serious obstacle. He confesses that "it appears, at first blush, as if *The Tempest* were threatening the shipwreck of all our hopes and labours in the cause of Shakespearean authorship". After this he can hardly expect to be regarded as an impartial judge of the play, and—to revert to his own metaphor—we are all in the same boat. As Gilbert Slater says in *Seven Shakespeares* (p. 181): "Literary judgements are necessarily individual, we are all entitled to form our own, recognising that they have no validity except for those who happen to agree with us." I cannot agree with Mrs. Le Riche that Looney's arguments from the internal evidence of the play are founded on facts. They are founded on matters of opinion—inferior poetry, negative philosophy, etc.—and are unlikely to gain general acceptance. The one inescapable fact is that, having once accepted the orthodox date, Looney was compelled to say that the play was not by "Shakespeare" or abandon his whole case, for it is impossible to hold at the same time:

- (a) That Oxford was "Shakespeare".
- (b) That *The Tempest* is by "Shakespeare".
- (c) That *The Tempest* was written after Oxford's death.

It is true that Looney cites four authorities who placed *The Tempest* in, or before, 1604, but only to dismiss their arguments as untenable. The great majority of those who prefer to include the play in the canon naturally take this as strong confirmation of the orthodox date. If Looney,

with such an incentive for doing so, could not call it in question, they assume that it must indeed be unquestionable, which, from their point of view, is highly satisfactory. For them, the date presents no problem, but proves conclusively that Oxford was not "Shakespeare".

In support of Dr. Mez, I should like to say that if Looney had "closely read Professor Elze's arguments", it is surprising that he should have refrained from comment. His list of authorities for an earlier date is to be found in the *Variorum Shakespeare*. No doubt he checked the other three, but no clear reference is given, and he may not have succeeded in finding an English translation of Elze. Incidentally, Hunter did not maintain, as Mrs. Le Riche implies, that *The Tempest* was by a different author from the other plays—nor did Looney say that he did—but only that it was comparatively early work. He dates it 1596, too early in my opinion, even on the assumption of Oxfordian authorship.

Looney—all honour to him!—refused to "take refuge" behind his four authorities, but, by implication, he admits that his case would have been much stronger if he had been able to accept, and substantiate, their common conclusion—that *The Tempest* was written in, or before, 1604. Instead, he took the only remaining course compatible with being an Oxfordian and, in effect, staked his whole theory on the validity of his personal judgement on *The Tempest*. It was, for him, the inevitable course, but it was also a "disastrous" one. The disaster, itself, was not Looney's rejection of *The Tempest*, but the scholars' rejection of Looney.

May I add that Dr. Mez is quite right in stressing the negative, or neutral proposition that "there exists not a single convincing proof that Lord Oxford could not have been at least the main author". Once this is recognised, the question of whether *The Tempest* is, or is not, a genuine Shakespearean play ceases to be of vital importance to the main issue—i.e. the identification of "Shakespeare" as Oxford—and we shall be free to form our own literary judgements independently, without having either to recant as Oxfordians or face the charge of wishful thinking. Until it is recognised, many people will continue to regard the Earl of Oxford as disqualified, on *prima facie* grounds, from being the author of the "Shakespeare" plays in general.

GWYNNETH BOWEN.

Dear Sir,

In the last *News-Letter* of the Shakespeare Fellowship I was very interested in the review by J. R. Metz of my husband's book *George Gascoigne or Edward de Vere*. For the sake of accuracy I must say Mr. Kittle was never on the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin. He took his Bachelor's and Master's degrees at that University and as

you state did many years of research in the very fine library of that University.

Beside the book on Gascoigne he published *Edward de Vere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford* and *Edward de Vere and Shakespeare*. This last book was published after Mr. Kittle's death.

It is true the books are out of print but the publisher sent me what he had, perhaps one or two hundred altogether. The publisher had sent copies to many of the universities in this country. I would be glad to send a copy to any person desiring one. The price is three dollars and postage.

CHRISTY ANN KITTLE.
804 West 41st Street,
Minneapolis
Minnesota, U.S.A.

(*Edward de Vere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford*, has been added to the Shakespeare Fellowship Library.)

One of the most enthusiastic members of the Shakespeare Fellowship, Mrs. Kathleen Le Riche, gave a most successful lecture to the House of Arts Literature Circle at Chiswick in October 1952. Mrs. Le Riche was introduced to this circle by another and new member, Miss Helen Atkinson, who wrote to her as follows: "I take great pride in having introduced Edward de Vere to Chiswick via such an ambassadress as yourself." The conclusion of a good report in *The Brentford and Chiswick Times* is as follows: "House of Arts members were so interested in Mrs. Le Riche's lecture that many have decided to attend a future meeting of the Shakespeare Fellowship at its London premises."

Mrs. Le Riche contributed an admirable article to the *Essex Review* for October 1952, under the title "Shakespeare in Essex". Copies of this article can be obtained for a shilling from Mrs. Le Riche, Flat 25, Ten Palace Gate, W.8.

THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP.

Past Presidents :

LT.-COL. M. W. DOUGLAS, C.S.I., C.I.E.
PERCY ALLEN.

President :

REAR-ADMIRAL H. H. HOLLAND, C.B.

Vice-Presidents :

T. L. ADAMSON. WILLIAM KENT, F.S.A.
J. SHERA ATKINSON, LL.B. (LOND.).
MISS K. EGGAR, A.R.A.M. MRS. M. H. ROBINS.

Hon. Secretary : MISS G. M. BOWEN.

Asst. Hon. Sec. : MISS HILDA AMPHLETT.

Hon. Treasurer : T. L. ADAMSON.

6 Upper Cavendish Avenue, Finchley, London, N.3.

Hon. Editor of "News-Letter" : W. KENT, F.S.A.,
71 Union Road, S.W.4. (Mac. 2007.)

The Hon. Editor is always glad to receive MSS., newspaper-cuttings, letters, etc., for publication.