

REPORTS OF MEETINGS

The Annual General Meeting

13th October, 1956.

The Annual General Meeting was held at the Newman Centre, 31 Portman Square. The Chair was taken by the President, Mr. Christmas Humphreys, and just over twenty members attended.

The Minutes of the last Annual General Meeting and the Secretary's Report were read by Miss G. Bowen, the Treasurer's Report by Mr. T. L. Adamson, and the Report on the Study Circle and Library by Miss R. M. D. Wainwright.

The following officers were unanimously elected:
President: Mr. Christmas Humphreys, M.A., LL.B. CANTAB., J.P. *Vice-Presidents*: Mr. T. L. Adamson, Miss H. Amphlett, Mr. J. Shera Atkinson, LL.B. LOND., Miss K. Eggar, A.R.A.M., Mr. William Kent, F.S.A., Dr. John R. Mez and Mr. J. W. Russell. *Hon. Secretary*: Miss Gwynneth Bowen. *Assistant Hon. Secretary*: Miss N. Loosely. *Hon. Treasurer*: Mr. T. L. Adamson. *Hon. Librarian*: Miss R. M. D. Wainwright. *Joint Hon. Editors of the News-Letter*: Miss G. Bowen, Mrs. K. Le Riche and Miss R. M. D. Wainwright.

It was decided that, in addition to the Hon. Secretary, Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Librarian, the Joint Editors should all be ex-officio members of the Committee. The following members were then elected to the Committee: Mr. J. Shera Atkinson, Miss K. Eggar, Mr. J. W. Russell and Miss N. Loosely.

THE PLAYS OF CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE

By T. L. ADAMSON—14th November, 1956

In his splendid survey of Marlowe's poetic dramas from which he quoted many a "mighty line", Mr. Adamson showed by his deep perception and clear point, the character of Marlowe as revealed by his plays. They show Marlowe's passion for power and his ineptitude. When keeping to the plot of an original drama which he is translating and adapting, Marlowe is at his best. When he tries to invent a plot he fails, as in the *Jew of Malta* which has such a grandiose beginning but cataracts into the worst possible kind of senseless melodrama. Mr. Adamson thought *The Jew* was Marlowe's effort to imitate Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* which, as we think, was written by Lord Oxford not so long after he returned from Venice in 1576, thus preceding anything that Marlowe, fourteen years younger, could then have written.

From internal evidence of the plays, the essential differences between the two poets was stressed—*Marlowe*: pompous, bombastic, with nothing at the end of it, safe only when he adhered to a classical original—*Shakespeare*: courtly, witty, inventive in character, plot and word, with a

proud, ancestral background which no pseudonym could disguise, weaving an intricacy of social drama which was exemplified by no less than five distinct themes in *The Merchant of Venice* for instance, and always with deep human feeling, realistic imagery and with *humour*.

Four visitors came including Mrs. Dolly Wraight who had given the talk at the Old Vic, claiming Marlowe's authorship of Shakespeare's Sonnets, upon which she challenged Mr. Adamson. He replied with impressive factual evidence, showing how nearly the Sonnets reveal Lord Oxford's private life.

Mrs. Wraight insisted that only plays on the "Senecan Model" could have been acted at Court; therefore Lord Oxford, as a Court playwright, could not have been Shakespeare who, like Marlowe, broke away from the Senecan model and wrote plays for the common theatres. She put forward with some vigour, her view that a playwright can change *radically*, and that Marlowe, after his "exile" in 1593 (when it was supposed he was dead), developed humour, *not shown in the plays under the name of Marlowe*, by the tragic circumstances of his exile. It was then, Mrs. Wraight claimed, that Marlowe became the versatile, courtly writer, "William Shakespeare" who reflected his foreign travel in his plays. She cited one instance where a dramatist had changed. "Who could have believed", she said, "That Brecht (the German dramatist from Eastern Germany) could have developed from the feeble playwright he was in the U.S. to become the grandest exponent of Marxism?"

Mr. Adamson pointed out that a writer can develop the gifts and characteristics he has, but cannot grow those he has not; and that there is no inkling of a hint in Marlowe's works that he was imbued with the natural, unmistakable and *satisfying* genius of Shakespeare.

NOTE: Thomas Nash, in his preface to Robert Greene's *MENAPHON* wrote: "... yet English Seneca . . . will afford you whole *HAMLETS*; I should say *handfulls of tragical speeches*." Therefore, if the author of *Hamlet* was recognized in his time as the "English Seneca", was not the "Senecan model" played outside the court?

KATHLEEN LE RICHE.

THE UPSTART CROW

By GWYNNETH BOWEN—8th December, 1956

Miss Bowen began by reading a good deal of the context of the famous allusion to "The Upstart Crow" in "Greene's Groatsworth of Wit", of 1592, and cleared the ground by admitting that the attack is directed against the *players* in general, and one in particular . . . "who thinks himself the only *Shake-scene* in the country." She thought that the pun can hardly be a coincidence for, "in the same passage Greene parodies a line from *Henry VI, Part 3*:

O tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide.
This line, however, occurs in another Elizabethan play, *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke* or second part of *The Contention betwixt the two noble Houses of York and Lancaster*, published in 1595, and regarded by the first critics as an early version of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, by Shakespeare himself.

Miss Bowen showed that the question whether or no Greene intended to accuse Shakespeare of *plagiarism* is inextricably bound up with the relation between the *Contention* plays and *Henry VI* 2 and 3.

Critics have contended as to whether the former were Early Versions, or bad copies of the latter, or whether they were the work of Greene, Marlowe and Peele, and revised by Shakespeare in *Henry VI*

The opinion of modern orthodox scholars is chiefly represented by Peter Alexander and Dover Wilson.

The former argued, in a book published in 1929, called *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III* that the *Contention* Plays were memory versions made by travelling actors who had either lost or sold their books. According to his view Greene was merely jealous of a player turned playwright, and no charge of plagiarism was intended.

The latter critic—Dover Wilson, published an article in *Shakespeare Survey*, 1951, entitled *Malone and the Upstart Crow*, in which he established, by references to the Crow in the Fable, that Greene *must* have intended to imply "dishonest appropriation" by his charge. The Professor did, however, accept as proven Alexander's theory that the *Contention* Plays were later than their Shakespearean counterparts. He therefore postulated two lost source plays, by Greene and his friends, behind both *Henry VI* and the *Contention*.

In the last half of her lecture, Miss Bowen argued convincingly that it was the player from Stratford (Shaksper), who was "the incorrigible plagiarist", and can be identified as such, and as a "poet-ape" author, in other Elizabethan Plays, e.g. *Satiromastix* and *The Poetaster*.

"He would have been capable of bombasting out a blank verse, and, if he had acted in genuine Shakespeare Plays and had a good memory, he could have produced the 'stolen and surreptitious copies' now known as Bad Quartos, including *The Contention* and *The True Tragedie*".

R.M.D.W.

DEBATE

Oxford v. Derby 16th January, 1957.

This debate, in which Mr. A. J. Evans spoke for Derby and Miss Wainwright, Miss Bowen and Mr. Adamson for Oxford, was a bracing experience for Oxfordians, who are seldom challenged seriously on their own ground. It was an interesting and

important occasion. Mr. Evans' recently published and extremely readable book *Shakespeare's Magic Circle*, is a serious contribution, and all his three rivals are, of course, established authorities. In the circumstances a special procedure was by consent devised. It was agreed that, instead of a debate "at large", each side should draft and in its turn be prepared to answer three questions. The six questions were exchanged in advance. To each question was given 15 minutes, to include the answer, rejoinder from the questioner, reply to rejoinder, and summing up from the Chair. In the Chair, doing his best to be impartial, was your humble servant.

To start the proceedings the Chairman tossed for first innings. Oxford won, and the Captain, Miss Wainwright, after inspecting the wicket put Derby in to bat. So Mr. Evans had to answer the first question; and after him the questions went alternately.

The questions were

For Mr. Evans, who spoke for Derby:

1. If Derby, who lived till 1643, was the main author of the plays, why did he not prevent the almost innumerable errors in the First Folio?

2. Why did the regular issue of the Quartos that began in 1597, cease abruptly in 1604, the year of Oxford's death?

3. How do you account for the fact that play after play reflected so closely the incidents and emotions of Oxford's life, which would have had no personal significance if Derby were the author? The factual knowledge of events in some of the plays which Derby admittedly had could have been known by Oxford.

From Mr. Evans:

1. Mr. Adamson was asked to explain how the following epigram of John Davies, addressed in 1611

To our English Terence, Mr. Will Shakespeare: could apply to Oxford when Davies said he might have been a King and in 1611 spoke to him as a living man.

Some say good *Will* (which I in sport do sing)
Had'st thou not plaid some kingly parts in sport
Thou had'st bin a companion for a *King*;
And beene a King among the meaner sort.

Some others raile; but raile as they think fit,
Thou hast no railing, but a reigning wit:

And honesty thou sew'st which they do reape;
So to increase their stocke which they do keepe.

2. Miss Wainwright was asked to explain how John Donne's sonnet, dedicating his 6 Holy Sonnets to E of D and written about 1618, could be addressed to de Vere, though manifestly addressed to "Shakespeare".

See Sir, how the sun's hot masculine flame,
Begets strange creatures on Nile's dirty slime
In me your fatherly yet lusty Rhyme
(For these songs are their fruits) have wrought
the same;

But though the engendering force from whence
they came

Be strong enough and nature doe admit
Seaven to be born at once, I send as yet
But six; they say the seaventh wave hath still
some main;

I chose your judgement, which the same degree
Doth with her sister, your invention, hold
As fore these drossie Rymes to purifie
Or an Elixir, to change them to gold.
You are that alchemist wich always had
Wit, whose one spark could make good things
of bad.

3. Lastly Miss Bowen was asked a long and detailed question on *Love's Labour Lost*, in which many links with Derby were mentioned especially Richard Lloyd's 9 Worthies.

To do justice to the replies in this brief report would manifestly be impossible, and anything less than a full report would be unfair. Suffice it to say that each side left the stricken field with an added respect for the foeman's steel. A full summary of the replies was called for by Captain Broadwood and will be available in the Fellowship Archives. The thanks of the Fellowship are due to all four champions to whom we are indebted for a most instructive and enjoyable evening.

JOHN W. RUSSELL.

JOURNEY THROUGH SHAKESPEARE'S ITALY

BY KATHLEEN LE RICHE—16th February, 1957.

On Saturday afternoon at the Poetry Society's Rooms, 33 Portman Square, Mrs. Kathleen Le Riche gave a scintillating lecture on her travels through Northern Italy—following in the footsteps of Lord Oxford on his Grand Tour of 1575-6. The purpose of this journey was to try to discover how Shakespeare-Oxford revealed his tourist's observations in his plays, wherein it is just these cities of Northern Italy that are so predominantly reflected.

Visiting Milan, which Lord Oxford (at that time a Protestant) decided to by-pass owing to the rigours of the Catholic Bishop, Mrs. Le Riche proceeded to Verona and thence to Mantua, Padua and Venice.

At Verona she saw the so-called "Juliet's tomb", and gave a vivid description of a young Italian woman kneeling there, touching the sarcophagus where Juliet's head would have lain, with a handkerchief which she then pressed to her brow and lips, then crossed herself reverently. This shows the deep emotion still evoked by the story of Romeo and Juliet, written first in Italian, but made world famous by Shakespeare.

Of Padua, the famous seat of learning in the 16th and 17th centuries, Mrs. Le Riche recalled that Edward de Vere's tutor, Sir Thomas Smith, had been a Professor at the University there, which could well explain "The great desire" he had, "to

see Fair Padua, Nursery of Arts", as Lucentio says in *The Taming of the Shrew*.

At Mantua she saw the paintings on the walls of the Palazzo Ducale, done by the only artist mentioned by Shakespeare—Julio Romano. There also, in this home of the Gonzaga family, she saw this painter's frescoes of the Fall of Troy, recalled by Lucrece in Shakespeare's poem. In the archives "written in choice Italian" is the "tale of the Gonzago" referred to by Hamlet.

At the Palazzo del Té, a mile away, she saw more paintings by Julio Romano, because it was this palace of pleasure which he rebuilt after his own design and decorated throughout with the assistance of a few pupils, for the Duke Federigo, who there, shortly afterwards, entertained the Emperor Charles V.

Of particular interest was her discovery of a book in Venice, wherein is the "legend that was passing through Europe" in the 1570's, in which Lord Surrey (Oxford's uncle) was referred to as "breaking spears for the fair ladies whose charms he had sung in his poems", and further that the Earls of Essex, and Oxford, and Sir Philip Sidney followed in his wake as spearbreakers.

Mrs. Le Riche also spoke of Professor Lambin's discovery that the Friar Patrick of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, was an actual personality—to wit, Father Patrick O'Healey, who, she learned, was martyred in County Mayo in Ireland in 1579. He would in all probability, have been known to Lord Oxford, by repute or otherwise, as they were travelling the same terrain in Italy, at the same time. But Friar Patrick would not have been known to other Shakespearean claimants; certainly not to Derby who was very young and untravelling when Father O'Healey died.

HILDA AMPHLETT.

OUTSIDE LECTURES

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

The centenary of the birth of J. M. Robertson—man of letters, politician and intensive critic of Shakespeare's text—was celebrated last year, and, on 11th November, 1956, Mr. H. Cutner addressed an audience at the South Place Ethical Society, Conway Hall, W.C.1, on the subject of his theory concerning the authorship of the works of Shakespeare.

Mr. Robertson was referred to as the "foremost disintegrator", because he judged that the styles of seven of Shakespeare's contemporaries (Marlowe, Peele, Nashe and Greene, etc.) were recognizable in the plays. He was not interested so much in the author—the man: he was unswervingly Stratfordian as he showed so clearly in his famous contests with the great anti-Stratfordian, Sir George Greenwood, K.C.

Mr. Howell Smith, one time Assistant Director of the Victoria and Albert Museum, from the audience, referred to the book of Georges Connes (translated under the title of *The Shakespeare Mystery*) wherein the author arrived at the conclusion that there was no Shakespeare problem.

There was no serious challenge from the audience to Mr. Cutner's claim that "Shakespeare" was the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford.

Mr. William Kent, making one of his too rare visits to London from the country, was in the audience, and supported the speaker by his sound, factual knowledge.

LONDON SOCIETY

On 5th December, 1956, several members of the Fellowship attended, as guests of the London Society, a lecture by Mr. W. A. Eden, the Chief Architect of the Ancient Buildings Department of the London County Council, on Brooke House, Hackney—now, unfortunately, demolished. From 1596 to 1609, the house was the property of Lady Oxford, the second wife of the 17th Earl. The Earl was buried at Hackney in 1604, and probably spent his last years there. An account of the lecture with several illustrations was published in the *Journal of The London Society* (No. 336, February, 1957), and the Survey Committee of the London County Council is to issue a much fuller account in the course of the year.

MARLOWE SOCIETY

On 1st March, 1957, Miss Hilda Amphlett gave a lecture on the Oxfordian Theory to the Marlowe Society at Chislehurst. This society was founded in September, 1955, to carry out further research into the life and works of Christopher Marlowe. The lecture was given at the house of Mr. Clifford Russell, the Hon. Organising Secretary, and Mr. Thomas Bushell was in the Chair.

Miss Amphlett began by saying that she did not want to go over old ground in talking about William Shaksper of Stratford-upon-Avon, but she would like to mention some of the absurdities involved in the belief that this country-town tradesman and little-known actor could have been the author of the great plays and sonnets of "Shakespeare." She spoke of the lack of evidence that he ever attended the Stratford Grammar School, or indeed any school; of the illiteracy of his parents. She pointed out how little we know of his life in London—and that little not to his credit. On his return to Stratford, he spent his time trading in malt and suing for small debts. How could such a man have written the greatest plays in the English language? Miss Amphlett then went on to describe the enthralling search carried out by Mr. J. T. Looney for the Author

whose personality is revealed so clearly in the plays and sonnets, and how this search led him to Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford. She drew a fascinating picture of the life and character of de Vere, giving some of the parallels in the works of "Shakespeare". The Oxfordian Theory, which was new to most of the audience, was received with much interest.

ABERDEEN

We hear from Mr. Thomas Henderson Murdoch, M.A., L.G.S.M., L.R.A.M., A.D.B., of Aberdeen, that he has given two Lecture Recitals during the winter on the authorship question, based largely on *Shakespeare Identified*, by J. T. Looney and *Who Was Shakespeare?* by H. Amphlett. Much interest was aroused among the audience.

DUBLIN SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY

During the past winter, the Study Circle of the Dublin Shakespeare Society had a series of five lectures on the authorship problem from the Oxfordian point of view. The first two lectures were given by Mr. W. G. Malvin, one of the founders of the society, a convert to the Oxfordian theory, and the other three by Mr. Kennedy-Skipton, a member of the Shakespeare Fellowship and a disciple of the late Mr. G. W. Phillips. Two Sonnet Readings were also given under the direction of Mr. Kennedy-Skipton. The sonnets were read by Mrs. Otway Freman (late of the Old Vic), Miss V. Kelly, Miss M. O'Grady and Mr. Justice H. A. McCarthy, in the order arranged by Mr. Phillips, with a biographical commentary by Mr. Kennedy-Skipton and echoes from the plays by other readers. By an odd coincidence, both these Sonnet Readings took place within a month after the Sonnet Reading at the Old Vic (see article, p. 8), which was designed to show that the author was Christopher Marlowe.

The Dublin Shakespeare Society was founded thirty-five years ago. It has about a hundred members, many of whom are now Oxfordians.

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

On 13th December, 1956, Mr. Arthur Stanwood Pier, of Boston, Massachusetts, read a paper advocating the Oxfordian case to the Massachusetts Historical Society. Mr. Pier is a well known author and educator, and the paper was listened to closely by about thirty members of the society, many of whom in the discussion that followed, and subsequently, expressed much interest in the theory.

PSYCHOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN HAMLET

And the Authorship Question

By R. M. D. WAINSWRIGHT

It has often been suggested by Shakespeare critics that in the character of *Hamlet* we seem to get closer to Shakespeare himself than in any other of his creations.

Bradley, for instance, in his essay on *Shakespeare The Man*, says: "If, again the question were put to us, which of Shakespeare's characters reveals most of his personality, the majority of those who consented to give an answer would answer *Hamlet*", and he concludes his essay with these words:

"And if this is more than fancy, it may explain to us why *Hamlet* is the most fascinating character, and the most inexhaustible, in all imaginative literature. What else should he be, if the world's greatest poet, who was able to give almost the reality of nature to creations totally unlike himself, put his own soul straight into this creation, and when he wrote *Hamlet's* speeches wrote down his own heart?"

In the character and life of Oxford, however, we can see that *Hamlet*, so far from being totally unlike his creator, resembled him in the most fundamental relationships and circumstances of his life. And this, of course, is one of the strongest arguments for Oxfordian authorship.

At the core of Oxford's psychology we get what Looney calls "Father-Worship", together with those conflicting feelings towards his Mother, resulting from her re-marriage with a Usurping step-father, shortly after his beloved father's death, occurring when he himself was only twelve years old.

Ward tells us that "it is safe to assume that his mother's second marriage offended her son, who saw in it perhaps a slight, not only to the memory of his father, but to the great de Vere lineage to which he was so proud to belong."

John de Vere himself had been a Captain in the French wars, and it will be remembered that *Horatio* first addresses the Ghost as "that fair and war-like form, recalling Gervase Matthew's description of the 16th Earl's famous boar hunt, which begins: "By reason of this war-like disposition".

Would any of the other candidates for Shakespeare authorship—William of Stratford, Francis Bacon, or Derby, have had this kind of hero-worship for their fathers? And do we find that those fathers are likely prototypes for "the buried majesty of Denmark?"

John Shakespere was certainly not a soldier, and his pretensions to nobility are shown to have been false by Sir George Greenwood. They are probably derided in several Elizabethan Plays, and Lodge and Greene's *Looking Glass for London* contains a passage which surely suggests a parody of the Ghost in *Hamlet*.

One of the characters in it—*The Clowne* is talking to "a gentleman of Ninevie" in an ale-house, and he says: "A gentleman! good sir, I remember you well and all your progenitors: your father bare office in our town . . ." and after an absurd description of him, he continues, "Alas! sir, your father, methinks I see the gentleman still." *Hamlet's* words were, "My father . . . methinks I see my father."

If, as tradition says, William Shakesper played the Ghost in *Hamlet*, Greene would have been first to see the incongruity of his taking this royal and impressive part, impersonating his father.

John Shaksper, moreover, did not die till 1601, when his son was nearing middle-age, and the shock and grief at the loss would scarcely have been an overwhelming one.

Francis Bacon, if we reject the "evidence" of the cyphers, which is not accepted by many Baconians themselves, was the son of Sir Nicholas Bacon and the Lady Anne.

The former, though a worthy and distinguished person, was not of noble birth, nor was he in the least "war-like". He was elderly by the time that Anthony and Francis—the children of his second wife were born, and was reputed to be gouty.

We know a good deal about the Lady Anne from her Letters, chiefly to her son Anthony. And to consider this strictly religious, learned, yet over-maternal lady as the prototype of *Gertrude* would be ludicrous.

Nor do the parents of William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby, match the portraits of the King and Queen in *Hamlet*. Henry Stanley, the 4th Earl, was a diplomatist rather than a soldier, and did not die till his second son, William Stanley, was 32. His relations with his wife, Margaret Clifford, were most unhappy, and ended in divorce. It is true that we have no positive evidence of the mutual happiness of Oxford's parents, but we have none to the contrary, and may assume that *Hamlet* was speaking with de Vere's voice when he says of his father that he was

"so loving to my Mother

That he might beteem the winds of heaven

Visit her face too roughly."

There is evidence in the State Papers Domestic, for July 1567, that Lord Strange, as he was then called, treated his wife very roughly indeed. Her own presentations to Burleigh, supported by those of her servants, show she was obliged to borrow money for her confinement from her own woman Mrs. Calphill, who lent her a considerable sum on this and on other occasions.

The latter says that the Lady Margaret Strange was "altogether unfurnished with money and other necessaries" for this event at Knowsley.

And what of *Ophelia*? Surely Oxford's wife—Anne Cecil—is the only possible model for this part, which is so essentially linked to that of her father *Polonius*, who exactly fits the character of Lord Burleigh.

Ophelia, for all her unsophistication, is essentially a Court lady of highly-wrought sensibilities, and instinctive good breeding. The same could hardly have been said of either Anne Hathaway or Mrs. William Shakspeare. Nor could the latter have apostrophised *William* as possessing "the courtier's, soldier's, scholar's, eye, tongue, sword."

Francis Bacon's biographers record no early love-affairs, and, after an unsuccessful courtship of the rich heiress—Lady Hatton, he married Alice Barnham, an alderman's daughter, at the age of 45. It will be agreed, I think, that this offers little suggestion for romance of any kind.

As for Derby, his wife was Elizabeth de Vere—a great lady indeed. Too great in fact, for she would hardly have regarded William Stanley, as *Ophelia* did *Hamlet*, as in any way her social superior.

The argument that *Derby* took over the draft of *Hamlet* from Oxford, and finished it, being himself the Master-mind, fails to convince, if we remember that Derby would have had no emotional interest in the central events.

He was only a year old when Oxford's father died, and ten when de Vere married Anne Cecil.

Nor does it seem at all likely that he would have put his father-in-law at the very centre of his greatest work. The soliloquies in *Hamlet*, and such a scene as the one between him and his Mother are surely beyond the power of intuition into another man's deepest mind and heart.

For it is *Hamlet* himself who is the play. Above all else, it is a one-man show. And all the evidence goes to prove that Oxford must have written it.

BEES AND HONEY

By R. RIDGILL TROUT

"So work the honey bees." *Henry V.* 1. 2. No child brought up in the country can be ignorant of or uninterested in the industrious bee. Edward de Vere was no exception. Amongst the flowers and shrubs of the great park at Hedingham, and in the wilder woods and forest lands stretching for miles around the Castle, it would have been impossible for him not to have watched with interest the incessant search for honey. Later on he was to partake of it in the form of mead, and as part of his daily food.

At the age of 12 years as Cecil's ward, he had further insight. A mental picture rises before us and we see him listening entranced to the lore of the honey bee, told to him by the greatest of all English herbalists, John Gerrard, superintendent of the great garden of Cecil House, in the Strand, which reached down to the Thames. For over twenty years Gerrard had cared for this beautiful garden. Proud are the possessors of his wonderful first edition in folio, with all the wondrous woodcuts of every medicinal and other herb known to the Elizabethan world. Who better could have

informed him? Round this wonderful garden the great Lord Burghley ambled on his small nag, his feet almost touching the ground.

Edward de Vere was to see more wonderful gardens—those of the Queen at Windsor, at Nonesuch or Greenwich; the gardens of the many noble houses he visited; the gardens of the great Doges of Venice, of the Medicis and other great houses.

For a short time he lived at or visited Lord Burghley's smaller house at Pymmes, 'where was a garden'. About 1590 he purchased the large house, rightly named Fisher's Folly, situated where Devonshire Square now stands, in the heart of Bishopsgate. The Folly had a great garden with pergolas, a bowling green and all etceteras. His interest in bees must have been intensified by now. It passed into his very being. The little bee was more than an insect. It was a type of human action, to pass into the plays he had to give to the world. He sold Fisher's Folly to the son of a relative, who at the time held what was left of the old Vere estates at Kensington.

Edward de Vere married a second time and went to live at Stoke Newington, later to move to the historic dower house of King's Place, Hackney. Here in the quadrangle, to be seen from the surrounding windows, was the formal garden with its rosemary and gilliflowers, laid out no doubt by the previous owner, Lord Hunsdon, the Queen's cousin.

When I wandered round the grounds a year or two ago they had become a wilderness. In the nineteenth century they had been the exercise grounds of a mental asylum. 'Who can minister to a mind diseased?' War came. Brooke House (its later name), was damaged almost beyond repair. Insufficient interest could be aroused to save it. On its site now are being built modern buildings. Industrious men instead of bees throng the site.

When the Ashurst family held Hedingham Castle, a grove of lime trees grew by the side of the large lake. A constant visitor and friend of the family was Isaac Watts. Wandering in the evenings amid the sweet scent of their blossom he watched the busy bees and wrote

"How doth the busy little bee
Improve each shining hour."

But Edward de Vere's interest in bees does not cease there. The buzz of the bee entered into his poems, his plays, his sonnets and became of world interest enthusing amongst others, Will Essinger of Vallance Road, N.22, who on July 22, 1956, sent a letter to the *Standard* thus. "SHAKESPEARE AND MARLOWE. The dispute whether or not Christopher Marlowe wrote the plays of William Shakespeare seems easily answered from a bee-keeper's point of view. Wherever you look in Shakespeare's works, in drama, comedy or sonnets you will find impressions of his love of bees. But no-where in Marlowe's work."

MARLOWE AND THE SONNETS

BY KATHLEEN LE RICHE

On the evening of Sunday, 11th November, at the Old Vic Theatre, Mr. Calvin Hoffman's theory that Christopher Marlowe was the author of *The Sonnets*, by William Shakespeare was presented by Mrs. Dolly Wraight. Mr. John W. Russell, Barrister-at-Law, a Vice-President of the Shakespeare Fellowship, took the chair.

The speaker first sketched in the background of Marlowe's life and made reference to the documents discovered by Dr. J. Leslie Hotson from which he deduced that the evidence given at the inquest on Marlowe after his murder at Deptford was dubious. The supposition that Marlowe's "murder" was a fiction and the evidence faked for state purposes was referred to, and the suggestion made that, after his supposed murder Marlowe went over to the Continent; continued writing plays which he sent to Sir Thomas Walsingham (at whose house Marlowe had stayed prior to his alleged murder) who had the plays copied by a scrivener before publishing them under the pseudonym "William Shakespeare".

A number of writers were cited who had believed they discerned Marlowe's style of verse in the drama of Shakespeare—interpolations—in some plays fairly substantial. Mrs. Wraight made no mention, however, of the case for Marlowe authorship, included by Dr. Gilbert Slater (a few years after Dr. Hotson's discovery of the Deptford case documents in 1925), and published in 1931 by Cecil Palmer under the title *Seven Shakespeares*, some years before Mr. Hoffman developed the theory.

Mrs. Wraight's paper was confined mainly to the claim that Marlowe wrote *The Sonnets* which were "written from the heart"; that they were not exercises in sentimental word-play as the orthodox school suggests when they cannot verify their content against the background of Stratford-on-Avon; and that these poems do relate to Marlowe's life.

The speaker made one prominent exception to this thesis. She claimed that the first seventeen sonnets were *not* written out of the heart, but were made up by Marlowe because he was commissioned by Lord Burleigh who, at that time, was urging the young Earl of Southampton to marry his grand-daughter, Elizabeth Vere. No evidence of any kind was given to support this idea of the poet being so commissioned. According to the theory presented, most of the remaining sonnets (the Dark Lady was not mentioned) were addressed to Sir Thomas Walsingham, Marlowe's friend and lover.

Points of significance purporting to show the identity of Marlowe as the writer of the Sonnets—Shakespeare—were these:

1. The Sonnets revealed that the writer was heterosexual.
2. That his reputation was sullied.

3. That he was known as "Machiavelli".
4. That the earth yielded him "but a common grave".
5. He concealed his name which would lie buried where his body lay and this was especially stressed in Sonnet 76 where the poet wrote "every word doth almost tell my name".
6. That he was sorrowful because he was separated from his lover, a man, undoubtedly Sir Thomas Walsingham.
7. About twenty sonnets were read (expressively, by two young actors) to illustrate the points made, the "golden proof" of which was proffered in Sonnet 74 which contains the line: "The coward conquest of a wretch's knife", and this Sonnet was read later again at the end of the discourse to emphasise such proof.

As the lecture lasted from 7.15 until 9.25 p.m. there was no time for comment or questioning from the audience which had remained quietly attentive throughout.

Mr. Russell, summing up the situation, and paying tribute to Mrs. Wraight's presentation and the Sonnet reading, said that, whilst he did not accept the case—he himself had other convictions as to the authorship—at least this talk had made people think, and also to realise that, because the orthodox case for authorship was untenable, other authorship theories could, with advantage, be examined. When he said that, in fact, a very good case had been made that Edward de Vere was the real author, the audience laughed loudly.

Several members of the Shakespeare Fellowship attended, and had different points to raise, had the opportunity come. My own comments are summarized, very briefly, below, keeping to the enumeration above:—

1. (a) The Sonnets do not support the theory that Shakespeare was heterosexual. Sonnet 20 which is usually quoted to "prove" this idea, was not read. In fact, this Sonnet proves the contrary: "But since she (Nature) pricked thee out for women's pleasure,

Mine be thy love, and thy love's use their treasure."

2. (b) Shakespeare's reputation was indeed sullied but his fall was from high estate, which could not apply to Marlowe who rose in the world.

3. (c) Marlowe would most probably have been known as "Machiavel". In his *History of English Poetry*, W. H. Courthope writes that all Marlowe's plays portray different conceptions of Machiavelli's principle of *virtue*. But no one can recognise such a principle in the works of Shakespeare. Whoever he was, he was not of that order. A humanist of the humanists, Shakespeare was entirely opposed to the political and philosophical thought of Machiavelli. Judge this from his references (three only) to him:

"Alençon, that notorious Machiavel"

I King Henry VI, v. 4-74.

"I can add colours to the chameleon,
Change shapes with Proteus, for advantage,
And set the murd'rous Machiavel to school."
III King Henry VI, iii, 2-193.

"Peace, I say! hear mine host of the Garter.
Am I politic? am I subtle? am I a Machiavel?"
The Merry Wives of Windsor, III, 1-104.

If, as some writers have claimed, especially J. M. Robertson, Marlowe's lines are interpolated into Shakespeare's plays, they certainly did not interpolate anything into Shakespeare's philosophy. If Mr. Calvin Hoffman, following such writers, claims to perceive Marlowe in Shakespeare, I would like him to answer the question I put to him when he came to visit the Study Circle of the Shakespeare Fellowship, and which he would not answer:—

If Marlowe's hand is recognizable in Shakespeare's plays, who was Shakespeare?

4. (d) As Marlowe was the son of a shoemaker, despite the academic education he achieved, he could not expect to have anything but a common grave. It could not evoke heart-wringing complaint.

5. (e) Since Marlowe's name as a playwright was already well known it was not possible to conceal it. "Every word" does not almost tell his name. It tells the name of E. Vere, whose signed poem, "Anne Vavasour's Echo" played upon that theme all through.

6. (f) The Sonneteer bewails the journey from his friend, on horseback. It is never suggested that he is overseas, as Marlowe would have been—according to this theory—separated from his "lover" Sir Thomas Walsingham.

7. (g) The case for Marlowe as Shakespeare, is based specifically on the theory that he remained alive, and *was not knifed at the inn at Deptford*. Therefore the "golden proof" in Sonnet 74 revealing his conquest by the coward wretch's knife, *entirely belies the whole edifice of this theory*.

The relationship between Shakespeare and Henry Wriotheshly, the Third Earl of Southampton, was avoided, but a most complicated story was put forward, unsupported by any evidence, that "Mr. W.H." was Mr. Walsing-Ham and the dedication of the Sonnets to him thereby explained!

As we can read, the writer of the Sonnets was forty years old; he remembers the mother of the boy (then about nineteen) to whom he addresses these poems, "in the lovely April of her prime", which Marlowe, twenty-six years old, or thereabouts could scarcely have done.

The alleged "lover", Sir Thomas Walsingham (1568-1630), a cousin of Sir Francis, married Audrey the daughter of Sir Ralph Shelton. She was frequently at Court acting in masques, and she, her husband and their son seem to have led most respectable public lives. As a patron of the arts Sir Thomas received Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* which he left unfinished, and which Chapman

completed dedicating it to Sir Thomas. Marlowe may, or may not have been killed in the inn at Deptford, but if he continued his literary activities, it seems strange, in my view, that he should have let Chapman finish his poem and present it to his own patron.

THE RECUSANTS IN "LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST."

Although L.L.L. is the most discussed of all Shakespeare's minor plays, the prototype of Holofernes is still in dispute. I should like to suggest, for the following reasons, that he stands for Cardinal William Allen:

1. As the founder and principal of the English Seminary at Rheims, Allen was the most notorious schoolmaster of his day.

2. When raised to the rank of cardinal, in August, 1587, he took the title of St. Martin in Montibus. That gives point to this dialogue from Act V, Scene I,

Armado: Do you not educate youth at the charge-house on the top of the mountain?

Hol.: Or *Mons*, the hill.

Arm.: At your sweet pleasure, for the mountain.

Hol.: I do, *sans question*.

I believe that Nathaniel represents Allen's great friend, Father Robert Persons, who is identified as under:

1. In Act IV, Scene II, Jaquenetta twice addresses Nathaniel as 'master person'. (Modern editors take the view that she is speaking to Holofernes, because Costard immediately afterwards calls him 'master schoolmaster,' but Persons as well as Allen founded schools on the Continent for English Catholics).

2. There are two references in the play to 'a member of the commonwealth.' Persons' supreme achievement as a propagandist was the writing of 'Leicester's Commonwealth.'

If Holofernes was dressed as a cardinal the audience would have recognised him at a glance, because Allen was the first Englishman for thirty-three years to be raised to that rank. In 1587 he published a letter in which he claimed that English Catholics owed no allegiance to Queen Elizabeth. For that reason Holofernes is denounced in the final scene as Judas. The choice of the Nine Worthies as the Princess' entertainment was probably dictated by the fact that one of the Worthies was named Judas Maccabeus. By referring to 'a kissing traitor' the playwright changed that character to Judas Iscariot.

I. GRETTON.

BOOK REVIEW

THE SHAKESPEARE FIRST FOLIO. Its Bibliographical and Textual History. By W. W. GREG
Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1955. Price 42s.

As Dr. Greg says in his preface: "This account of the Shakespeare First Folio was originally planned as an introduction to a facsimile of the volume. The scheme for a facsimile fell through, but the introduction got itself written in an extended form and now appears independently." If it would not otherwise have appeared in its present form, we have some reason to be grateful that the scheme for a facsimile fell through. Let us hope it is only postponed but, meanwhile, we have the extended introduction.

This is necessarily something more than a study of the First Folio itself, for about half of the Folio texts were set up from *corrected* quartos—a fact which is vouched for by the numerous misprints which escaped detection and crept into the Folio from the Quartos. And what lies behind the quartos; behind the corrections and additions; and behind the texts of the remaining plays, which had not previously appeared in print? Manuscripts, of course—but what sort of manuscripts: playhouse prompt copies; transcripts made for the purpose; or Shakespeare's own autograph? These are some of the questions which Dr. Greg sets out to answer. Then there is the fascinating problem of the "Bad Quartos" which appeared from time to time, and the abortive attempt at a *collection* in 1619.

"The 'Collection' of 1619 is not on the face of it a collection at all, nor does it ostensibly associate itself with any one year. Of the ten plays included only three have continuous signatures, the other seven are all bibliographically independent: of the nine title-pages one is undated, three are dated 1619, three are dated 1600, and two are dated 1608; and the names of several different stationers appear in the imprints. Yet there is no question but that they were all printed at Jaggard's press within a few weeks of one another in 1619."

The plays, all attributed to Shakespeare, were: *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, 2 *Sir John Oldcastle*, *Pericles*, *The Whole Contention*, spurious texts of *The Merry Wives* and *Henry V*, and reasonably good texts of *The Merchant of Venice*, *King Lear* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Only two copies of the collection survive, as such. For the rest, the plays were sold in separate volumes under their false dates, but the bibliographical evidence "suggests that the original plan was for a regular collection . . . with a general title-page on which fuller information respecting the printing and sale of the book would be provided", but the plan seems to have been abandoned owing to the intervention of the Lord Chamberlain, William Herbert, Earl of

Pembroke. Greg quotes a note from the Court-Book of the Stationers' Company:

"Hen, Hemmings. upon a letter from the right honourable the Lord Chamberleyne It is thought fitt & so ordered That no playes that his Majestyes players do play shalbe printed without consent of some of them."

and adds the following comment: "If 'Hen' is an error, as seems probable, it was John Heminge himself who took the letter to the Court". Here, then, we have two of the sponsors of the First Folio acting together in 1619 to prevent the publication in Shakespeare's name of a collection of plays, two of which were not his at all, while the texts of most of the others were spurious. Unfortunately William Herbert's letter has not survived, but it is evidently referred to in another letter, quoted by Greg, which was addressed to the Stationers' company on 10th June, 1637, by Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery, who had by then succeeded his brother, William, both as Earl of Pembroke and Lord Chamberlain:

"Wheras complaint was heertofore presented to my Deare brother & predecessor by his Majestes servants the Players, that some of the Company of Printers and Stationers had procured, published and printed diverse of their bookes of Comedyes, Tragedyes, Cronicle Historyes, and the like, which they had (for the speciall service of his Majestye & their owne use) Bought and provided at very Deare and high rates, By means wherof not onely they themselves had much prejudice, but the bookes much corruption to the injury and disgrace of the Authors; And therupon the Masters & Wardens of the company of printers & stationers were advised by my Brother to take notice therof & to take order for the stay of any further Impression of any of the Playes or Interludes of his Majestes servants without their consentes."

From Greg's point of view: "it is here the players speaking: we hear them voicing their resentment at the circulation of garbled versions of Shakespeare's plays" but, from the Oxfordian point of view, these two successive Lord Chamberlains may have had more personal grounds for resentment, since Philip Herbert was, of course, the son-in-law of the Earl of Oxford.

Who planned the First Folio? Was it, as Greg thinks, the players Heminge and Condell, or was it, by any chance, "that Incomparable Pair of Brethren," William, Earl of Pembroke and Philip, Earl of Montgomery, to whom it is dedicated.

Greg is more than doubtful whether Heminge and Condell actually wrote the Dedication and the Address to the "Great Variety of Readers" and seems inclined to favour the theory that these were the work of Ben Jonson—who was, of course, in the employment of the Herberts. In any case, says Greg, Heminge and Condell claim no more than to have "collected" the plays. Who was the Editor? Greg disposes of the claims of the

stationer, Edward Blount, who came unto the venture too late, and suggests the book-keeper of the King's Men. But this is sheer guess-work and there is a good deal to be said in favour of Ben Johnson himself.

A whole chapter is devoted to "Questions of Copyright." In Elizabethan times, copyright was vested in the Stationer, not in the author, and entries were made in the Hall Book of the Stationers' Company, generally known as the "Stationers' Register." Many of Shakespeare's plays had been published in quarto by many different stationers, but by the time the Folio was published some of the copyrights were "derelict" and the others had passed by assignment into the hands of a few men. The Folio was printed in 1623, "at the Charges of W. Jaggard, Ed. Blount, I. Smithweeke, and W. Aspley," who owned between them the rights in six plays; and arrangements must have been made with the other owners. Shortly before publication, an entry was made in the Stationers' Register including all the plays which had not already appeared in print, with four notable exceptions—*The Taming of the Shrew*, *King John* and two out of the three plays on *Henry VI*. These must have been treated as identical with *The Taming of the Shrew*, *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and the two parts of *The Contention between the Houses of York and Lancaster*.

Apart from the final chapter on "The Printing," the second half of the book is taken up with a detailed textual examination of the individual plays which is invaluable for reference but impossible to deal with in a short review. I have, however, one criticism to make: Why does Greg adopt the chronological order "as arranged by Chambers" which, as he knows, has recently been called in question by the processes of textual criticism itself? As yet, there is no new chronology to replace it, but since this book is about the First Folio and was, in its inception, an introduction to that volume, would it not have been better to throw chronology to the winds, for once, and discuss the plays in the Folio order, too little known to the modern reader, instead of merely listing it on p. 169? Greg also gives Chambers' dates at the head of each section, though he admits at the beginning of the chapter that they are often "conjectural and approximate."

GWYNNETH BOWEN.

OBITUARY

Lieut.-Col. Montagu W. Douglas

The Fellowship was undoubtedly fortunate in its first officials and none of these was more highly esteemed than Montagu William Douglas, C.S.I., C.I.E., who died on Sunday, 24th February, at the advanced age of 93. Incidentally it is curious that, of our Presidents and Vice-Presidents, three have lived and kept up their interest in the authorship problem until they were well over four score years and ten—Dr. Gerald Rendall, Abel Leirauc and now Col. Douglas. The last of these was really one of the founders of the Fellowship although he gave the credit of this to his friend, Col. B. R. Ward—

Ward and Douglas were two of the many who were convinced by Looney's now famous book, *Shakespeare Identified*, that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford was the real author behind the pen name of William Shakespeare and in 1922 they had the enterprise and courage to found the Fellowship, this being appropriately done at Hackney where Oxford lived in retirement for many years and where he died in 1604.

The object of the Fellowship was 'to unite all lovers of Shakespeare who were dissatisfied with the prevailing Stratfordian orthodoxy, and who desired that further research be conducted in order to obtain a solution of the problem.'

The first President was Sir George Greenwood, whose books had, in the opinion of many, practically torn the orthodox theory to shreds. Col. Ward was Hon. Sec. and Col. Douglas and three others formed the Executive Committee. Sir George died in 1928 and was succeeded in the Presidency by Col. Douglas who remained in office until his retirement in 1944.

During his term of office he gave a great deal of his time to the affairs of the Fellowship, taking the chair at nearly all meetings. He was a first-rate chairman, fair and impartial and always prepared to give a hearing to views he did not share. In fact he endeared himself to all members.

His own opinions are clear from the three books published by him, *The Earl of Oxford as Shakespeare*, 1931; *Lord Oxford was Shakespeare*, 1934; and finally, *Lord Oxford and the Shakespeare Group* in 1952. At first he was of the opinion that all the plays were by one hand but later he came to the conclusion that other members of the aristocracy were represented forming a group all using the name of Shakespeare.

Col. Douglas had many other interests in life. In his early days he played Rugby football and captained the Sandhurst XV.

His professional life was spent mostly in India where he held many important posts as Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner of many districts. From 1913-1920 he was Chief Commissioner of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

He was much interested in the pictorial arts and was himself a good water colour painter whose work was frequently shown in London exhibitions.

In conclusion we mourn the passing of an indomitable champion of our cause and trust that his work will act as an inspiration to some of our younger members.

T. M. AITKEN.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Coronation Sonnet

Sir,

Since my whole interpretation of Sonnet 125, in my article published in the *News-Letter* last Spring, depends upon a point of grammar, I must do my best, even at the risk of tediousness and pedantry, to reply to Mr. Atkinson's arguments in his letter, published in the Autumn number.

I gave my authority as Fowler's *Modern English Usage* (*Subjunctives*), and the book is available at any reference library. It may be objected that Shakespeare was not 'modern' and, in any case, was no stickler for grammar, but then, the subjunctive is a *dying* form and would come much more naturally to him than to us. To save space, I will take Fowler's article on subjunctives as read. From it I infer that, in the sentence under discussion:

'Were't aught to me I bore the canopy'—*Were* (sing.) is 'a recognizable subjective, and applicable not to past facts, but present or future non-facts', and that *bore* is, therefore, also in the subjunctive, though indistinguishable in form from the past indicative. Fowler gives *would be* as the modern equivalent of *were*, though the terms are not always interchangeable. I paraphrased the line as: 'Would it be anything to me if I bore the canopy' i.e., on some future, though probably not far distant, occasion, and unfortunately added that the *if* had been omitted. Mr. Atkinson is probably quite right in saying that the

only word which can legitimately be inserted in the original sentence is not 'if' but 'that'.

Were't aught to me that I bore the canopy? But the meaning is the same. As it happens, that is almost a component part of the Present and Imperfect Subjunctive best known to us from the French Verb Books. The phrase 'that I bore' is a variant form of 'that I might (or should) bear'. Another way of saying the same thing were (would be) to substitute the infinitive 'to bear'.

Were't aught to me to bear the canopy? Were is not the equivalent of either *was* or *is*. Custom has now sanctioned the use of *was* in many cases where *were* would be, strictly speaking, more correct, but the process cannot (legitimately) be reversed. However, we must not assume Shakespeare's infallibility as a grammarian, so let us take a few examples from his own usage—others can be found in the *Shakespeare Concordance*.

By heaven, me thinks it *were* an easy leap
To pluck bright honour from the pale-faced moon.
I Henry IV. I. iii. 201.

O gentlemen, the time of life is short!
To spend that shortness basely *were* too long.
I Henry IV. V. ii. 82.

'Twere to consider too curiously to consider so.
Hamlet. V. i. 200.

If it *were* done when 'tis done, then 'twere well
It *were* done quickly.
Macbeth. I. vii. 1.

It is my lady—O, it is my love!
O that she knew she *were*!
Romeo and Juliet. II. i. 53.

Oh absence what a torment would'st thou prove,
Were it not that thy god-like *were* gave sweet leave
To entertain the time with thoughts of love!
Sonnet 38.

In none of these examples does the word *were* apply to past fact and neither in the last two to the words *was* and *is* which follow. In each case it is a wish and a future. *Were* is a form of the verb *to be* and like *is* and *was* it is a finite verb. Shakespeare was obviously trying to get his *were* as he could, but he might have ended 'twere correctly (then is now) with 'twere well we did it quickly, yet the murder was still fantastical.

I entirely agree with Mr. Atkinson that if the bearing of the canopy was hypothetical, the laying of great bases for eternity must have been so too, but I do not agree that this makes nonsense of the words that follow—that *proves* more short than waste or ruin. Whatever Shakespeare may have meant by 'great bases for eternity' I feel sure he did not mean that eternity promised to the recipient of the sonnets, but the kind of eternity represented by marble and the gilded monuments of princes in *Sonnet 55*, which meant *asought* to him. He was making a paradoxical generalization and there is no need to assume that the particular 'great bases'—whatever they may have been—had already been laid.

That the opening sentence is in the subjunctive and does not refer to the past is confirmed by the fact that, after a parenthesis of four lines, the writer answers his own question with an emphatic 'No,' and then slips into the Imperative, which invariably refers neither to past nor present, but to a more or less immediate future.

No. Let me be obsequious in thy heart
And take thee my oblation poor but free.

It seems that the outward obsequiousness of bearing the canopy would somehow contaminate the oblation and put him in the same category as the 'dwellers on form and favour'.

We know that Lord Oxford did not bear the canopy in the procession from Westminster Hall, to the Abbey on the day of the coronation, for it was borne, in accordance with tradition, by the 'barons' of the Cinque Ports; and, as it turned out, he *could* not have borne it in the customary procession from the Tower to Westminster on the preceding day, for that procession was postponed at the last minute owing to the plague—but he may have been asked to do so.

GWYNNE BOWEN.

Edward Bonaventure

The interesting article by Rex Clements on Shakespeare as Mariner in the Autumn 1956 *News-Letter*, must have reminded many Oxfordians of the *Edmund Bonaventure*. Mr. G. W. Phillips pointed out that Edward de Vere had joined his ship the *Edmund Bonaventure* in June 1588, to meet the Invincible Armada, which had sailed 29th May 1588.

The *Edmund Bonaventure* was of 300 tons and in 1580 was 'Vice-Admiral' in an expedition against the Spaniards led by Henton.

In July 1586, when off Sicily, she was one of 'Five gallies and stoute shippes appertaining to London' (of the Levant Company) which were set upon by 11 galleys and 2 frigates of the King of Spain. The galleys were overpowered by the broadside fire of the merchantmen, which during five hours lost only two men, while at the end the galleys and frigates wanted men to continue the charging of their pieces, and withdrew with shame and dishonour. The Londoners, on putting into Algiers, were received with high honour, the Dey, entertaining them in the best sort.

and for the rest of the fleet,
Which I dispos'd, they all have met again,
And are upon the Mediterranean flote,
Bound homeward home.

In 1597 she was one of the Levant Company's Squadron of seven ships that went with Drake to singe the King of Spain's beard. The next year she fought against the Armada.

B. R. SAUNDERS

We regret to announce the resignation of Mrs. Kathleen P. Kiche from the Joint Editorship of the *News-Letter*.

THE SHAKESPEARE FELLOWSHIP

President: CHRISTOPHER HINDFORD, M.A., LL.B. (CANTAB.), J.P.

Vice-Presidents: T. L. ADAMSON, MISS H. AMPHLETT, J. SHEILA ATKINSON, LL.B. (LOND.)

Hon. Secretary: MISS G. M. BOWEN, 38, Roland Gardens, London, S.W.7.

Assistant Hon. Secretary: MISS N. LOOSELY, 19, Pennard Mansions, London, W.12.

Hon. Treasurer: T. L. ADAMSON, 6 Upper Cavendish Avenue, Finchley, London, N.3.

Hon. Librarian: MISS R. M. D. WAINWRIGHT, 4 Collingham Road, London, S.W.5.

Joint Hon. Editors of the *News-Letter*: MISS G. M. BOWEN, MISS R. M. D. WAINWRIGHT.

Annual Subscription 10/- Life Membership £5

The *News-Letter* appears each Spring and Autumn

Back-numbers (price 6d.) can be obtained from the Assistant Hon. Secretary.

The Editors will be glad to receive articles not exceeding 2,000 words, news items, letters, etc., all of which will be carefully considered.

Contributions for the Autumn issue should be sent to the Hon. Secretary not later than JUNE 1ST, 1957

bears the present a short-lived future
 (I think it is the case if we were to be
 long of those in the state of being outwards & inwards
 future