

American members. I hope Osler's
"Incunabula Medica" will now be
published as an Illustrated Mono-
graph within the next few weeks.
There has been a good - not ^{very}
good - exhibition of modern printing
at the rooms of the Medici Society
this last month. & I am feeling
my way to some sort of an arrange-
ment with them by which the
Bibliographical Society might do
more than it has yet done for in-
creasing printing. But we shall
have to go cautiously.

I hope you & Mrs. North get a
good ~~rest~~ holiday. We shall be
going again to Kew on Aug. 9
in yrs. sincerely
Alfred Woodard

DEPARTMENT OF PRINTED BOOKS,
BRITISH MUSEUM,

LONDON: W.C.1.

2 July, 1923

My dear North,

I am delighted to send
you a copy of the Guide to the
Shakespeare exhibition, duly
autographed! I am rather
disappointed that it has not
attracted more visitors, but
those who come seem to like it.

I shall be very pleased
to show Mr. & Mrs. Murray
Boyer round the Printed
Books, & will have their

names noted in case they
come on a day when I am
not here. There do not seem
to have been so many literary
Americans coming in as
usual this year. Perhaps
the English Literature Conference
at Columbia University which I
think only ended on June 16,
may have kept some of them
back; but I hear that Carleton
Brown is at Oxford, with
so much to do that he is
harassed to get through. My

chief visitor has been Miss
Bartlett, who is delightfully
full of life and makes friends
wherever she goes.

== The Bibliographical Society
continues to flourish over here.

Two Americans

Mr. Frank Altschul, 950 Park
Avenue, New York

Professor George Sherburn,

== University of Chicago
have been nominated for election
here & will be proposed at our
next Council. It is quite
irregular, but I understand from
Wanship that the American Committee
does not mind, & I want more

Q.S.

On Printers of Shakespeares
day there is nothing better
than our Bib. Soc. Dictionary
edited by R. B. McKerrow.

// no one has written (that I
know of) specifically about
the Printers Art of the time

// I've never seen reason to
believe that the First Folio
was printed in more than
one office, nor that its
Bibh of 1611 was. Has
any one said its Bibh was
fanned out?

\$

Q.S.?