

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY




3 3433 04453 6633

D 10-4172

Woodward, Parker

Strange case of Francis Tidir



673

THE STRANGE CASE
OF
FRANCIS TIDIR.

111

INVESTIGATED


BY

PARKER WOODWARD.

"Truth can never be confirmed enough."—PERICLES.

London:

ROBERT BANKS & SON,
RACQUET COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.
1901.



“ The poet in a golden clime was born,
With golden stars above,
Dowered with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn,
The love of love.

He saw through life and death, thro' good and ill ;
He saw through his own soul.
The marvel of the everlasting will
An open scroll,

Before him lay. With echoing feet he threaded
The secretest walks of fame ;
The viewless arrows of his thoughts were headed
And winged with fame.”

Tennyson.

TO
THE PHILOSOPHER, POET,
AND HUMORIST,

WHO, IN HIS LAST WILL, WROTE :

“FOR MY NAME AND MEMORY, I LEAVE IT TO
MEN'S CHARITABLE SPEECHES, AND TO
FOREIGN NATIONS, AND THE NEXT AGES,”

Timothy
This Booklet

IS

Dedicated.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. A QUEEN'S SONS	13
3. THE RETORT COURTEOUS	37
4. EDMUND SPENSER'S POEMS	47
5. PRACTICAL JOKING IN 1592	57
6. GREENE'S BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS	65
7. WOLSEY'S FAREWELL	73
8. NOTE ON THE INDUCTION TO "TAMING OF THE SHREW"	83
9. THE PLAYS SORTED	91
10. NOTES	95
APPENDIX I.—"THE ROSICRUCIANS"	101
" II.—WHY "TIDIR" ?	102
" III.—BIOGRAPHERS WANTED	104
" IV.—THE CONCEALED POET A CONCEALED TEACHER OF THE ART OF POETRY	110
" V.—TWO ITEMS	115
" VI.—WORKS CONSULTED	116

"How poor they are that have not patience."—OTHELLO.

*“ A poor humour of mine, Sir, to take that that no one
else will.”*

AS YOU LIKE IT.

Introduction.

“ Truth will out, even in an affidavit.”

LORD JUSTICE BOWEN.

“He that will be secret must be a dissembler
in some degree.”

Bacon's Essays.

“There are many mysteries contained in Poetrie,
which of purpose were written darkly, lest by
profane wits it should be abused.”

Apologie for Poetrie.

“Nothing is lasting that is feigned, it will have
another face than it had ere long.”

Ben Jonson's Discoveries.

"Truth can never be confirmed enough."—PERICLES.

INTRODUCTION.

IN contributing these few articles to the controversial literature which during the past thirty years has accumulated around the name of Francis Bacon, I desire to say that I have been actuated solely by the wish that truth should prevail.

When first I heard, before the publication of Mrs. Gallup's decipherings, that Francis Bacon had claimed to be a son of Queen Elizabeth, I was prepared to join the noble army of scoffers, who, too much committed to the conventional view to take any personal trouble, yet seek to deter the researches of others with the cry, "What is the good of it all when you have done?"

The claim to Royal parentage, coupled with the allegation of the cipher story that Francis was the author of the poems put forth as Spenser's, of the Plays attributed not only to Shakespeare, but those of Greene, Marlowe, and Peele, and of the prose compendium known as Burton's "Anatomy of Melancholy," was so prodigious that I can well understand the mental attitude of most who have been asked to give credence. I concluded the story to be right or demonstrably wrong by the known facts of English history.

The following articles are the result of an amateur, and more or less first time, search of Elizabethan history and certain biographies, by one who has had some experience in dealing with evidence. I have found no recorded facts inconsistent with the cipher claim, but much in history that supports it.

If the claim of parentage be true, then much that was puzzling becomes clear. Francis Bacon, after receiving an education fit for a prince, found himself at the age of sixteen

to be an illegitimate son of Queen Elizabeth, suffered to attend at Court, but ignored so far as sufficient pecuniary help or advancement was concerned. Received into the company of the wits, of which Sir Philip Sidney was the head, he essayed poetry as an anonymous writer, "Immerito." Fearing discovery by Elizabeth, he and his friends induced a poor clerk named Spenser, to father his compositions, for which Spenser was rewarded by an appointment in Ireland. Poetry proving unprofitable, he conceived the idea of writing Plays for the Booth theatres, which at that time were taking a great deal of money. His terms, according to the late Mr. Donnelly's book, was a share of the receipts.

Many Plays were written by Francis in the period of over twenty years, 1580—1600, of his non-advancement by Court favour. They were mostly put forward without any name, at other times in the name of Greene, Marlowe, Peele, or Shakespeare, who were rewarded for their silence. Many of them may, I think, justly be classed as the "hack-work of genius," the expression used by Mr. Max Beerbohm, in a recent (5th January, 1901) number of the *Saturday Review*. Francis was writing Plays for a living, just as many artists have had to paint "pot boilers."

The knowledge and philosophy shewn in the Plays as in the personally acknowledged writings of Francis, were the result not only of large and varied reading and experiment, but of his methodical record and analysis of the facts and ideas ascertained in the course of much reading and experiment. In the "Promus of Formularies and Elegances" we find some of his gleanings jotted down. A more extensive collection was analysed and digested and made the medium of the discursive but connected essays known as "The Anatomy of Melancholy," by Democritus, Jun.

As Francis, in the "Faerie Queen," followed the lead of Sidney, and the style of Chaucer, so in "The Anatomy of Melancholy" he followed the example and style of Montaigne, coupled with a scheme for turning his collected

information and experiences to the general advantage of his fellow men, which is practically absent from the earlier treatise.

To those, like myself, who do not believe in heaven-born genius, it must be satisfactory to find the poet and philosopher naturally evolved by careful training, wide and methodical study, recorded observation, and hard work.

It is interesting moreover to have had an answer to the proper enquiry as to why so much valuable literary work of the Elizabethan age was unclaimed. Upon the footing of the truth of the cipher-story we can now see the practice of hiding, originally adopted of necessity, became afterwards a recreation. He intended to hide from those too blind to see. Just as in the game of hide and seek the hider is astonished to notice how near the seekers may go to the object hidden without discovering it, so was Francis amazed that his preliminary efforts in the way of ciphers and anagrams were not discovered by the wits of the period. He also appears to have noticed that he could scatter his writings with similarities of thought and expression, and yet by merely altering his *style* the *cognoscenti* could be misled.

This probably led him to the formation of a society of sharper wits whom he taught to read "between the lines," to communicate to one another "under the rose" by means of emblems, word ciphers, anagrams, numbers, and the like, in the expectation that their successors might in future years unravel the ciphers and anagrams which in his printed quartos and folios he was industriously inserting. Up to the day of his death he was always altering and adding, sometimes for the purpose of his cipher-stories, sometimes for improvement of the writings themselves. At the same time he bound all his best work together with the pack thread of a cipher explaining his personal and secret history, and studded it with allusive remarks, peculiarities, anagrams, and double meanings, to induce men to search for that which was hid.

I trust I may without irreverence ask the high priests of

Shaksperianism to reconsider their position. Placed upon the right track they would be best qualified to trace and co-ordinate the work of unquestionably our greatest Englishman.

In saying this I must not overlook the remarkable grasp and insight as to these matters shewn by Mr. W. F. C. Wigston, who in the preface to his book on "Bacon and the Rosicrucians," published in 1888, made a remarkable prophecy: "The only conclusive proof upon a subject of this sort is a cipher beyond dispute with a revelation following it of papers and evidence admitting neither question nor hesitation. . . . That this has been done and will follow at some time we have no shadow of doubt."

That Francis deliberately contemplated and planned for the re-discovery of his authorship years after his death is corroborated by the strict manner in which all manuscripts likely to lead to an early discovery were destroyed in his lifetime or by his Secretaries after his death. It is not surprising, therefore, that the literary critics should have been frequently confused whether to class a Play as by Marlowe or Greene, Shakespeare or Peele, or the joint work of two or more of them. It was enough to deceive the "very elect." What I hope is that they will not once more shew their anger in the pages of the "Quarterly" or the "Atlantic Monthly" or their facetiousness in the columns of "Literature." With great respect I suggest that the reputation of Francis, as the greatest Englishman, is better worth conserving than their own. The introduction to his acknowledged, and subsequently to some of his unacknowledged writings, which the Shakspeare-Bacon controversy afforded, has brought me to the belief that he approached nearer to the heart of things, both practical and philosophical, than any other general student. What he has to say as a Statesman, a Lawyer, an Investigator, a Student of Nature, and as a critic of human conduct generally, is of immense value to-day; and I trust the time is not far distant when some publisher will select and print for students of the departments of thought concerned, the portions of his best work dealing

with that particular branch of knowledge, rather than leaving them amongst the ponderous collections of the present.

As a last word in a lengthy Preface, the italics in the articles are mine. I have italicised freely, not with the assurance that I am every time carrying home conviction to my reader, but out of the desire to draw attention to pertinent facts.

PARKER WOODWARD.

King Street, Nottingham.



NOTE.

THE article on "Edmund Spenser's Poems" appeared in the number of *Baconiana* for January, 1901. That on "Wolsey's Farewell" was written for the same magazine in 1899, and on "Taming of the Shrew" in 1898.

A Queen's Sons.

“Before the phantom of False morning died
Methought a voice within the Tavern cried :
‘When all the Temple is prepared within,
Why nods the drowsy worshipper outside?’”

Fitzgerald's "Omar Khayyam."

“Can't yer hear me calling, calling at the falling of
the May?”

Somersetshire Ballade.

Porter.—“Here's a knocking, indeed! If a man were
porter of hell-gate he should have old — turning the
key. (Knocking without.) Knock! knock! knock!
Whose there, i' the name of Beelzebub?”

Macbeth.

A QUEEN'S SONS.

1. "*History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.*" J. A. FROUDE.

2. "*Lives of the Queens of England.*" AGNES STRICKLAND.

3. "*History of England.*" DR. LINGARD.

4. "*Memoirs of the Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton.*"
NICHOLAS.

5. "*Romance of the Peerage.*" G. L. CRAIK.

6. "*Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex.*"
W. B. DEVEREUX.

7. "*Life and Letters of Francis Bacon.*" MONTAGU.

8. "*The Bi-literal Cipher.*" E. W. GALLUP, 1900. (London :
GAY & BIRD).

WHEN we are asked to unravel a tangled ball of string, the first thing we naturally endeavour to do is to find one or both of the ends. By the same process, if we wish to rightly judge the acts and behaviour of persons, we must endeavour to discover their motives and their particular difficulties of the time being.

The conduct of Queen Elizabeth with regard to Lord Dudley, to Robert Earl of Essex, and generally as to marriage and the succession to the throne, has, we believe, never been satisfactorily accounted for. Elizabeth, as is well known, was the daughter of Henry VIII. by Anne Boleyn. She was a highly educated woman, able to converse both in French and Italian fluently, and had a large acquaintance with the literature of her time.

succession was followed by a violent reaction in favour of the papist party. On 18th March, 1554, the Princess Elizabeth, who was known to be associated with the Puritans, was lodged in the Tower. At the time Elizabeth learnt that she was to be sent there, she was suspected of having been involved in the then recent insurrection, and in a letter to the Queen, her sister, written about this time, she protests and avows her innocence. The circumstances of her entering the Tower are graphically told in Miss Strickland's "Life." Elizabeth's imprisonment was at first rigorous, but this was soon relaxed. Ten of her own servants were appointed to superintend the purveyances and cooking department, and to serve at her table. After the execution of Wyatt, on the 13th April, Elizabeth was allowed to walk in a little garden. The Tower was at this time crowded with prisoners of State, including Courtenay, Sir James Crofts, Sir William Saintlow, Edmund Tremeine, Harrington, and others of her own household, and last but not least, Lord Robert Dudley. Miss Strickland says, with reference to Elizabeth and Dudley: "Considering the intriguing temper of both, *it is probable that*, notwithstanding the jealous precautions of their respective gaolers, *some sort of secret understanding was established between them at this period.* . . . The signal favour that Elizabeth lavished on Robert Dudley by appointing him her Master of Horse, and loading him with honours within the first week of her accession to the Crown, *must have originated from some powerful motive which does not appear on the surface of history.* . . . He must by some means have succeeded not only in winning Elizabeth's pardon, . . . but in exciting an interest in her bosom of no common nature while they were both imprisoned in the Tower, since, being immediately after his liberation employed in the wars in France, he had no other opportunity of ingratiating himself with that princess." On the 17th April, Noailles writes: "Madam Elizabeth having since her imprisonment been very closely confined, is now more free. She has the liberty of going all over the Tower, but without daring to

Cig.
data
 speak to anyone but those appointed to guard her. As they cannot prove her implication [in the recent insurrection], it is thought she will not die." It is evident that at this period Elizabeth was in the greatest doubt as to whether or no she would be permitted to live, and it is more than possible that her conduct was that of a woman who had lost all expectation not only of succeeding to the throne, but of being allowed to remain alive. About the 20th May, Elizabeth was alarmed by the appearance in the inner court of the Tower of Sir Henry Beddingfield and one hundred men at arms, and she demanded in terror to know "if the Lady Jane scaffold were removed?" Finally Lord Chandos explained that she had no cause for alarm, but that his orders were to consign her into the charge of Sir Henry Beddingfield, to be conveyed, he believed, to Woodstock. "The fate of Elizabeth," says Miss Strickland, "was long a subject of discussion at the Council Board of her Royal sister. After her removal to Woodstock, the base Padget had dared to assert that "there would be no peace for England till her head were smitten from her shoulders." On the 8th June, Elizabeth was so ill that an express was sent to the Court for two physicians to come to her assistance. They were sent, and continued in attendance upon her for several days. About this time the Princess Elizabeth professed herself to be of the Roman Catholic religion.

The date of the invention of the cipher

Explanation of the method
 Now let us break off from ordinary history to refer to the curious story Mrs. Gallup alleges she has deciphered from the first edition of the *Novum Organum* (and other documents) published by Francis Bacon in the year 1620 (p. 81). The cipher she refers to is the one known as the biliteral cipher, invented (as mentions Lord Macaulay) by Francis Bacon while in Paris in the year 1578, and full particulars of which are given in his book, *De Augmentis*. This cipher is the reduction of each of the letters of the alphabet to two symbols of a and b. If you desired to write "a" in cipher, according to his keys, you would write aaaaa; if you wanted to write "g" the cipher letters would be aabba, and if "e,"

aabaa; so that, if it were wanted to write the cipher-word "age," the a's and b's would follow in the order shown.

The next course is to insert your cipher in ordinary print. One way frequently adopted by Francis Bacon was in addition to having an ordinary font of type, to provide himself with two fonts of italic type. All the letters from a to z in font No. 1 would differ slightly in shape from the letters in italic font No. 2. In instructing the printer when to use italics, all that would be necessary would be to underline, as we do at the present time, those words in the MS. which it is desired to have in italics, and place a dot beneath each letter it is desired to have from italic font No. 1, so as to represent the "a's," leaving undotted those to be taken from italic font No. 2 to represent the "b's."

There is nothing very difficult in this, but, as Francis Bacon said, "Everything is subtle until it be conceived." Now to the cipher story :—

"Soone will my discypherer finde another kind of drama that shall give as great varietie to th' interiour Plays as hath been noted in the exterior. It is a comedy having for its actors divers whom I have used to masque myselfe from sight, having a co'stant feare lest my name should be found.

"Ill would my work fare if fate remov'd me ere they were finish'd, and ill my very life itselfe would have fared if my Plays, which I then composed, had bene knowne to be the work o' my hand, to Queene E—, who, as hath bene said previously, publiquely tearm'd herselfe a mayden-queene, whylst wife to th' Earle of Leicester. By th' union, myselfe and one brother were th' early fruits, princes by no meanes basely begot, but so farre were wee from being properly acknowledg'd, in our youth we did not surmise ourselves other than the sonne of the Lord Keeper of the Seale, Nicholas Bacon, in the one case, and of th' Earle of Essex, Walter Dev'reux, in the other."

In other parts of the cipher-story we are told that

Elizabeth and Dudley were secretly married while they were prisoners in the Tower. If this story be correct, we have the end of the tangled skein which for a long time has baffled historians.

Queen Mary married Philip of Spain, and the expectation of Elizabeth's succession to the throne was not thereby improved. However, on the 17th November, 1558, Mary died. Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, and on the 28th November took formal possession of the Tower. Lord Robert Dudley, as Master of the Horse, rode next to her. For the next thirty years until his death an association between the Queen and Dudley of a more or less close character troubled the Houses of Parliament, caused scandal in the Courts of Europe, and disquieted the public of England.

*Very interesting -
not such data*

The date of the birth of Francis Bacon is given as the 11th January, 1560 (old style) and the place as York House, Strand. The exactitude of this information is remarkable, having regard to the fact that the date and place of the birth of Anthony Bacon, the admitted son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, by Lady Ann Cooke, are not known to his biographers. Curiously, neither Montagu nor Spedding give any authority for the date and place of birth of Francis. If the cipher-story be true, Francis was the son of the secret marriage of Elizabeth with Dudley, and on the assumption that the marriage took place before Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, her right to the succession was somewhat compromised, having taken place without the consent of the Council. That is, if we can read into the terms of Henry VIII.'s will that the control of the marriage of Elizabeth passed on the death of Edward VI. to Queen Mary and her advisers.

7.

According to the cipher-story, Francis was not popular with his alleged mother Elizabeth. Taken charge of from birth by Lady Anne Bacon, we can understand the devoted care with which the child (as a possible successor to the throne) would be educated and trained, and there is evidence to show that the early training of Francis was conducted with the same

thoroughness and care that the Princess Elizabeth in her own early days received. The Queen frequently visited Gorham-bury. A bust was made of the young child at the age of 12. At an earlier age still he was taken to Court.

Now, let us turn once more to the conduct of Lord Dudley and the Queen's attitude towards him. According to Mr. Craik (Vol. I., p. 43), Robert Dudley was in June, 1550, married to Sir John Robsart's daughter, Amy, so that it is quite clear that up to September, 1560, when Amy Robsart died, Dudley was not in a position to marry Elizabeth, and that any secret union between them before that date was bigamous. On September 8th, 1560, Amy Robsart died suddenly, and we draw attention to Mr. Craik's account of the circumstances attending the death. The whole of the circumstances, carefully considered, point to the conclusion that she was deliberately murdered on an occasion when all the people about her had been sent away to Abingdon Fair. According to De Quadra's letter to the Duchess of Parma (see Froude, p. 278), "The Lord Robert had made himself master of the business of the State and of the person of the Queen to the extreme injury of the Realm with the intention of marrying her, and *she was shutting herself up in the Palace to the peril of her health and life.* . . . Last of all, he said they were thinking of destroying Lord Robert's wife. . . . The day after this conversation the Queen, on her return from hunting, told me that Lord Robert's wife was dead, or nearly so, and *begged me to say nothing about it.* . . . Since this was written the death of Lord Robert's wife has been given out publicly."

Francis was born on the 11th January previous, and on the assumption that he was the child of Dudley and Queen Elizabeth, *he was a bastard.* De Quadra writing again to Philip II. on the 22nd January, 1561, says:—

"Of this I am certain, that if she married Lord Robert without your Majesty's sanction, your Majesty has but to give a hint to her subjects, and she will lose her throne.

Re Dudi.
2. v.

Very valuable
data re the
intrigue of
R. & 2. E.
vs
Amy e.

Not

Grav.
Froude
and
etc.

. . . *She is infatuated to a degree*, which would be a notable fault in any woman, much more in one of her exalted rank. Cecil, who was the great obstacle, has given in. . . . I ought to add that this woman is generally believed to be out of her mind, and it is thought, too, that she can never have a child. *Some say that she is a mother already*, but this I do not believe."

The close relationship between Dudley and the Queen continued. It is not necessary to do more than refer to the written complaints by Mary Queen of Scots, by the Earl of Arundel and others of the very free familiarities of which Leicester was from time to time accused. For a period he occupied the next sleeping chamber to his royal mistress for a reason, says Dr. Freeman in the *Quarterly* article already referred to, "according to Elizabeth herself, which neither friend nor foe seems willing to accept, namely, that his health suffered in his former quarters." Leicester appears during the early years of the Queen's reign, to have behaved as a sort of unofficial Prince Consort. He rode by her side at all ceremonials ; he was at Court called only "my lord," without any other addition ; all affairs of State were imparted to him ; Ambassadors made their reports to him direct ; "he was always at hand to raise objections to any match with a foreign prince, or, if necessary, to insult the French Ambassador." He was created Knight of the Garter at her accession. In December, 1559, according to Dr. Lingard, it was reported in foreign Courts that the Queen and Dudley were living together. In 1564 he was created Earl of Leicester, and was the recipient of large grants of money and offices. In April, 1566, we find Cecil urging the Queen against her marrying the Earl of Leicester, one of his reasons being that "he is infamed by the death of his wife."

According to Mr. Devereux, Robert Earl of Essex was the issue of Walter Devereux, Lord Hereford, by his marriage with Lettice Knollys. At the accession of Elizabeth, the Herefords were very young people, the mother of Lady Hereford was a

first cousin to the Queen, and chief woman of her bed-chamber. Robert is stated to have been born at Netherwood, Hertfordshire, on November 10th, 1567.

Penelope, Dorothy, and Walter, other issue of Lord Hereford's marriage were born at Chartley, the Hereford country seat. Mr. Devereux, in his "Lives of the Earls of Essex" says, "Although I have followed the general report of former writers in making Netherwood the birthplace of Robert, Earl of Essex, I must observe that *it is more than doubtful*, for the register of Thornbury, in which parish Netherwood is situated, makes no mention of the fact." Some months prior to the 10th November, 1567, the date given as the birth of Robert, Queen Elizabeth had been, under pressure of the Council, negotiating marriage with the Archduke of Austria, and it is a circumstance to be noted that an important letter from the Earl of Sussex, her representative in Austria, containing terms of the proposed marriage, was in London the 10th November, but it was not until the 11th December according to Mr. Froude, "that Elizabeth collected herself to reply." In this reply, which was of a doubtful and discouraging character, she is particularly anxious for a *personal interview* with the Archduke, which, however was declined.

In 1570, a Norfolk gentleman named Marsham, was condemned to lose his ears for saying "my Lord of Leicester had two children by the Queen." In 1571 a Statute was passed rendering it penal even to speak of any other successor to the Crown of England than the issue of the reigning Queen "Naturalis ex ipsius corpore soboles." Miss Strickland says, "Elizabeth's fastidious delicacy in refusing to have the word 'lawful' annexed, *as if it were possible that any other than legitimate children could be born of her*, gave rise not only to unnecessary discussions upon the subject, but some defamatory reports as to her motives for objecting to the customary word." "I remember," says Camden, "being then a young man hearing it said openly by people, that this was done by the contrivance of Leicester, with the design to impose hereafter

some base son of his own upon the nation as the Queen's offspring." In this same year, the Manor of Mark's Hall, near Braintree, in Essex, was bestowed by the Queen upon Lord Hereford. In 1572 he was created Earl of Essex and K.G. In 1573 Essex was sent to Ireland. Fuller says he was put upon this adventure by Leicester, and accepted it as being "sensible that his room was more welcome to some than his company at Court." This journey by Essex to Ireland was a strange proceeding. The Queen gave him one half of an estate, comprising nearly the whole of the county of Antrim, in Ireland. She made an arrangement with him for fortifying and guarding the joint possession, and lent him £10,000 it is said to defray his portion of the capital expenditure. For this money and interest at 10 per cent. he gave security on some of his lands in England. The same year he wrote a strange letter to Burleigh, then the Queen's Prime Minister, offering him "the direction, education, and marriage of mine eldest son, whom, if you can like to match with your daughter, I will, &c." At this date, Robert would be six years old! During the whole of Essex's stay in Ireland, his wife and young family were living in England. In 1575, the Queen's gifts to the Earl of Leicester totalled to £50,000. In August of that year, the Queen visited Lady Essex at Chartley, and from that place wrote to the Earl agreeing to make him Earl Marshal of Ireland. To this letter she added, "Deem therefore, cousin mine, that the *search of your honour with the danger of your breath* hath not been bestowed on so ungrateful a prince, that will not both *consider the one* and *reward the other.*" Shortly after this Essex asked that he might receive, in lieu of all former grants, the Barony of Farney, in County Monaghan and the island of MacGuy.

The attitude of Essex from this time towards the Queen and her Government *grew more difficult and troublesome.* He objected to discuss business with Sir Henry Sidney, and was very pressing to have the demands he had made satisfied. In November he returned to this country and stayed at a house

in Pembrokeshire and thence came on to his town house in London. On 5th February, 1576 (see Devereux), he wrote, "But Her Majesty is *to resolve for me quickly*, for I am come to that pass as my land being entangled to her no man will give me credit for any money." In March it became apparent that Leicester was most anxious to procure the absence of Essex. In May the patent of Lord Essex as Earl Marshal of Ireland was sealed and the territory of Farney and Mac Guy's Island were granted to him. Soon afterwards Essex went to Chartley, where, according to Mr. Devereux, he was occupied in arranging his affairs as it would almost seem in anticipation of the fatal termination of his second visit to Ireland, for which country he embarked in July. On 2nd September, being then in the best of health, he and another with whom he was supping at a wine merchant's house in Dublin, were seized with illness. The guest recovered, but Essex, after enduring great agonies for about a fortnight, died. A rumour (for which there seems to have been good reason) was that he was poisoned. The day he died he wrote to the Queen, asking her to be a mother to his children. Robert was then nine years old. Sir Henry Wotton, who became associated with Robert later in his life is reported to have said that the late Earl (Robert's father) "*Had but a cold conceit of him*, and had a higher opinion of his second son Walter." Robert remained at Chartley till January 1577, when he became a member of Lord Burleigh's family, thence going to Trinity College, Cambridge. *Robert spent his Christmas holidays at the Court.* If the cipher-story be true this was quite natural. Mr. Broughton says, "On his coming the Queen meeting with him offered to kiss him, which he humbly altogether refused. Upon Her Majesty bringing him through the Great Chamber into the Chamber of Presence, Her Majesty would have him *put on his hat*, which nowise he would . . . Si' thence he hath been accompanied with the Lords to Hampden Court, Windsor, and my Lord Leicester's house at Wanstead."

To go back to the history of Francis for a moment, the

cipher-story is that in 1576, Francis being at Court became aware, through accident, of his sonship to the Queen, and that the Queen subsequently admitted the fact and upbraided him for not keeping her secret (see page 139 of the Cipher-story). The same year he was sent to France in charge of the Ambassador, Sir Amyas Paulet, and in 1577-78 he was still travelling abroad with his foster-brother Anthony, a youth of delicate health.

In 1578 Leicester married the widow of Walter, Earl of Essex, incurring the displeasure of the Queen by so doing. He was at first ordered to remain a prisoner at Greenwich Castle, and his wife forbidden the Court. The same year a portrait of Francis was painted by Hilliard, and the Queen presented her own portrait, painted by the same artist, to Sir Nicholas Bacon, whose house at Gorhambury she frequently visited. Robert's portrait by Hilliard is also at Gorhambury. In February, 1579, Sir Nicholas Bacon died. His will contained gifts of estates in Hertfordshire and Middlesex to Anthony, and also a gift to him of Gorhambury on the death of Lady Anne, but *nothing* beyond, possibly, a small sum of monee *was left to Francis!* That despite the wonderful interest shown in the training and education of Francis, *he was not provided for by his reputed father*, is very significant. As we know, Francis was then entered at Gray's Inn, and commenced life as a Barrister in Chambers. - Meanwhile Robert remained at Cambridge until some time in 1581, and gradually developed expensive habits. In 1583 he commenced to live at Lanfey, in Pembrokeshire, and it was only on the Earl of Leicester's pressure that in his seventeenth year he returned to Court. At the latter end of 1585, Essex at the request of Leicester, "who doth set much by your company," left Chartley and joined him on his visit to Holland. Thereupon Chartley is *utilised by Elizabeth* as a place for the residence, and semi-imprisonment of Mary, Queen of Scots. On 21st August, 1586, Essex writes a letter to Leicester in which he signs himself, "Your excellency's son." We do not desire to

lay too much stress on this fact, as he was then step-son, and Lady Leicester was in the habit of calling herself mother in her letters to Robert. Still it is a matter to be noted. Leicester and Essex returned together to England. In May, 1587, Leicester arranges with the Queen to resign his place as Master of the Horse in favour of Essex. The post was worth £1,500 per annum, and except on the theory of very close relations between the parties it is difficult to see why Leicester should want to give it up. About this time young Bagot, who was a companion of Essex, wrote concerning the Queen, "When she is abroad nobody near her but my Lord of Essex, and at night my Lord is at cards or one game or another with her." In 1587, according to a letter from Essex to Mr. Edward Dier, the Queen and Essex, were staying at North Hall, the seat of Lord Warwick. A quarrel took place over the behaviour of the Queen to one of the late Earl of Essex's daughters, and over Robert's treatment of Sir Walter Raleigh, whereupon Robert sent the lady away from the house at midnight, and *afterwards went away himself*, resolved to go by ship to Flushing. Sir Robert Carey was sent to fetch him back! These proceedings seem very much like the insubordination of a son.

In December of that year Essex was made Master of the Horse. The following was the famous year of the Spanish Armada, whereupon Leicester (who although then not very closely associated) wrote letters to the Queen advising how she should assemble her army. When she reviewed her troops at Tilbury she *was attended only by him*, and Essex, though the Earl of Ormonde bore the sword of State before her. At this time of great peril and excitement Leicester appears to have behaved towards the Queen very much as a near relative naturally would, even though previously estranged.

Notes of an examination of a Spaniard, Don Pedro, were handed not to the Queen but to Leicester, who in turn gave the document to Dr. Sharp to publish to the army. After the defeat of the Armada the Queen created Leicester Lord

Lieutenant of England and Ireland, an office, as Miss Strickland remarks, "that would have invested him with greater power than any sovereign of this country had ever ventured to bestow on a subject."

Leicester died later on in the year 1588. His will contained a very full adulation of the Queen and the gift of a valuable jewel. To Robert (described as his well-beloved son-in-law) he left Leicester House, his best suit of armour, his two best horses and a *George and Garter*, in the hope that he should wear it shortly. Before the year was out Essex was appointed Knight of the Garter, he being at that time about 21 years of age. Early in the following year Essex asked permission of the Queen to join a small fleet starting from Plymouth to attack the coast of Spain. The Queen refused to let him go. *In spite of this, he went on horseback from London to Plymouth and succeeded in getting away, although both Lord Huntingdon and Sir Francis Knollys had been sent after him by the Queen in order to stop him.* Later on the Queen wrote to Knollys and Drake that if Essex had reached the fleet they were *forthwith to send him back safely.* Was this the conduct of a lover or a mother? Essex, however, insisted upon staying, and joined in a landing party. He returned to England in June, and, going direct to her room, just mud-stained from his journey, soon made peace with the Queen. At this time he was in debt to the extent of £22,000. In 1590 he succeeded Leicester to the "farm of sweet wine." The same year he was secretly married to the widow of Sir Philip Sidney. The Queen, according to Mr. Devereux, was highly incensed when the marriage came to her knowledge. "Then her anger knew no bounds against Essex, not merely because he took a wife *without asking her consent*, but for marrying, as she said, *below his degree.*" So we see she was not *jealous* of him for marrying. Mr. Devereux goes on to observe: "One would have thought that the daughter of so distinguished and upright a public servant as Sir Francis Walsingham might have been esteemed a fair match even for Lord Essex."

In 1591 Essex is urged to take some troops to help Henry IV. of France. The Queen *opposed his going*. Eventually, after he had shown his displeasure by absenting himself from Court, Essex had his own way. Towards the close of that year Sir Francis Darcy was sent by the Queen to France with "peremptory orders for Robert's immediate return," and on Sir Robert Carey coming to England with news from Essex to the Queen, she flew into a great passion against the Earl, vowing she would make him an example if he did not come home forthwith. He is then allowed to be present at the siege of Rouen, but "provided he is not to put himself in danger." It is curious, as Mr. Devereux remarks, "that the honourable Privy Council should be employed in *writing orders to a General to keep out of harm's way*." Again and again was Essex urged to return home, and he appears to have found it necessary to come over to England a second time to persuade the Queen to allow him to stay longer in Normandy. Why was the old lady troubling so much about him? At the close of the year 1591, before his return, he sent a challenge to one Villiers, the Governor of Rouen, inviting him to a duel. The Queen hearing of this, a letter was written from the Council that, *owing to his position*, he had no business to engage in such a duel, and on the 9th December the Council again wrote that, "Hearing some infection had broken out in his own familiar company, they heartily desired him *to return from such danger to his person as they fear may happen from the increase of such infection*." The following year, 1592, Essex resides entirely at the Court. The next year Parliament was summoned. Mr. Devereux writes: "The position of Essex at this time was one to make an older head giddy. He was courted by the young nobles; looked up to by all military men as their leader and patron; the Puritan party considered him as their protector, while the Roman Catholics looked to him to obtain toleration. He was the idol of the populace, while the Queen could scarce bear his absence from her side." In this year the Queen's age would

be about 60, while Robert was 26. The following year Essex is still resident at Court, and we find him pressing for the appointment of Francis as Attorney-General, or, failing that, as Solicitor-General, and the result of a long struggle was that Sir Henry Coke was made Attorney-General in 1594, and Sergeant Fleming, after a further long delay, Solicitor-General. At this time Essex seems to have *taken a very prominent part in the management* of the Queen's affairs. In 1596 Essex was engaged with the fleet in a war with Spain. On his return, to the great joy of the Queen, there was considerable controversy as to the conduct of the expedition he had just returned from. At this time, says his biographer, the Earl had touched the pinnacle of his fortunes. His popular reputation was vastly increased, and therein lay the danger of his position. The Queen at this time became envious and jealous of his popularity. In February, 1597, Robert was ill, but *the Queen visited him*. R. White wrote on the 25th of that month: "Full fourteen days hath my L. of Essex kept his chamber. Her Majesty has, I heard, resolved to *break him of his will and pull down his great heart*; who found it a thing impossible, and says he holds *it from his mother's side*."

In March Essex wanted to go into Wales, and the Queen objected. Eventually he went on a visit to the ports, and his letters to the Queen are full of affection. One from Weymouth concludes: "And *know me to be the most your own* of all your maj. creatures."

In October Charles Lord Howard was created Earl of Nottingham, and he being Lord Steward of the Household had precedence over Essex. Robert accordingly *demand*ed to have the patent altered, and in the meantime *refused* to go to Court. Eventually, to appease Essex, he was on 18th December created Earl Marshal of England. In 1598 there was further trouble between the Queen and Essex as to the marriage of Lord Southampton, and the relations between them were somewhat strained.

In March, 1599, Essex at the head of a big expedition, went

to Ireland as Lieutenant-Governor. This was not, however, until after he had *as a condition of his going*, negotiated with the Queen for his release from various debts due to the Crown. He had very full powers to deal with all Irish affairs. Difficulties soon arose. Essex against the Queen's wish appointed, the Earl Southampton, General of the Horse. In August, Essex wrote to the Queen complaining of his exile. However, in September he returned to London, and immediately sought the Queen. A day or two afterwards he was summoned before the Council, and charged with having contemptuously disobeyed Her Majesty's directions, and written presumptuous letters to her. Over this matter *the Court divided openly into two parties*, one following the lead of Robert Cecil, the other that of Essex, and, finally the Queen committed him to the custody of the Lord-Keeper at York House. In November, Essex was still a captive, and Sir John Harrington about this time spoke of an interview he had with the Queen, who complained that she was no Queen, and that Essex was above her, and wanted to know who gave him authority to come back so soon. Says the biographer, "The storms raised in the Royal atmosphere by the name of Essex were probably aggravated by what took place without. *The popular voice was loud in his favour.* The severity of the Queen was blamed. The clergy preached in his vindication, and prayed for him; pamphlets were published; papers were found on the walls and scattered about the palace praising him, and libelling his supposed enemies." At this time he was seriously ill, and Elizabeth *secretly visited him.* In June, Essex, having partially recovered his health, was brought before a tribunal of 18 commissioners at York House. Their verdict was practically that he be confined a prisoner during Her Majesty's pleasure. On the 26th August, Essex again had his liberty, but was not permitted to approach the Court. He failed to recover favour with the Queen, with the result that from sorrow and repentance, he gave himself up to rage and rebellion. He used insulting expressions regarding her. He opened Essex

71. /601

House to all comers. A large number of discontented persons continually assembled there, while Puritan divines preached sermons there almost daily to large congregations of people. At the beginning of ~~1561~~ he was plotting with his friends *to obtain forcible control* of the Queen and Court, with the intention of requiring the Queen to give up her then advisers, and surround herself with his friends. His attempt failed, and as is well known, he was subsequently besieged in his own house, and finally surrendered. He was tried for his rebellion and sentenced to death. During the week following, the Queen first signed the warrant for execution and then *sent to countermand* it. In the absence of expressions of submission, which appears to have been sent but intercepted, and under the influence of Raleigh and Cobham, she sent orders to execute the warrant Thereupon (25th February, 1601) Essex was executed in private on account of his popularity with the people. So powerful was the feeling in his favour, that *after his death the Queen was no longer received with cheers, but was received in silence when she appeared in public*, and her Ministers insulted. The Queen died on the 24th March, 1603.

We conclude our examination of Elizabethan history in the light of the cipher-story with the belief that a *prima facie* case is established in favour of such story. Viewed afresh the relationship of Elizabeth and Leicester appears to be quite consistent with the allegation that he was *de jure* her husband, *though the relationship was not such as could be publicly claimed on either side*. There is a reasonable probability for believing the cipher-story to be true in its statement that both Francis and Robert were the issue of that union. The death of Leicester's wife Amy not having occurred till September, precludes the suggestion that Francis, in the January preceding, was born in wedlock. This may account for the attitude which the Queen adopted towards him during almost the whole of his life. Her behaviour to Robert on the other hand is consistent with his having been her child after some form of

private marriage such as is set forth fully in the cipher-story, had been performed between herself and Leicester. It is tolerably clear that while Sir Nicholas Bacon and his wife were safely trusted with the Queen's secret there was considerable doubt as to the fidelity of the first Earl of Essex, which strengthens the belief that he was purposely put out of the way. The part taken by Leicester at all times of his favour with the Queen appears to have been that of an unacknowledged Prince Consort, and the Queen would seem in the year 1571, and probably down to a much later period, to have had some expectation of the succession falling on her unacknowledged child Robert. Her behaviour to Robert and his to her seem to us that of mother and son and not that of lover and mistress, like the traffic between Elizabeth and Sir Christopher Hatton, for instance. His wilfulness and his masterfulness were characteristics which he could have well inherited from the Queen, ending with the sad denouement which we have in this article once more briefly indicated. *The populace would seem to have behaved as if they believed him to be the Queen's own son.*

In his prosecution the cipher-story tells us that Francis was compelled under pain of death to take a part. This course was no new thing in the history of the period. The father of Queen Anne Boleyn was compelled to sit on a Commission which tried her offences, and it is only natural on the assumption of the truth of the relationship that the Queen at the age of 68, at a time too when Leicester was long since dead, should try to support her action against her younger and favourite son by insisting upon the elder although illegitimate taking part in the prosecution.

This alleged new revelation of history is terribly sad, but, if it be the truth, those living at a distance of 300 years after the events recorded, must regretfully accept it.

2. v. p. 2

V.
m
Came ...
to a
year ...
10

The Retort Courteous.

Touchstone.—“O, Sir! we quarrel in print by the book, as you have books for good manners. I will name you the degrees. The first is the Retort Courteous.”

As You Like It.

“The silence often of pure innocence
Persuades where speaking fails.”

Winter's Tale.

THE RETORT COURTEOUS.

(Being a Reply to an Article Rejecting the "Cipher Story.")

—:0:—

JUST after correcting the proofs of the preceding Essay, my attention was drawn to an article by Mr. G. C. Bompas, in *Baconiana* for January, 1901.

As that gentleman takes an entirely different view of the "Cipher Story," it seems to me desirable in this place to give my comments upon his article.

I gather the following to be the main points put forward by Mr. Bompas against the truth of the "Cipher Story" :—

1. That the book is published to bolster up the works of a certain American author, Dr. Owen.

2. That the disclosures in Mrs. Gallup's book are in direct conflict with Francis Bacon's own statements in his authentic work, "The Felicities of Elizabeth."

3. That in the light of the ascertained facts of history, the story may be rejected as fabulous.

I therefore deal with the points in the above order.

1. While it would appear to be in accordance with modern literary manners to suggest that any person favouring the Baconian view of the authorship of the Shakespearian Plays is a "crank," or "quarter educated," I was unprepared to find a writer in *Baconiana* ready to impute sinister motives to a new worker in the field of research. As to the likelihood of a cipher, so careful a thinker as Mr. W. F. C. Wigston has borne testimony, but it seems to be the fate of those who work in that particular direction to meet with nothing but contumely and reproach. The late Mr. Donelly, with his mathematical cipher has just gone to his grave "unwept, unhonoured, and unsung."

Of his monumental compilation, known as the "Great Cryptogram," published at 30s., I was able to secure a copy for 5s. Dr. Owen, with his "Word Cipher," has broken down through ill-health, and now Mr. Bompas proceeds to give him a kick. Why ought Mrs. Gallup to expect better treatment? I understand that her eyesight is affected, and that she has been ordered complete rest, while her work is referred to in a magazine as "American tarradiddles." The lady is a complete stranger to me, save for a bow exchanged on the occasion of the only meeting I have attended of the Bacon Society. She seemed and has been since described to me to be a modest and fair-minded American lady, and as a mere act of common politeness, she deserves to be treated as honourable until the contrary be conclusively proved. If Mr. Bompas desires to completely discredit her, his first course should be to employ competent decipherers to check over portions of the works she vouches, and if their report be adverse, publish it. The truth or untruth of the story which she has deciphered (the voice from a long past age) is another matter. As to the suggestion of profit, I am prepared to assert that there is no reason for the expectation that the labours of Mr. Donnelly, Dr. Owen, and Mrs. Gallup could ever be adequately compensated by the profits of their books, any more than could the producers of the first Shakespeare folio have expected to make money by it. It is not merely a question whether there has been profit in any of these cases, but whether such profit was adequate for the sacrificing labour involved. I think Mr. Bompas has failed to prove this point, and should in any event have reserved it to a future occasion.

2. I feel indebted to Mr. Bompas for reminding us of the eulogy written by Francis Bacon six years after Queen Elizabeth's death, and published after his own death, *in accordance with special directions* left by him. Until the Cipher Story, Francis Bacon's strong anxiety for the publication after his death of the "Felicities" was inexplicable to me. It consists of a string of platitudes and adulatory statements inconsistent

with what we know, and what Francis himself must have known, about the Queen. Why did Francis print copies, and send them amongst his bosom friends, and report to Sir Tobie Matthew "that it carries a manifest impress of truth with it, and that it even convinces as it grows?" As the "Felicities" may not be handy for all my readers, I must refer them to Mr. Bompas's article; but these are some of the items it contains:—

"For if, perhaps, there fly abroad any factious fames of her, raised either by discontented persons or such as are averse to religion, which, notwithstanding, dare now scarce show their faces, and are everywhere cried down, the same are neither true, neither can they be long lived." Again, "Notwithstanding, I have thought good to insert something now concerning her moral part, yet only in those things which have ministered occasion to some malicious to traduce her." Again, "But to make an end of this discourse, certainly this Princess was good and moral, and such she would be acknowledged." And again, "This much in brief, according to my ability, but to say the truth, the only commender of this lady's virtues is time." Mr. Bompas is quite right, Francis Bacon, if speaking in cipher, contradicts Francis Bacon in the "Felicities." Is there any explanation of the contradiction? I think there is. At the time the Queen died it is manifest from the "Felicities" that the remarks flying abroad about Elizabeth were, (to quote Bret Harte) "frequent and painful and free." The population was largely composed of Papists "averse in religion," and they were not disposed to deal gently with her memory. Charles the First was at that time on the united throne of England and Scotland, but the Earl of Essex had left children, and it was most undesirable that questions should be raised as to the right of the Stuarts to the throne. Owing to the lapse of time there was no likelihood of any trustworthy evidence being procurable as to the marriage of Dudley and the Queen, and it was best for the State that these rumours should be quieted down. Moreover, whose statement would be more likely to be accepted as final than that of the

last surviving, though illegitimate, son of the rumoured union ? I think, therefore, that the contradiction, which Mr. Bompas very properly emphasises, is between a statement intended for publication immediately after Bacon's death for sound reasons of State, and another statement expected to be revived at a much later date, when no harm to the succession to the throne could be done by it.

3. The facts of history, says Mr. Bompas, conflict with Mrs. Gallup's disclosures. As to the particulars of his birth, Francis Bacon, like any other of us, had to rely upon what he was told. I should imagine, from what I understand of the characteristics of this great man, that he naturally clung to the theory of his legitimacy. But whether the union of Dudley and Elizabeth was blessed by a priest or not we are never likely to know. It is possible, as Mr. Bompas says, that she may have known of Dudley's marriage with Amy Robsart, and she may have been an eye-witness of the illustration of the manners of that time, which Mr. Bompas quotes, namely, "When gentlemen did strive who should first take away a goose's head, which was hung alive on two cross posts," but just, as he reminds us later in his article, that the Queen confessed to Bishop Quadra *that she was no angel*, it is quite possible that the union in the Tower was a vulgar intimacy which had its results on the future conduct of the parties. Let us bear in mind somewhat of the habits and manners of the time. Read what M. Taine says of the habits at Playhouses ; read of the intrigues at the Court ; the Sir Thomas Seymour papers ; the Hatton correspondence ; think of the bull-baiting, bear-baiting, and dog-fighting that Lords and Ladies delighted in ; witness how readily undesired persons were beheaded, or otherwise got out of the way, and it is not necessary for the justification of the "Cipher Story" to produce a marriage certificate. With regard to tolerance in religion in Elizabeth's reign, it is quite true that there was little or no burning of Papists by the party representing the Protestant religion, but matters had not really altered, or

three Unitarian ministers would not have been successively burnt at the stake at Norwich.

Mr. Bompas next shows by extracts from State papers that on 15th October, 1560, Quadra reported that the Queen had decided not to marry Lord Robert; that in December she notified Scotland that she was not presently disposed to marry; that on the 22nd January, 1561, and 3rd and 6th February of the same year the Queen signed official documents, and on the 15th of the latter month gave audience to Quadra. Now, says Mr. Bompas, the 22nd January, 1561, was the date of Francis Bacon's birth, and "in the light of all these facts the story of Francis Bacon being Elizabeth's son may be rejected as fabulous." If Mr. Bompas is right as to his date I admit he has made a very strong point. *But is he accurate?* Montagu's "Life" gives 11th January, 1560, as the date of birth; and 22nd January, 1620, as the date of the special celebration of his 60th birthday; Spedding's "Life" gives the date 22nd January, 1560-1. No doubt the 22nd is arrived at by altering eleven days to make it "new style."

Both Montagu and Spedding state Bacon to have died on 9th April, 1626, at the age of 66. The inscription on the tombstone gives "ætatis 66." I notice the "Dic. National Biography" gives 22nd January, 1561, for the birth, but I should like to know on what better authority. Seeing that in Elizabeth's time the historical year had long dated from 1st January, the ecclesiastical year, dating from 25th March, had nothing to do with the matter. Until Mr. Bompas comes forward with a baptismal certificate, I take 1560 as the year, and 11th January (old style), as the day and month. He can hardly expect a certificate to be forthcoming in support of my side of the controversy!

Mr. Froude, from whom doubtless Mr. Bompas, like myself, quotes the Quadra letters, gives his history dates as A.D., and, I presume, has simply translated the letters without alteration of dates to new style. I also apprehend Quadra used in his letters the dates current in England at that time.

That being so, I have no doubt whatever that Mr. Bompas is *clearly wrong as to eleven days*. There is accordingly *nothing extraordinary in a Queen signing a State document eleven days, and interviewing an Ambassador five weeks, after her confinement*. That is, even if we accept (which at present I do not) 1561 as the year Francis was born.

The quotations given by Mr. Bompas subsequent to 22nd January, 1561, do not in any way defeat the suggestion of a form of marriage prior to the birth, on 10th November, 1567, of the son Robert. In fact, the letter of 6th August, 1566, is strong evidence that the Queen on that date *had definitely promised* that if she altered her determination as to marriage she would chose *no other than Dudley*. Everything points to the assumption that Dudley, whom the Queen, according to Miss Strickland, used to call her "Turk," was a little too much for Elizabeth, and I can well understand why Elizabeth, in 1554, was so anxious for a marriage between Dudley and Mary Queen of Scots. He was in the way of her ambition, and, if the facts of that time were as the "Cipher Story" suggests, it was in his power to disclose secrets which might not only defeat her matrimonial schemes but possibly endanger her throne. I cannot accept the short statements made by Mr. Bompas as to Dudley's relations with Lady Sheffield, and subsequently with Lady Essex. The facts should be studied in the books of Mr. Craik, Mr. Devereux, and Miss Strickland, which are referred to at the head of my previous article. Nor do I see any difficulty in Robert succeeding to the Earldom of Essex, which the Queen had herself created only seven years before; nor to the Essex estates, which were already mortgaged to the Queen. What chance had Walter Devereux at the age of six, seeing that his mother was wedded to Leicester? Various difficulties, with which Mr. Bompas sums up his article, do not seem to me to be more than matters which a little further elucidation will make clear. I think that he will find that many of the printers' and publishers' names are merely *noms-de-plume*, for the purpose of concealment. Mr.

Bompas does not adduce in support of his argument the attitude of Bacon to those persons whom he always outwardly dealt with as his relations, such as Lady Ann Bacon, the Cecils, and the other relatives of Sir Nicholas Bacon's family. I think it was quite imperative on all parties in the secret that these conventions should be observed, so I attach more importance to the curious fact that, from early dates in their careers, both Francis and Robert were taken charge of by the Queen and her ministers. Sir Nicholas Bacon did not die until 1579, and the following year we find Francis (see letter of 15th October, 1580) thanking the Queen, through Lord Burleigh, for having appointed him to the Court, and made some provision for his maintenance. Doubtless up to 1579 his maintenance was provided through Sir Nicholas. Again, I see no special reason (except as explained by the Cipher) why Bacon and Essex should have always been such close friends, and always concerned in fighting one another's battles with the Queen.

not well

Of course I am not so stupid as to believe that I have said the last word upon this very large and complicated business; but it is manifestly a case that should be carefully investigated by our cleverest men, and not boycotted as it appears to be at present.

NOTE.

See Appendices II. and V.




Edmund Spenser's Poems.

“The Violet pallid blue,
The little Daisy that at evening closes,
The virgin Lily and the Primrose true,
With store of vermeil Roses,
To deck their Bridegroom posies,
Against the Bridal day which was not long :
Sweet Thames run softly till I end my song.”

Prothalamion.

EDMUND SPENSER'S POEMS.

[*Reprinted from "Baconiana."*]



IN a book entitled "The Bi-literal Cipher of Sir Francis Bacon," discovered in his works, and deciphered by Mrs. E. W. Gallup (London: Gay and Bird), amongst other remarkable statements, it is asserted that Francis Bacon claims to have written the "Færie Queene," and other poems, hitherto attributed to Edmund Spenser; further, that Francis Bacon was the son of a secret marriage of Elizabeth and Robert Earl of Leicester. Robert Earl of Essex is alleged to be a younger son of the same union.

Believing that the truth or falsity of these assertions might, perhaps, be demonstrated by an examination of what is known about the life and works of Spenser, we have devoted a little leisure to the examination of the works and a number of the biographies of Spenser.

The very few facts known about Spenser, apart from the printed works, may be summarised as follows:—

Aubrey says, he "was a little man, wore short haire, little band, and little cuffs." In July, 1580, Spenser proceeded to Dublin, as secretary to Lord Wilton. He held several public offices, acquired and trafficked in certain estates, was granted Kilcolman Castle and three thousand acres of land, started to return to this country December 9th, and arrived at Whitehall 24th December, 1598. He died 16th January, 1599. There is no evidence of his having visited England between 1580 and December, 1598. His identity even is not clearly established. He may have been the Edmund Spenser who in October, 1569, brought letters to Elizabeth from her Ambassador in France.

Another conjecture is that he was the Edmund Spenser (believed to be the son of a journeyman tailor) who, in 1568, was a poor scholar at Merchant Taylors School, and, in 1569, entered Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. The date of the poet's birth is unknown. Assuming him to have been Spenser No. 2, a calculation of his supposed age would fix his birth about 1552. The calculation from Sonnet No. 60 is difficult to comprehend. The date of his marriage is gravely given as 11th June, 1594. The biographer's authority for this is the "Epithalamion," published in 1595. Perusal of the verses should satisfy anyone that this poem is not addressed to a real person. It is a poet's ideal of a marriage to an ideal bride, and this he distinctly tells us in the first verse :

"So Orpheus did for his owne bride,
So I unto *myself alone* will sing,
The woods shall to me answer and my eccho ring."

The poem mentions a day for such a marriage—

"This day the sunne is in his chiefest hight,
With Barnaby the bright."

Saint Barnabas (the longest day) was (old style) 11th June. The poem was published in 1595. Hence, say the biographers, Spenser was married on 11th June, 1594!

Unless this can be called evidence, there is nothing to prove the date, and there is certainly nothing to prove the place of marriage, nor the name of his wife. The names of Spenser's parents, and the *place* of his birth are also unknown. He left no manuscript letters, or poems in manuscript. There may be some MS. of his "View of Ireland," a short work in prose, but it is doubtful. The place of his birth is stated to be London, upon the authority of some words in the *Prothalamion*—a spousall verse, written in honour of two daughters of the Earl of Worcester, who were married at Essex House, Strand, on 8th November, 1596. The verse was published about the same time. The passage is :

“To mery London my most kindly nurse,
That to me gave this life's first native source ;
Though from another place I take my name,
An house of ancient fame.”

The same poem contains this passage :

“When I (whom sullen care
Through discontent of my long fruitless stay
In princes' Court, and expectation vain
Of idle hopes which still do fly away,
Like empty shadows did afflict my brain)
Walked forth to ease my paine.”

A writer in Vol. 18 of the *Dublin University Magazine* failed to reconcile this complaint with the facts of Spenser's pecuniary position. Kilcolman Castle and its 3,000 acres, to say nothing of paid appointments, ought to have been good enough.

Francis Bacon, in 1594, was, at the age of 33, still unsuccessful in his application for advancement by Court favour, and had been passed over for the post of Solicitor General. He was born in London, and the poem is open to another interpretation :

“Though from another place [St. Alban's] I take
my name, [Bacon]
An house of ancient fame.”

(The house of which Sir Nicholas Bacon was the head.)

On the authority of the 74th Sonnet in the “Amoretti,” published in 1595, the biographers assert that Elizabeth was the name both of the poet's wife, and of his mother. Neither an Elizabeth Spenser, mother of Edmund Spenser, nor an Elizabeth his wife, has ever been traced. We say this despite Dr. Grosart's book. But, assuming the sonnet to have been written by Francis Bacon, it fits in with his story of his mother being Queen Elizabeth. It is more than likely that all three Elizabeths in the sonnet, referred to one in the three

capacities of mother, queen, and beloved one. Lady Elizabeth Hatton, to whom Bacon paid his addresses, was not a widow until March, 1596.

The poems were produced in the following order :

“Shepherd’s Calendar,” December, 1579, anonymously under the signature “Immerito,” dedicated to Philip Sidney :

“Goe, little booke, thyself present,
As child whose parent is un-kent.”

“Faerie Queene” (1st part), 1590, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth and with an introductory letter to Sir Walter Raleigh.

“Complaiments,” 1591, a collection of poems variously dedicated to Lady Compton, the Marquesse of Northampton, Lady Strange, Countess of Pembroke, and Lady Carey. The same volume contains a poem called “Virgil’s Gnat,” curiously dedicated to the Earl of Leicester, who died 1588. We give a part of this dedication :—

“Wronged yet, not daring to express my paine,
To you, great lord, the causer of my care,
In cloudie tears I thus complain
Unto yourselfe, that only privie are.”

This seems to lend support to the cipher story. One fails to see that Spenser had any cause of complaint against the Earl of Leicester. Spenser was in Ireland, and well off.

Before leaving the “Complaiments,” it occurs to us as remarkable that a poet known to be living at that time in Ireland, which at that period was about as far off in the way of days journeying as Jamaica is from us to-day, should be so well acquainted with a number of ladies of title frequenting the Court of Elizabeth. No correspondence with him has ever been shown to have existed. Francis Bacon, whom the cipher story declares to be the author, was in almost daily attendance at Court.

In 1595 were published the “Amoretti” (Sonnets), “Astro-

phel," and the "Epithalamion." I quote a portion of Sonnet No 33:—

“Great wrong I doe, I can it not deny,
 To that most sacred Emperesse my dear dread,
 Not finishing her Queen of Faery
 That mote enlarge her living prayes dead.
 But Lodwick this of grace to me aread.
 Do ye not thinck th' accomplishment of it
 Sufficient work for one man's simple head.”

The "Astrophel" were verses on the death of Sir Philip Sidney, who died in 1586, and with it were published poems by a sister of Sir Philip, and by his old friend, Ludovick Bryskett.

"Colin Clout Home Again" was published in 1595, but had been written before 27th December, 1591.

In 1596, the second part of "Faerie Queene" was published, and "Fower Hymns," which were dated from Greenwich, 1st September, 1596, and dedicated to the Countesses of Cumberland and Warwick.

In 1609, after Spenser's death, there was a re-issue in folio of the "Faerie Queene," with *two cantos never before printed*.

In 1611 the whole of Spenser's works were collected and published in folio.

Certain facts at first sight appear to support the contention of Spenser's authorship. These are:—

1. Five letters published in two parts in 1580, some of the prints having the name Spenser upon them. The correspondence is nominally between Gabriel Harvey, of Cambridge, and "Immerito," and contains two printed letters of October, 1579, and April, 1580, ascribed to Spenser. The earlier of the Spenser letters is preceded by a Latin poem, which states that the writer expected to be sent abroad to France and Italy, and also contains the word "Edmontus," as the writer of the lines.

2. The plain reference to the scenery round Spenser's home

at Kilcolman in the "Colin Clout," written in 1591, but *not published till 1595.*

3. In 1606 was published a "Discourse on Civil Life," being a translation from Italian by Ludovic Bryskett. To this book is a curious introduction, the purport of which was evidently to say that Bryskett met a number of friends (including Spenser) at a cottage in Dublin, and there Spenser being asked to discuss moral philosophy, replied that he had already dealt with the matter in heroical verse, under the title of "Faerie Queene."

On the theory of the accuracy of the Cipher story, it is desirable to know a little more about Harvey and Bryskett, and what Bacon and they were doing about this time.

Harvey was at Cambridge as a Fellow and Lecturer from 1570 to 1585. Philip Sidney, Edward Dyer, Edward Kirke and Francis Bacon were at Cambridge during Harvey's period, Bacon being there from April 1573 to December, 1575. Bryskett was an Italian who went abroad with Philip Sidney as his companion from 1572 to 1575, travelling in Germany, Italy, and Poland. Francis Bacon was with the Embassy in France in 1576 to late in 1578. During his stay in Paris he invented the Bi-literal Cipher (see Macaulay's Essay), and his miniature was painted by Hilliard, having round it words which translated are, "If I could only paint his mind." Clearly at the age of about eighteen Bacon was a very precocious young man. In 1578 a Literary Society called the "Areopagus" was formed, and met at Leicester House (afterwards Essex House), Strand. Sidney was a poet, and probably the president. We are disposed to think that, amongst others, Bacon, Bryskett, Dyer, and possibly Kirke, were members. Harvey would appear to have been the old tutor of most of these men, and had a scheme of his own for improving English verse. Bryskett was Clerk to the Irish Council, but that no more involved residence in Ireland than the holding of the present Secretaryship of State for India involves residence in the latter place. He was a dependent of Sidney and Leicester, and there is no

proof that he was ever in Ireland. He certainly held a patent as Clerk to the Council in Munster, but divided the pay with Spenser, who did the work in Ireland. In February, 1591, shortly after the "Faerie Queene" (1st part) was produced, a pension of £50 was granted to Spenser, but there is no evidence of its ever having been paid to him, nor that he was in England in that year.

During the whole of the period 1580—96 over which the poems appeared, we know that Francis Bacon was at Grays Inn struggling as a barrister, and repeatedly importuning the Queen's Ministers to be appointed to some place of profit under the Crown. Sidney, Dyer and Bryskett were all reputed versifiers. Why not Francis? It is quite likely that Francis published the "Shepherd's Calendar" anonymously, that subsequently being fearful of discovery he induced Spenser to let him use his name, Spenser being rewarded by the appointment in Ireland procured for him. For what useful purpose were these letters printed later in 1580, unless *to mislead as to the real authorship of the Calendar*. The "Faerie Queene" in 1590 having proved to be a success, was followed early in the succeeding year by the grant of a pension of £50, which, if ever paid, probably went into Francis Bacon's pocket or the funds of the "Areopagus." Surely "Colin Clout" was written with a view to immediate publication should any further question be raised as to the imputed authorship of the "Faerie Queene" and other poems published at that time. It was a proper precaution to take in those dangerous times, and likely to have been adopted by a cautious man such as Francis Bacon. That it, with its local allusion to Kilcolman and neighbourhood, was not published until 1595, strengthens the belief as to the true object of the poem, namely to *throw people off the scent once more as to the real authorship of Spenser*. The introduction placed in Bryskett's work in 1606 *was to serve a like purpose*. Francis Bacon, who at that time had made a considerable advance in popularity and reputation for great learning, *was again taking cover*. Otherwise what

chance had he as the known author of these poems of being, in 1607, promoted to the office of Solicitor-General, with an income of £1,000 per annum?

Practical Joking in 1592.

**“His language, when he could spare or pass by a
jest, was nobly censorious.”**


Ben Jonson.

(Testimony to Francis Bacon.)

“And one man in his time plays many parts.”

As You Like It.

PRACTICAL JOKING IN 1592.



HAVING ventured in *Baconiana* for January, 1901, here reprinted, to hazard a speculation as to the works published under the name of "Edmund Spenser," and as it is unlikely that my time will permit of much further participation in the interesting questions raised by the Cipher story, deciphered by Mrs. Gallup, or alleged so to be, I write here the result of a raiding incursion upon the works of "Robert Greene."

Enjoying the advantage of having no literary reputation to maintain, nor responsibility of Baconian Council to conserve, I have been free to welcome the Cipher story as a beacon and work along in the light it sheds. If it prove a will-o'-the-wisp and land me in the desert pursued by well mounted literary men armed with Mauser rifles, what matters?

Wherever I have turned along the path of the great Bacon-Shakespeare controversy I have been met with the eternally quoted address to Greene's "Groatsworth of Wit." I became so familiar with:—

"The Tygres heart wrapt in a Player's hide."

and the "Johannes Factotum and only Shakescene," &c., that I actually took the trouble to read the whole of the address in Dyce's "Life and Works of Marlowe."

Really, I said to myself; this is not only clever, but in many places it seems quite Baconian in style

"As he beganne in craft lived in feare and ended in despaire"

"For one being spoken to, all are offended—none being blamed, no man is injured."

"Your lives are like so many light tapers that are, with care,

E

delivered to all of you to maintain, these with wind puffed wrath may be extinguished, with drunkenness put out, with negligence let fall."

The last quotation called to my mind,

"Out, out, brief candle,
Life is but a walking shadow,
A poor player who struts, and
Frets his hour upon the stage,
And then is heard no more."—*Macbeth*.

"Here burns my candle out ; ay, here it dies,
The air hath got into my deadly wounds."

—3 *Henry VI.*, II. 2.

Having long ago accepted Bacon as the writer of the Shakespeare Plays I must be excused for classing as Baconian some nominally Shakespearian quotations.

It then occurred to me to enquire what sort of rubbish was the real work of Greene, seeing that the *address* from the "Groatsworth" seemed the only thing literary people were interested in. I thought I should discover a sort of sixteenth century trash (which would be well sold at fourpence), and satisfy myself, by the difference of quality, that Francis and his "brachygraphy men"* had been up to their tricks again, and that the "address" was inserted as some bit of cover in connection with the use of Shakespeare's name as the author of Plays.

After many enquiries I found myself a short time ago fortunate in being able to come across a set of fifteen volumes of "The Life and Works of Robert Greene," edited by the late Dr. Grosart, of which only fifty copies appear to have been printed.

I spent a couple of days over these books, more particularly the "Life," and must express my admiration for the great research and unselfish trouble displayed by the learned editor.

* *Note.* Shorthand writers (See Murray's Dictionary).

But I found him deficient in one respect—Humour.

He had unknowingly resuscitated from semi-oblivion a number of the early Plays and novels, and pamphlets produced under the *nom de plume* of "Robert Greene." That is not very humorous, you will reply; but I am coming to the joke, which has proved a very practical one, so much so as to impose upon the learned for over three hundred years.

Now, it is complained in respect of Bacon decipherers, that they will not deliver up their "keys" when demanded by investigators. I will not imitate their example. But I had better first give you the joke.

Just as Sherlock Holmes had to die to satisfy the exigencies of Dr. Conan Doyle, just as poor "Tompkins," the coster poet of the London *Daily Chronicle*, had to depart this life to make a stepping-stone of his dead self to higher things, for (I believe), Mr. Barry Pain, so "Robert Greene" died for Francis Bacon.

True, all three departed were in the nature of *noms de plume*, but they had become popular in their several walks, and were much regretted.

But while "Sherlock Holmes" and "Tompkins" drew their last breaths very quietly, the same cannot be said of "Robert Greene."

Never in this world was the departure from this sublunary abode made the opportunity of such lecturing, addressing, repentances, death-bed confessions, not to mention visions, and a fierce pamphlet warfare over the "deceased."

Just as Gabriel Harvey, an old college friend of young Francis (the latter was aged 32, in 1592), had in 1580 been called in with the "Two Letters," and "Three Letters" to assist in fastening the paternity of the "Shepherd's Calendar" upon the shoulders of poor little Spenser, so in 1592, with the "Four Letters" of extravagant invective, he was again engaged helping to make believe there had been a real death and burial of "Robert Greene."

According to Dr. Grosart, Greene died 3rd September, 1592. He states this upon no better authority than that in the "Repentance" (that godsend to "Greene's" biographers), is the date "2nd of September, 1592, written by thy dying husband Robert Greene."

On 4th December, 1592, Harvey's "Four Letters" are entered on the registers. On 8th of same month a reply pamphlet "Kinde Hart's Dream," by "Henry Chettle" is entered. Says Dr. Grosart, "such rapidity of work can only be explained by the supposition that the printer of Harvey's pamphlet allowed Chettle to read the proofs.

"Indeed my lord it followed hard upon."

On 12th January, 1593, appeared a pamphlet by one Thomas Nashe, called "Strange News" defending Greene and attacking Harvey. The ball was still kept rolling by later pamphlets, but I need not further pursue that matter. Now for the key.

If any reader will take the 12th vol. of Grosart's "Greene" he should read :—

1. "Greene's Groatsworth of Wit."
2. "The Repentance of Robert Greene."
3. "Greene's Visions."

The last is the most important for elucidating the subject. It purports to have been written at the "instant of his death" (see title). Read first the Preface from which I now quote :—

"I crave pardon of you all if I have offended you with lascivious pamphleting. Many things I have wrote to get money, which, I could otherwise wish to be suppress. Poverty is the father of innumerable infirmities."

I now quote from the "Visions" :—

"I will begin from henceforth to hate all such follies, and to write of matters of some import, either moral to discover the actual course of virtue, how man should direct his

life to the perfect felicity, or else to discourse as a naturalist of the perfection that nature hath planted in her creatures, thereby to manifest the excellent glory of the Maker, or some political axioms, or canonical precepts that may both jointly and particularly profit the Commonwealth. . . . They which hold Greene for a patron of love, and a second Ovid shall now think him a Timon of such lineaments, and a Diogenes that will bark at every amorous pen."

Then follows a vision of Solomon, who makes a speech, and "Greene" goes on to say :—

"And this he spake with such a majesty that the terror of his countenance affrighted me, and I started and awoke and found myself in a dream ; yet, gentlemen, when I entered into the consideration of the vision and called to mind not only the counsel of Gower and the persuasions of Solomon, a sudden fear attended every limb, and I felt a horror in my conscience for the follies of my pen, whereupon, as in my dream so awake, I resolved peremptorily to leave all thoughts of love, and to apply my wits as near as I could to seek after wisdom so highly commended by Solomon ; but howsoever the direction of my studies shall be limited me, as you had blossoms of my wanton fancies, so you shall have the fruits of my better labours."

The reader should now turn to an undated letter, written by Francis Bacon when he was 31 years old, to Lord Burghley. The year of this letter would be 1591 or 1592, according as the year of his birth (see my second article) is 1560 or 1561. Let me quote from it :—

"I ever bear in mind (in some middle place that I could discharge) to serve her Majesty. . . . Again the meanness of my estate doth somewhat move me : for though I cannot accuse myself that I am either prodigal or slothful, yet my health is not to spend nor my course to get.

“ Lastly, I confess that I have as vast contemplative ends as I have moderate civil ends ; for I have taken all knowledge to

be my province. . . . This, whether it be curiosity or vain glory or nature or (if one take it favourably) philanthropia, is so fixed in my mind as it cannot be removed.

“And I do easily see that place of any reasonable countenance doth bring commandment of more wits than of a man’s own, which is the thing I greatly affect. And if your lordship will not carry me on . . . I will become some sorry book-maker, or a true pioneer in that mine of truth which (he said) lay so deep.”

So we see, in 1592, “Robert Greene” intended to write of “matters of some import,” “to discuss the actual course of virtue . . . or else to discourse as a naturalist,” resolved “to leave all thoughts of love,” and “to seek after wisdom, so highly commended by Solomon.”

Bacon, in his Essays, says, “It is impossible for a man to love and be wise.”

The Cipher story includes a claim not only to the works of Greene but the “Anatomy of Melancholy” also. Let the reader next refer to that short part of it in which the idea of a “New Atlantis” is discoursed upon. Then read Bacon’s “New Atlantis,” and, afterwards, Heydon’s “Land of the Rosicrucians.” By this time the “death” of “Robert Greene” will, I think, be understood in its true relevance, and (so far as the reader has been put to some considerable trouble and vicarious suffering) I trust, avenged!

2. v. succeeding

Greene's Biographers and Critics.


“Oh! my Antonio, I do know of those
That therefore only are reputed wise
For saying so.”

Merchant of Venice.

Re-reading: Invaluable

valuable - use

GREENE'S BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS.



WHAT the biographers can tell us about "Greene" is not worth knowing.

No living family of "Greene" claims him as ancestor.

His alleged burial was at the "New Churchyard near Bethlehem Hospital." Who has found the grave?

The biographers dispute both as to the place and year of his birth. One says Norwich; another Ipswich. Dyce says he was born in 1550; Grosart and others say 1560.

A "Robert Green" was entered as a sizar or poor scholar of St. John's, Cambridge, on 15th November, 1575, leaving, says Storojenko, in 1578, having passed B.A. (Cooper's "Athenae Cantabrigienses"). Grosart says "Greene" did not leave until 1583, but gives no authority except the dedication and title to "Mamillia" (2nd part), which may have been purposely intended to mislead. Foster's "Alumni Oxonienses" says "Robert Green" was incorporated at Oxford 1588. Grosart asserts, and the biographer in the Dic. Nat. Biography denies, that a certain Vicar of Tollesbury, named Robertus Grene, who became vicar 19th June, 1584, and resigned 17th February, 1585, can be identified with the author. Grosart says the author was a cleric, and vouches some references to the "red-nosed minister" in proof of his point. I hazard the suggestion that the poor scholar who left Cambridge as B.A. in 1578 is the red-nosed cleric who was probably called upon to resign after the short seven months at Tollesbury. As the collier remarked to the Bishop travelling in mufti when the latter said he was not then vicar of the parish, but had been—"Drink, I suppose!" Green may accordingly have been the person whose name slightly

altered was for valuable consideration (see the Cipher Story) put forward as a mask for Francis Bacon.

Let me state another odd fact. "Greene's Repentance" affirms that the author travelled in Italy and Spain. The biographers cannot agree as to the years when the alleged travelling took place, but the works do not shew that the author was at all acquainted with Spain. They do shew some book knowledge of Italy (and there is reason to believe Francis travelled there in 1579, or earlier), and a considerable acquaintance with France, where we know he resided for a long period.

In "Never Too Late; or, Francesco's Fortunes" published in 1590 are:—

- (1). A minute description of Paris.
- (2). A criticism of the French Court and Society.
- (3). Sketches of refined life at Lyons.

"Spenser's" "Shepherd's Calendar" was entered on the registers *anonymously* in 1579.

"Greene's" "Myrrour of Modestie" was also registered *anonymously* earlier in the same year (though not published until some years later).

"Peele's" "Arraignment of Paris," which was a Court entertainment very much in praise of Elizabeth, was published *anonymously* in 1584.

"Marlowe's" Tamburlaine was shortly afterwards published *anonymously*.

"Greene's" publications commenced with "Mamillia" in 1580, and until 1590 continued to be of a light class of love tale, after the Italian style. In 1590 his writings assumed a more serious turn. In 1591 he published his "Farewell to Follie," which was in the nature of a farewell to his former class of literary productions. He stated himself to be determined thenceforward to tread the path of virtue and truth. Dr. Grosart remarks that, by Folly, Greene meant all amorous distractions and vanities of life. I have already drawn attention to Francis Bacon's important letter to Lord Burghley,

which I attribute to this year (see previous article). Down to the end of 1592 Greene's subsequent publications (except the Plays which I will deal with afterwards, and except a novel called "Philomelia," which Greene stated in his preface to have been written a long time previously) were of a serious character.

With regard to the Plays Dr. Grosart says, "*En passant* I venture to remark that it has not been sufficiently noted that we are repeatedly told by Greene himself, *e.g.*, as Roberto and Francesco—that when in sorest straits he fell among actors and thereafter earned a good living by his part as a Playwright. This involves that the extant Plays are *a mere flotsam* of his dramatic productions." I am glad to note this admission of Dr. Grosart. If the Cipher Story be true, the mystery is solved, as the other Plays were appearing either anonymously, or in the names of Marlowe, Peele, and Shakespeare.

With regard to the Plays themselves, we must not assume that the dates upon which they are printed are any real guide as to the years in which they were written, nor do I think it likely that as performed by the players they were as long as they appear in print. The additions were probably made for publication only.

The Plays published in the name of "Greene" were the following. Opposite each I put the year to which it may be attributed:—

"Selimus"	1586
"Orlando Furioso"	1586
"Alphonsus, King of Arragon"	1587
"Looking Glass for London"	1589
"Friar Bacon"	1590
"Pinner of Wakefield"	1593
"James IV."	1594

Let us examine what the critics have to say about them. That "Selimus" (says Mr. Swinburne) was published four years later than "Tamburlaine" proves of course nothing as to

the date of its publication . . . it undoubtedly in the main represents the work of a prior era to the reformation of the stage by Marlowe.

“Orlando Furioso,” says Professor Brown, pointed the way to “Lear” and “Hamlet.” “Its intention is of course to dramatise madness.” Friar Bacon, with Marlowe’s “Faustus,” preceded Shakespeare’s use of the supernatural. The fairy framework of “James IV.” is followed by the “Midsummer Night’s Dream.” His “Winter’s Tale” follows Greene’s prose novel of “Pandosto” in plot and character. Mr. Brown further says, “In style, again, Greene is father of Shakespeare.” Again, “James IV. is the finest Elizabethan historical Play outside Shakespeare, and is worthy to be placed on a level with Shakespeare’s earlier style.”

“The Play is still more remarkable for its being amongst the first to have an acted prologue and interplay. Shakespeare followed Greene’s example in “The Taming of the Shrew,” and the “Midsummer Night’s Dream.” “The Play,” says Mr. Daniel (in the ‘Athenaeum,’ 1881) “is founded on the first story of the third decade of Cinthio’s collection of tales.”

Tieck a German critic, when first he translated it, considered the “Pinner of Wakefield” to be one of Shakespeare’s juvenile productions.

Professor Storojenko, the Russian critic, was of opinion that much of Shakespeare’s “Cymbeline” was founded on Greene’s “Philomela.”

I have mentioned these peculiar identifications of Greene with Shakespeare to point what is probably the moral of the whole business, viz., that all the works proceeded from the man who claims in the CIPHER STORY to have written some sixty Plays, and to have put them off anonymously, or in the names of Peele, Marlowe, Greene, or Shakespeare.

Wherever we turn we meet with the same class of criticism. Mr. Swinburne vouches Marlowe as the writer of the second part of the Shakespeare Play of “Henry VI.” “Aut Christopherus Marlowe, aut diabolus.”

Mr. Swinburne will not, like Tieck or Ulrici, concede to Shakespeare the authorship of "Edward III.," but considers "Arden of Feversham" his first tragic masterpiece. Tieck claims "Fair Emm," "Arden of Feversham," and three or four other anonymous early Plays, as being written by Shakespeare.

Schlegel, another German critic, says that "Thomas Lord Cromwell," "Sir John Oldcastle," and "A Yorkshire Tragedy" are not only unquestionably Shakespeare's, "but in my opinion they deserve to be classed among his best and maturest works."

The biographer of Marlowe in the *Dic. Nat. Biography* asserts him to have been part author of "Titus Andronicus," and that "there is internal proof that Marlowe worked on the earlier Plays of Shakespeare." Further "that all the blank verse in Shakespeare's early Plays bears the stamp of Marlowe's inspiration." Again, "that 'Edward II.' was Marlowe's chief incursion to the English Historical Drama."

It is curious that among the earliest contributions to our Historical Drama are "Edward I.," published in the name of Peele, "Edward II.," of Marlowe, and "Edward III." attributed to Shakespeare.

Ulrici says "Pericles" and "Arden of Feversham" are evidently composed in Greene's style, while "Titus Andronicus" and "King John" approximate to that of Marlowe.

R. Grant White thinks "Taming of the Shrew" was the joint production of Greene, Marlowe, and possibly Shakespeare.

T. W. White, a later critic, would assign "Love's Labour Lost" and the "Comedy of Errors" to Greene; the second and third parts of "Henry VI." to Marlowe (assisted by Greene, Peele, and Nash); "Midsummer Night's Dream," and possibly "Merchant of Venice." "Two Gentlemen of Verona," and "King John" to Peele; "Henry IV." to Nash; and the "Winter's Tale" to Nash and Greene.

Mr. White (I quote from "Our English Homer") moreover

asserts that Francis Bacon wrote "Hamlet," "Julius Cæsar," "Anthony and Cleopatra," "Coriolanus," "Timon of Athens," and "Henry VIII."

So we see the authorship of the Greene, Marlowe, Peele, Shakespeare, and anonymous Plays is from the points of both external and internal evidence most perplexing and mixed up. The "authors" go to the works of the same prose writers for their plots—Boccaccio, Ariosto, Cinthio, Holingshed, and others. The characteristics of the assumed earlier Playwriters are found in later Plays attributed to Shakespeare, and those of Shakespeare in the Plays attributed to the "earlier writers."

Messieurs the biographers and literary critics, may I irreverently ask you to consider the matter afresh from the point of view of the Cipher Story? Try whether the riddle may not be read by accepting as correct the deciphered story that one man, Francis Bacon, assisted by a staff of stenographers (brachygraphy-men, good pens), produced these Plays. "The thing is impossible," say you? Go and watch the General Manager of a large commercial concern dictating to a staff of shorthand writers his replies to the day's correspondence; next figure out the unemployed years of the life of Francis, say from 1579 to 1594 (when he had his first brief) during which period the bulk of his literary work was done; then put down to each year the particular works computed to be written in that year. You will then, I think, cease to be supercilious and begin to investigate seriously. "*Everything is subtile until it be conceived,*" said Francis.

Wolsey's Farewell.

“Blow, blow, thou winter wind !
Thou art not so unkind
As man’s ingratitude.

* * * *

Freeze, freeze, thou bitter sky !
Thou dost not bite so nigh
As benefits forgot.”

“WOLSEY’S FAREWELL.”

—○—

NOTES ON THE PLAY OF “HENRY VIII.”

IN the folio of 1623 was printed for the first time a Play entitled, “*The Famous History of the Life of Henry VIII.*”

Mr. Sidney Lee (in his “Life of Shakspeare”) is quite ready to assume that it was performed in Shakspeare’s life-time. He does so on the authority of Sir Henry Wootton, who mentions the burning down of the Globe Theatre, in June, 1613, when a piece was in process of representation entitled, “*All is True representing some Principal Pieces in the reign of Henry VIII.*”

It is stated that on the books of the Stationers’ Company, under date February 12th, 1604, appears the entry, “Nathaniel Butter. That he get good allowance for the interlude of King Henry VIII. before he begin to print it.”

Dr. Farmer, in a note on the epilogue to the Play printed in the first folio, states that Robert Greene had written somewhat on the same story.

Fleay, in his “Life of Shakspeare,” writes: “Henry VIII. as we hear it is not the Play that was in action at the Globe when that Theatre was burned.”

That the folio Play was wholly or partially new, is material for my purpose in dealing with the internal evidences of its authorship. Stern Shaksperians, like Mr. John Fiske of the *Atlantic Monthly*, are always ready to suggest that similarities between the Plays and writings of Bacon are merely due to both authors borrowing from common sources, or to each borrowing from the other.

To avoid this retort it is desirable, as far as possible, to direct attention to the similarities between Bacon's writings subsequent in date to Shakspeare's death (3rd May, 1616), and those Plays about which nothing was known until they appeared in the folio of 1623.

I am disposed to think that the Play of "*Henry VIII.*" was either like "*Taming of the Shrew,*" founded upon an earlier Play by an inferior writer, or was an extension and partial reconstruction of the author's own work.

To take the latter view might throw light upon difficulties which appeared to have occurred to Shakesperian critics, who have attributed both the prologue and "Wolsey's Farewell" to other writers.

The differences may be explained by the later passages having been added by the author at a subsequent period of his life.

Certainly one can hardly credit an astute actor-manager, fond of money, with writing a Prologue not calculated to draw crowds to his Theatre, as the following extracts will show :—

"I come no more to make you laugh ; things now
That bear a weighty and a serious brow,
Sad, high and working full of state and woe,
Such noble scenes as draw the eyes to flow,
We now present. Those that can now pity here
May, if they think it well, let fall a tear.

Be sad as we would make ye, think ye see
The very persons of our noble story
As they were living ; think you see them great
And followed with the general throng and sweat
Of thousand friends ; then in a moment see
How soon this mightiness meets misery,
And if you can be merry, then I say
A man may weep upon his wedding day."

I should understand it better were it explained to be the

writing of a broken-down, unhappy old man, still clinging to his life’s work of teaching mankind, in a palatable form, the lessons of history and human conduct.

In the prologue the author points to the dominating incidents of the Play, and the lessons from the fall of great personages dealt with so masterfully in Wolsey’s speech.

In 1621 Bacon was degraded from his position of Lord Chancellor. In 1623 a Play, “*Henry VIII.*,” is printed and published for the first time, which contains “Wolsey’s Farewell,” a passage differing so much from the other portions of the Play as to cause some critics to attribute it to another writer.

Mr. Sidney Lee says: “Wolsey’s familiar farewell to Cromwell is the only passage, the authorship of which excites really grave embarrassment. It recalls at every point the style of Fletcher, and nowhere that of Shakspeare. But the Fletcherian style, as it is here displayed, *is invested with a greatness* that is not matched elsewhere in Fletcher’s work. That Fletcher should have exhibited such faculty once, and once only, is barely creditable, and we are driven to the alternative conclusion that the *noble valediction* was by Shakspeare.” (The italics are mine).

It is indeed a noble valediction. It seems to come direct from the heart of a man who has himself suffered, of one who wrote with the fullness of experience, rather than to be the mere imagination of a poet, however high his genius. It is noticeable that the author, while following closely (as was frequently the case with the Plays) the story to be found in Holinshed’s “Chronicles,” had, in writing the valediction, no inspiration from that source to guide him. Had Shakspeare survived Bacon, I could imagine Shaksperian critics telling us at once where their author had obtained his object lesson!

But matters happen to have been the other way. It is, therefore, all the more interesting to find in the hundred lines or so of the valediction some twenty similarities between it and the writings of Bacon (doubtless these are not all). I am

perfectly aware that instead of admitting the evidential pertinence of these resemblances, and joining fairly in the search for the real truth of the matter, those who think with Mr. Lee will be ready with the observation : "This is evidently taken from a common source," or "Here Shakspeare borrowed from Bacon." But I think such excuses will hardly carry conviction.

Let me take the similarities in the order of the lines :—

- (1) "And when he thinks, good easy man, full surely
His greatness is a ripening, *nips his root.*"

"This nips the flower in the bud."—*Argument in Low's Case of Tenures*. Bacon, 1607—1613.

- (2) "I have ventured
Like little wanton boys that swim on bladders."

"At the first let him practice with helps, as swimmers do with bladders or rushes."—Bacon, *Essay of Nature in Men*, 1612.

- (3) "Vain pomp and glory of this world I hate ye."

"Yesterday I took my place in Chancery. . . . There was much ado and a great deal of world. But this matter of pomp which is heaven to some men is hell to me, or purgatory at least."—Bacon, *Letter to Buckingham*, May 8th, 1617.

"He had nothing in him of vain glory, but yet kept state and majesty to the height."—*History of Henry VII.*, 1621.

- (4) "Oh how wretched
Is that poor man who hangs on princes favours."

"Nolite confidere in principibus." (Put not your trust in princes.)—Bacon, *Promus*.

- (5) "There is, betwixt that smile we would aspire to,
That sweet aspect of princes, and their ruin,
More pangs and fears than wars or women have."

"Between the mouth and the morsell."—Bacon, *Promus*.

(6) “Never so truly happy, my good Cromwell. Why, well : I know myself now.”

“My affliction hath made me understand myself better and not worse.”—Bacon, *Letter to the Lord Keeper*, October 18th, 1621 (after his fall).

(7) “And I feel within me
A peace above all earthly dignities,
A still and quiet conscience.”

“And besides I am persuaded (which is above *all earthly glory*) you shall do God good service in it.”—Bacon, *Letter to Villiers*, June 13th, 1616. (See “The view of earthly glory,” *Henry VIII.* i. 1.)

(8) “A still and quiet conscience.”

“Nothing more awakens our resolve and readiness to die than the quieted conscience.”—Bacon, *Essay on Death*, 1617—1621.

(9) “I humbly thank His Grace.”

“I humbly thank Your Grace that you make me live in His Highnesses remembrance.”—Bacon to *Buckingham*, about June, 1623.

(10) “These ruined pillars.”

“The four pillars of Government.”—Bacon, *Essay on Seditions*, written in MS., 1607—1613 ; first published in English, 1625.

(11) “A load would sink a navy, too much honor.
O, 'tis a burden, Cromwell, 'tis a burden.”

“Non honor est sed onus.”—*Ovid*. (Not an honor but a burden.)—Bacon, *Promus*.

(12) “May he continue
“Long in His Highness's favour.”

"I cannot too oft acknowledge Your Highness's favour in my troubles."—Bacon, *Letter to the Prince*, 1621.

(13) "No sun shall ever usher forth mine honours,
I am a poor fallen man."

"The honours which Your Majesty hath done me . . . and the misery I am fallen into."—Bacon, *Letter to King James*, September 5th, 1621.

(14) "I know his noble nature."

"That in building upon your Lordship's noble nature."—Bacon, *Letter to Buckingham*, March 20th, 1621.

(15) "Cromwell, I charge thee fling away ambition,
By that sin fell the angels."

"The desire of power in excess caused the angels to fall."—Bacon, *Essay of Goodness*, 1612.

(16) "How can man then the image of his Maker,
Hope to win by it."

"Neither do they speak of any other image of God but man."—Bacon, *Advancement of Learning* (Divine Philosophy), 1605.

(17) "Let all the ends thou aim'st at *be thy country's*" (&c.).

"I will look to bow things to the *true ends*."—Bacon, *Letter to Buckingham*, July 28th, 1618.

(18) "My robe,
And my integrity to heaven is all,
I dare now call *my own*."

"For though they be not *mine own* yet they are surer than mine own because they are God's *gifts* that is *integrity* and industry."—Bacon, *Letter to King James*.

(19) "Corruption wins not more than honesty."

"After this example it is like that judges will fly from any thing that is in the likeness of corruption."—Bacon, *Submission to the House of Lords*, April 24th, 1621.

(20) “Had I but served my God with half the zeal,
I served my king, He would not in mine age,
Have left me naked to mine enemies.”

“Cardinal Wolsey said that if he had pleased God as he pleased the king he had not been ruined.”—*Draft of Bacon’s Letter to King James*, September 5th, 1621.

“Quoth the Cardinal . . . but if I had served God as diligentlie as I have done the king he would not have given me over in my greie hairs” (Holinshed).

I make no pretence whatever to be a literary critic. My only desire is to ascertain the truth of the most interesting literary controversy I have known.

With this object let us seriously sum up the evidence above set forth.

Of the twenty illustrations given it is apparent that Shakspeare was unable to borrow from Bacon the similarities contained in twelve, because the letters, &c., containing them were written *after* Shakspeare’s death.

As to the others, it is difficult to assume that Shakspeare was the borrower. For to use numbers 15 and 16 he would have had to write the Play after 1612, which, while it fits in with the Globe performance, does not agree with either the theory of its date (1611) given by Mr. Sidney Lee, nor the facts of Shakspeare’s retirement.

Those of the instances, numbers 4, 5, 11 and 20, which are open to the theory of two authors dipping into the same common source would involve one in the curious and most improbable conclusion that two different men were contemporaneously diligent students of and borrowers from the Psalms, Erasmus, Ovid and Holinshed!

“Then Bacon borrowed from the Play,” would be the Shaksperian retort. Nothing would support this contention short of the assumption that the Play was printed before 1623 (for which there is not an atom of evidence) or that Bacon possessed the manuscript (of this there is also no proof) or that he

heard the Play and committed the valediction to memory ! An equally groundless supposition.

The only reasonable conclusion to be derived from these similarities of thought or expression, is, that Bacon was the writer of Wolsey's speech and thus put into poetic form his own intense feelings and sufferings.

It would follow either that the Play in progress on the 29th June, 1613, when the Globe Theatre was burnt, was not the Play printed in the folio of 1623 or that it was refashioned, extended, and the Wolsey valediction added subsequent to Bacon's own fall in 1621.

At the time of its publication we are aware that Bacon was again actively engaged in literary labour and in passing through the press his acknowledged works.

"Though in a despised weed I have sought the good of all men."—*Bacon's Prayer.*

**Note on the "Induction" to
"Taming of the Shrew."**

“Set a beggar on horseback and he will ride to the devil.”


Proverb.

Olivia.—“What’s a drunken man like? Fool.”

**Clown.—“Like a drown’d man, a fool, and a madman :
one draught above heat makes him a fool,
the second mads him, and a third drowns
him.”**

Twelfth Night.

NOTE ON THE "INDUCTION" TO
"TAMING OF THE SHREW."



SLY.—"Look in the Chronicles."

.

PAGE.—"It is a kind of history."

CASUALLY reading the above "Induction" in the "Whitehall Shakespeare" now in course of publication,* I was incited by the words used at its commencement, viz., "Paucus pallabris; let the world slide, Sessa!" to connote the passages with the introductory portion of the old Play, *Taming of a Shrew*, upon which it is apparently based.

It doubtless has often been noticed that, although the Induction takes its general idea from the old Play, the wording is almost entirely altered, and words are introduced which would seem surplusage except for their allusive character.

"Pocas Palabras" is Spanish for "*few words*." "Let the world slide" seems to mean *Let things go on as they are. Make no attempt to alter prevailing misconceptions. Cessa!* (Spanish) *Be silent*,

This is hardly the language a travelling tinker would address to the landlady of a country inn. It occurred to me that the author was addressing his intimates, and ambiguously referring to matters of common but secret knowledge, or that he was putting matters for unravelment in "future ages" by those who are advised in the preface to the First Folio to "Reade him therefore, and againe and againe."

Bacon, in the "Advancement of Learning," refers to a method, the object of which is "to remove the vulgar capacities from

* This article was written in 1898, for *Baconiana*.

being admitted to the secrets of knowledges, and to reserve them to selected auditors, or wits of such sharpness as can pierce the veil."

What, then, is the Induction, as it appears to one who has read it suspiciously "and againe and againe."

1. Taken as a whole, it reads as a figurative allusion to the drunken beggar of Wincott (Shakspur) being gradually brought to the assumption that he was the author of the Plays published in his name—

"Would not the beggar then forget himself."

2. I believe I am correct in saying that in this Induction are the only references to the neighbourhood of Shakspur's home which occur in all the Plays. They are to be found in those sentences in which the beggar tells us who and what he is.

He calls himself "Christophero Sly." In the old Play there is no Christian name, and "Sly" is written "Slie." The "o" in Christophero is not repeated a few lines further on. Can it have been intended to serve a special purpose? Singularly "Christophero Sly" contains the same number of letters as "William Shakspur."

Singularly, also, the name of the "fat ale wife of Wincot," Marian Hacket, contains the same number of letters as Anne Hathaway (including the hyphen, Shake-speare has the same number of letters as Francis Bacon).

It is suspicious in passing to note that the name Christopher was borne by another person, Marlowe, as to whose authorship of Plays there has been considerable difference of opinion.

To continue the enquiry, Christopher tells us he is "Old Sly's son, of Barton Heath." Barton-on-Heath is a few miles from Stratford-on-Avon, and we have it on the authority of biographers, that Shakspur's father, John Shakspur, came to Stratford to settle from some village in the country.

"By birth a pedlar," Shakspur's father is described on the register of the Bailiffs' Court of Stratford as a "Glover." This doubtless involved the making of leather gloves and other leather

articles of farming gear. Is it too much to imagine that, when made, he carried them about to the various farms for sale?

"By education a card maker," it seems natural that the youth, William Shakspur, should have been employed in making for his father the instruments of leather and wire with which wool was at that day carded.

"By transmutation a bear-herd," Shakspur's occupation during the early period of his life in London, appears, to use the words of Thackeray's "Jeames," to be "wrop in mistry."

Probably he endeavoured to make himself generally useful; but seeing how wrathful Shakesperian biographers are at the suggestion that he held horses for gentlemen frequenting the Playhouses, instead of cultivating the classics, I hesitate to suggest this to be an allusion to his employment at the Bear-garden, near which, according to Alleyn, he resided. Bear-baiting was a great sport in those days, and the care of the animals would find occupation for many young countrymen needing situations.

"And now by present profession a *Tinker*."

This may or may not be an allusive word. Dr. Schmidt in his Shakesperiau Lexicon gives "Tinker" as a name given to a proverbial tippler. Perhaps it may allude to a noisy actor who "bombasts out his blank verse." The inference however, is not strong.

3. In the latter portion of the Induction the author lays stress upon the pseudo-lord having for fifteen years been in a dream, and his lady "being all this time abandoned from your bed."

I venture to suggest that the lady as described in the following lines is no mortal person, but rather, some idealisation of the author's. If we can assume that ideal to be "Truth," and the period of the publication of the Plays in Shakspur's name to be alluded to in the frequent reference to fourteen (twice seven years) and fifteen years, we have a further insight into the story at once concealed and revealed:—

"Thou hast a *lady* far more beautiful,
Than any *woman* in this waning age,

And till the tears that she hath shed for thee
 She was the fairest creature in the world,
 And yet she is inferior to none."

I think the above can hardly be the description of a woman. Those readers of *Baconiana* who may think with me that "Truth" is referred to, may go further and agree that the line

"Being all this time abandoned from your bed"

is an allusion to the false assumption of authorship of the Plays. Again that the following :—

Sly.—"Madam, undress you and come now to bed."

Page.—"Thrice noble lord, let me entreat you
 To pardon me yet for a night or two ;
 Or if not so, until the sun be set :"

alludes to the intention that the truth about the authorship was not to be made known for a time ; at any rate, not until the "sun be set," that is to say, until after the death of the real author.

4. It is curious, in considering the following lines :—

Sly.—"I know it well—What must I call her ?"

Lord.—"Madam" (query *Truth*).

Sly.—"Al'ce Madam, or Joan Madam ?"

that Alice was the name of the wife of Francis Bacon, Joan that of a sister of Shaksper.

Curious again that Sly should be made to say :—

"We came in with Richard the Conqueror."

May this be an allusion to the putting forward of Shaksper as the author of the Play of *Richard II.*, or to Shaksper's application to the Heralds College for the grant of a coat-of-arms.

5. Strange again, that with the slight reference to hounds in the old Play, the author of the "Induction" should devote many lines to hounds and their qualities. Are Merriman,

Clowder, Silver, Belman, Echo, allusions to the assumed names of members of some secret society? *

There is, of course, great danger of overstating your case in dealing with a subject of this kind. But I think it is certainly one for investigation by those abler than myself to arrive at safe conclusions. As a student for some time past of all the literature bearing upon the Bacon-Shaksper controversy I have been struck with the fact that all the clues seem to point so uniformly in one direction, *viz.*, to the master-mind of Francis Bacon.

* Since this was written I apprehend it to be an allusion to Bacon's Shorthand writers, or Brachygraphy men. Brach, in addition to meaning short, is a name for a hound.

The Plays Sorted.

THE "POETS."

Green, "the red-nosed minister," "abandoned himself to a discreditable life." Closed his career 1592.

Marlowe, an actor, "led a career of low debauchery." Killed in quarrel 1593.

Peele was "improvident, reckless, dissolute." Died about 1596.

Spenser "died in poverty, 1599." Was buried at expense of Essex.

Shakspeare, an actor, "retired and became a maltster." Died 1616. Daughter unable to sign her name.

None of the above "poets" left either letters, manuscripts, or libraries.

Excerpts from the Biographers.

THE PLAYS SORTED.

“Devise Wit, write Pen, for I am for whole Volumes in Folio.”

LOVE'S LABOUR LOST.

BELOW is a list of Plays attributed to Francis upon the faith of the truth of the cipher story. Some he may have entirely written, others he probably partly wrote, and, as to other parts, revised either, his own earlier work or the work of assistants. (Did not the elder Dumas, the French novelist, do something of this kind?) I have very little doubt that Francis availed himself largely of the help of shorthand writers. Where passages in the Plays are trashy, obscure, or manifestly confused, I apprehend they are due either to ordinary errors by copyists and printers, or to the difficulties of some enfolded cipher story. The dates given are those of the years when the Plays were probably written. Closer students of these matters may be able to make corrections and variations, and, perhaps, some omissions from the list, *which I put forward as a sort of first draft to be worked upon.*

I append notes of a few facts as to other publications by Francis, his occupations, contemporary events likely to influence him, or which should be noted. They relate to the year opposite which I have placed the note number.

Note.	Date.	Play.	Printed.	Author first ascribed (if any).	Age of Francis.	
1 to 7	1584	Arraignment of Paris	1584	Anon	24	
		Hamlet (early form)...	1603	"		
		Dido, Queen of Carthage	1594		"
		Faire Emm	1631		"
8 and 9	1585	Tom Stuckley	...	"	25	
		Birth of Merlin	...	1662		"

Note.	Date.	Play.	Printed.	Author first ascribed (if any).	Age of Francis.
8 and 9	1585	Selimus		Anon	25
		Mucedorus	1595	"	
10 to 12	1586	Tamburlaine, 1st part	1590	"	26
		Orlando Furioso ...	1592	Greene	
		Misfortunes of Arthur		Hughes	
13	1587	Tamburlaine, 2nd part	1590	Anon	27
		Lochrine	1595	"	
		Alphonsus, King of Arragon	1591	Greene	
		Jeronimo	1605	Anon	
14	1588	Massacre at Paris ...		"	28
		Dr. Faustus	1604	Marlowe	
		Titus Andronicus ...	1600	Anon	
		Battle of Alcazar ...		Peele	
		Spanish Tragedy ...	1603	"	
15	1589	Jew of Malta	1633	Marlowe	29
		Lord Cromwell	1600	Anon	
		Looking Glass for England		Greene	
		David and Bathshebe	1599	Peele	
		Hiren the Faire Greeke		"	
16	1590	Edward I.	1593	"	30
		Edward II.	1593	Marlowe	
		Edward III.	1600	Anon	
		Arden of Feversham	1608	"	
		Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay		Greene	
17	1591	Love's Labour Lost ...	1598	Shakespeare	31
		Two Gentlemen of Verona	1623	"	
18	1592	Romeo and Juliet ...	1597	Anon	32
		Comedy of Errors ...	1623	Shakespeare	
		Henry VI., 2nd part (Contention) ...	1594	Anon	
19	1593	Richard II.	1597	"	
		Pinner of Wakefield...	1595	"	33
		Old Wives Tale ...	1595	Peele	
		Henry VI., 3rd part (True Tragedy) ...	1595	Anon	
		Cornelia	1594	Kyd	
20	1594	James IV. of Scotland	1594	Greene	34

PLAYS SORTED.

93

Note.	Date.	Play.	Printed.	Author first ascribed (if any).	Age of Francis.
	1594	Midsummer Night's Dream	1600	Shakespeare	34
		Richard III.	1597	Anon	
21	1595	All's Well that Ends Well	1623	Shakespeare	35
		Merchant of Venice... ..	1600	"	
		Taming of the Shrew	1623	"	
22	1596	King John... ..	1623	"	
		A Yorkshire Tragedy	1608	"	
		London Prodigal	1605	"	
23	1597	Henry IV., 1st part	1598	Anon	
		Henry IV., 2nd part... ..	1600	Shakespeare	
		Merry Wives of Windsor... ..	1602	Shakespeare	
24	1598	Twelfth Night	1623	"	
		As You Like It	1623	"	
25	1599	Much Ado About Nothing	1600	"	
		Henry V.	1600	Anon	
		Witch of Edmonton... ..	1600	"	
25A	1600	Sir John Oldcastle	1600	"	40
26	1601	Julius Cæsar	1623	Shakespeare	
		Troilus and Cressida... ..	1609	"	
27	1603	Measure for Measure	1623	"	
		Sejanus	1616	Jonson	
28	1604	Othello	1622	Shakespeare	
29	1605	Macbeth	1623	"	45
30	1606	King Lear	1608	"	
31	1607	The Puritan	1607	"	
	1608	Anthony and Cleopatra	1623	"	
		Pericles	1609	"	
32	1609	Coriolanus	1623	"	
33	1610	Cymbeline	1623	"	50
34	1611	Tempest	1623	"	
35	1612	Winter's Tale	1623	"	
36	1613	—	—	—	
37	1614	—	—	—	
	1615	—	—	—	
38	1617	—	—	—	
39	1616	—	—	—	
40	1618	—	—	—	

PLAYS SORTED.

Nota.	Data.	Play.	Printed.	Author first ascribed (if any).	Age of Francis.
41	1619	—	—	—	
42	1620	—	—	—	60
43	1621	—	—	—	
44	1622	Timon of Athens ...	1623	Shakespeare	
		Henry VIII. ...	1623	"	
		Henry VI., 1st part ...	1623	"	
45	1623	—	—	—	
46	1624	—	—	—	
47	1625	—	—	—	
48	1626	—	—	—	66

NOTES.

1. The anonymous author of "The Arte of English Poesie" states that in 1579 he gave the Queen a series of poems, entitled "Partheniades." I am disposed to think the author was Francis.

2. Greene's "Mirror of Modesty" entered on register early in 1579, anonymously.

3. "Shepherd's Calendar" entered on register, December, 1579, anonymously.

4. In 1580 the Queen makes Francis an allowance, and attaches him to the Court. "Greene's" light stories commenced to be published in this year.

5. In 1581 Francis is a student at Gray's Inn, being admitted a barrister a year or two later.

6. In 1584 Francis became M.P.

7. "Arraignment of Paris" published anonymously in 1584. This Play and "Dido" were performed by the children of Her Majesty's Chapel. As to the early form of "Hamlet," see the masterly article by Mr. Follett in the Bacon Journal, Vol. II.

8. "Tom Stuckley" contains many legal terms and expressions.

9. "Birth of Merlin" has the line, "His body but a tenement at will."

10. The first part of "Tamburlaine" was published anonymously.

11. The "Misfortunes of Arthur" was performed by the gentlemen of Gray's Inn before the Queen at Greenwich, on 8th February, 1587, and was, doubtless, written the year before. The author is stated to be "Thomas Hughes," a younger fellow student of Francis. His name was probably borrowed for the occasion only. The Play has these lines :—

"Yea, though I conqueror die and full of fame,
 Yet let my death and parture *rest obscure*.
 No grave I need, O fates ! nor burial rites,
 Nor stately hearse, nor tomb with haughty top ;

But let my carcase lurk ; yea, let my death
Be aye unknown."

In his draft Will, Francis directed that his body should be buried *obscurely*. (See Spedding's "Life.")

12. Francis was made a bencher of his Inn. Sir Phillip Sydney died in September of this year. Shakspeare, aged 22, believed to be in London.

13. "Treatise of Melancholy," by "T. Bright," published.

14. Earl of Leicester died. Also year of the Spanish Armada. "Greene's" "Spanish Masquerado" published. Francis elected Lent reader of his Inn. "Characterie," or the Art of short and swift writing, by "T. Bright," published.

15. "Arte of English Poesie" published anonymously. Francis made Queen's Counsel, publishes "Triumph of Time."

16. "Faerie Queene," 1st part, published. Also Sir Philip Sidney's "Arcadia." "Greene's" publications become more serious. Francis writes on the Government of the Papists.

17. "Spenser's" "Complaints," "Tears of the Muses," and "Mother Hubbard's Tale" published. "Colin Clout Home Again" written, but not published.

18. "Greene's" "*death-bed publications*."

19. "Venus and Adonis" published anonymously. Marlowe killed, 1st June. Francis takes up his residence at Twickenham House.

20. Francis has his first brief. (See Spedding's "Life"). "Comedy of Errors" played at Gray's Inn.

21. Spenser's "Colin Clout," "Amoretti," "Astrophel," and "Epithalamium" published. Queen gives Francis the reversion of Twickenham House (lease having nearly expired). Sidney's "Apologie for English Poetrie" is published this year (1595). Fulke Greville's letter of November, 1586, to a member of the Walsingham family, after Sidney's death (see Grosart's "Sidney"), asks directions as to his poems, which had not up to then been published, but makes no mention of the "Apologie" which I attribute to Francis. (See also the pamphlet, published by Husbands, of Birmingham, 1895, entitled, "Notes on the Origin and Construction of the Plays.") Certain Essays, which bear evidence of being the first state of Bacon's "Essays," published anonymously. (See Arber's Reprint, p. 10).

22. Spenser's "Faerie Queene," 2nd part, published. Francis

publishes "Colours of Good and Evil," and lectures on the Statute of Uses. The Pope *advises the deposition* of Elizabeth.

23. George Peele died (about). Francis published 10 Essays and certain Religious Meditations. Shakspeare built "New Place" at Stratford-on-Avon. Quarto of "Richard II." published, *without the deposition scene*.

24. "Twelfth Night" was played, at Middle Temple Hall, in 1602.

25. Essex goes to Ireland with a brilliant following. Trial of Essex. Queen gives Cheltenham Rectory to Francis. Spenser dies in January. "Henry V." published in quarto, *omitting portions in praise of Essex*.

25A. "Anatomy of Melancholy" published. The rebellion and further trial of Essex. Francis appointed double reader of his Inn. Lady Anne Bacon loses her reason.

26. Earl of Essex executed, 25th February. Anthony Bacon died. Queen makes a grant of money to Francis. The speech of Anthony in "Julius Cæsar" believed to be a covert reference to Essex:—

"The noble Brutus has told you Cæsar was ambitious,
If it were so, it was a grievous fault,
And grievously hath Cæsar answered it."

27. Queen Elizabeth died. Francis knighted by James I. He publishes a Discourse on the Union of England and Scotland, and 1st Book of "Advancement of Learning." "Valerius Terminus," by "Hermes Stella," also published.

28. Francis is appointed King's Counsel at £100 per annum. Shakspeare sues Philip Rogers, at Stratford, for £1 15s. 10d. for malt.

29. Publishes 2nd Book of "Advancement of Learning."

30. Francis marries Alice Barnham.

31. Is appointed Solicitor-General. (1608) Quarto of "Richard II." published, *with the deposition scene*, showing internal indications of application to the Essex rebellion.

32. Folio of "Faerie Queene" published, *with two new Cantos*. Francis published "Wisdom of the Ancients." Shake-speare Sonnets published by "Thomas Thorpe," dedicated to W. H. Some of the "Sonnets" believed to be addressed to William Herbert, son of the Countess of Pembroke, Sir Philip Sidney's sister. He succeeded to the Earldom in 1601, and was a poet, author, and friend of literature.

33. Lady Anne Bacon dies. Francis publishes "History of the Winds," "Sailing of Ships," "Ebb and Flow of the Sea."

34. Folio of "Spenser's" Works published. Francis made Secretary of State.

35. Published "The Intellectual Globe," and 40 Essays.

36. Is appointed Attorney-General. "Tempest" believed to have been written for the festivities in honour of the marriage of Princess Elizabeth.

37. Publishes Tract against Duelling.

38. Francis Privy Councillor. Shakspeare died, 23rd April.

39. Appointed Lord Keeper.

40. Appointed Lord Chancellor and created Baron Verulam.

41. Probably wrote "Sylva Sylvarum."

42. Published "Novum Organum." Created Viscount St. Albans.

43. Accused of accepting gifts from suitors in Chancery. Confesses his fault, and is fined and banished. Sentence is not enforced. Folio of "Anatomy of Melancholy" published.

44. Publishes "History of Life and Death."

45. Publishes "De Augmentis," and other works. First folio "Shakespeare" published (including 17 Plays not previously published).

46. "New Atlantis" may have been written in this year, or earlier.

47. Folio edition of his Essays (and 18 further Essays) published. Also Translations of certain Psalms.

48. Francis Lord St. Albans died, 9th April, and was buried at the Church of St. Michael, St. Albans.

*"But if Shakspeare is hauled from his pedestal,
Whom do you put in his place?"*

I print in capitals the reply to this question made by the late Mr. Ignatius Donnelly, when lecturing at the Westminster Town Hall :—

**"THE GREATEST INTELLECT OF THE
HUMAN RACE."**

Appendices.

APPENDIX I.

THE ROSICRUCIANS.

READERS interested in the history of the Rosicrucians, of which Francis was no doubt one of the founders, are referred to :—

“Bacon-Shakespeare and the Rosicrucians.” W. F. C. Wigston. London.

“Real History of the Rosicrucians.” Arthur E. Waite. London.

“Rosicrucians : Their Rites and Mysteries.” Hargreaves Jennings. London.

I give here some of their rules :—

2. All sworn to secrecy for 100 years.
3. They were to have secret names, but pass in public by their own names.
8. To aid in the dissemination of knowledge throughout all lands.
9. Writings, if carried about, to be written in ambiguous language or in “secret writing.”
10. R.C. Works not to be published with the names of their author. Pseudonyms, mottoes, or initials (not the writer’s own) to be adopted.
11. These feigned names and signatures to be frequently changed.
12. The places also of publication for the secret writings to be changed.
16. They must strive to become rich, not for the sake of money itself, for they must spend it ; but for the means afforded by wealth and position for benefiting mankind.
17. They were to promote the building of fair houses for the advancement of learning and the relief of poverty.

APPENDIX II.

WHY TIDIR?

BECAUSE in some writings Tidir is found used for Tudor.

In Mrs. Gallup's book at page 137, it is given as Tudor, and on page 334, Tiddir.

For sevenpence to the warders of the Tower of London for the "Short Sketch of the Beauchamp Tower and Guide to the Inscriptions," you will obtain both woodcuts and letterpress, which possibly give some further corroborations of the cipher story.

I can only here copy from the paragraphs :—

"(1) On the left-hand side as you enter the building on the ground floor is an inscription by 'Walter Paslew,' &c., &c.

"(2) Near to the device of Paslew is the name 'Robart Dudley.' This nobleman was the third son of John, Duke of Northumberland, who, &c., &c.

"(3) Under the last mentioned we find a *mutilated inscription*, by Johan Decker, of which no account can be found.

"(4) Over the door-way of the small cell at the foot of the stairs, is the name 'Robart Tidir.' The letters of which the name is composed are of a very singular character, but as the inscription is without date we are unable to give any account of the person. It is, therefore, without interest excepting what is excited by the recollections and associations of the building in which its unfortunate owner left it as a melancholy memorial of his sufferings.

"(5) Underneath the name Tidir are the letters 'I. H. C.'

"(14) On the right of the fire-place is a device bearing the name of John Dudley, &c., &c.

"(75) To the right of the above (No. 74), is a piece of carving which represents an oak tree bearing acorns, and underneath the initials 'R. D.' In all probability those of Robert Dudley, the favourite Earl of Leicester.

“(76) Adjoining the device of Dudley is the name of ‘Thomas Steven,’ and to the right of Steven, that of ‘James Rogers.’ Both these names being left without date or further inscription we are not able to furnish any account of their owners.”

Having made these rather lengthy quotations from the Guide Book, for which I here make an apology to Mr. Dick, the writer, and Messrs. Bemrose & Sons, Limited, the publishers, I am going to try my prentice hand at interpretation.

I think these are inscriptions by the Rose Cross, or Rosicrucian Society, in memory of certain events.

The monogram shown on the 75th inscription reads to me to be a composition of E. T. The symbol is, probably, intended to indicate the union in the Tower between Robert Dudley and the Princess Elizabeth Tudor, the acorns represent the fruits of the marriage, and the ambiguous names, those of the two sons. Compare in count of letters, “Thomas Steven,” with “Francis Tudor” (or Tidir), and “James Rogers” with “Robert Tudor.”

I interpret inscription No. 4 as an indication of the cell in which Robert Tudor or Tidir, otherwise Robert, Earl of Essex, was confined before his execution.

If I am wrong, doubtless some skilled person will be at the trouble to demonstrate my error.

APPENDIX III.

BIOGRAPHERS WANTED.

It would be useful to know very much more than we do at present of the following authors, printers, publishers, correspondents, friends, and other persons contemporary with the publication of the Plays. Are any of these *the same persons masquerading in different names?* Looking into this period makes one so suspicious, that I have begun to doubt whether even the names set out in the first folio Shakespeare represent play actors, or, under false titles, the names of a little syndicate of Rosicrucians, some of them actors who had been engaged in various ways upon the Plays. It is worth looking into. But my immediate purpose is to set on foot enquiry as to the "persons" named below, particularly the twelve lettered names first in order :—

Johan Leyland.	Joseph Mede, B.D.	Francis Alleyn.
Isaac Jaggard.	Francis Meres.	Robert Kemp.
Thomas Thorpe.	Edmund Willis.	Thomas Nashe.
Roland Freart.	Thomas Hammon.	T. Sprat.
John Bodenham.	Thomas Watson.	Henry Olney.
Hermes Stella.	William Webbe	Timothy Bright.
Robert Wilson.	Webster Puttenham.
Henry Chettle.	Abraham Cowley.	Herringman.
William Smith.	Johan Decker.	William Wrednot.
Robert Allott.	Robert Fludd.	Leonard Digges.
Thomas Pavier.	Robert Walley.	Francis Burton.
Edmund Bolton.	Thomas Campion.	Nicholas Oakes.
George Wither.	John Lillie	Anthony Scoloker.
Thomas Hughes.	George Ferrers.	Jarvis Markham
Thomas Browne.	Clement Edmundes.	
Joseph Heydon.	Thomas Shirley.	

Historical and biographical research should be endowed. Apart from the biographies of popular men, whom the public have not forgotten, there is no real demand for this form of research. As a

corollary, it must be poorly paid, and yet be amongst the hardest and slowest of literary work.

The majority of people for whom publishers cater do not care for facts. They prefer fiction, which is probably the reason why public libraries founded as storehouses for recorded facts and opinions, are now largely devoted to the collection and distribution of the popular fiction of the day.

The readiness with which the writers of minor biographies make use of second hand statements, in preference to inspecting original records, may be explained by the fact that the latter course does not pay.

If every time a biographer had to journey to examine registers of baptisms, marriages, deaths, burials, copyrights, university students, and public records generally, he were entitled to the fees of solicitors on verifying titles, we should have sounder work. The wonder is that so much painstaking work is ever obtained under present conditions. New investigators of Elizabethan lives and literature should be urged to avail themselves first hand of the best documentary evidence available. Wood's "Fasti" and Collier's researches should be checked where possible.

The Rosicrucians did not effectually *bury* their secrets, but only *had* them from those wits who had not "*sufficient sharpness to pierce the veil.*"

"*What's in a name? A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.*" I suggest some careful investigation of the facts surrounding such names as Jervis Markham, Robert Burton, Thomas Thorpe, Hermes Stella, Henry Chettle, Francis Meres, John Bodenham, and, though in some cases it may prove a false scent, in others you may be amply rewarded. I think the Bacon-Shagspur controversy may then shrink to its proper proportions. It will probably become amply demonstrated, that when this marvellously clever and highly educated youth, Francis Tudor, at the close of his university career, discovered his true parentage and the hopelessness of any princely position, he pushed along anonymously with his literary work.

Further, that in pursuance of his scheme, and to avoid the serious dangers and difficulties, which were inseparable from authorship, not to mention a man in his curious position, he published his works on different subjects, in different names, choosing mostly names of persons

who were willing to act as "parents" in case of necessity, and who received a consideration.

Other names were those of deceased persons, who had been known as authors, such as Carew, Sidney, and Leyland; others were entirely fictitious. In the latter class, I think, may, amongst others, be found "Bolton," "Webbe," "Puttenham," "Bodenham," "Thorpe," "Campion," "Watson," "Stella," and "Smith."

It will be found I believe, that under certain names he published plays; under others, poetry; under others, light novels; under his putative name of Bacon, philosophy and science; under another, works on husbandry and agriculture; under another, the principles of music and verse applicable thereto; under others, the art of poetry, which no one ever understood so well. I agree with Mrs. Pott, in the belief that he and his literary society of Rosicrucians were at the back of the Elizabethan revival of learning, the compilation of dictionaries, translation of foreign works, foundation of the Free Masons, and the invention of their feigned history. So that there is promise of plenty of interesting work for those who care to look into these matters.

We really do like to befool ourselves with ideals. We think of the present-day, trim little English town of Stratford-on-Avon, and not of the village with its "muck heaps" in Elizabethan times; of the poetic name, Shakes-speare, not the real one, Shagspur; of the heaven-born genius, not the village runaway.

Have not the Shakespearian Society settled this matter, and Mr. Sidney Lee written his book? *Chose juge!* This continual bothering after the deceased person with the name suggestive of a provision shop is as bad as the Dreyfus case. *Chose juge!*

Perhaps when people are satisfied that the Author of the Plays was a Prince as well as a concealed Poet, they may be able to transfer their affections from Stratford to St. Albans, where Francis was buried.

I have already wearied the incredulous of the few who will listlessly scan these papers, but I wish here to mention one or two more works of Francis Tudor. My reason is the fear that, otherwise, some half-witted—I beg pardon, half-educated person like myself, may anticipate me.

To follow the statements which I now make, you should obtain from Constable & Co., some of those invaluable Arber reprints.

Take for instance, "Lyly" and "Watson." Under the mask of "Thomas Watson," Francis published sundry early sonnets and poems mostly in Latin. Lyly was the mask of his early prose,—and what delightful writing it is. I agree with every word the late Charles Kingsley uttered in its praise. To me the discourse of Euphues on Religion is most cogent and powerful. 2. V.

As "Lyly," Francis wrote about eight light fanciful Plays for the entertainment of the Court. These were mostly played by the children from St. Paul's. Edward Blount reprinted six of them in 1632. 2. V.

See how natural are the beginnings of the master playwright of the world. Plays to be acted by children. No heaven-born genius tumbling out of a Stratford cottage. We have here a witness to the doctrine of evolution, even in the writing of Plays. Of course, the biographers are very much mixed up. Although persons of the name of Lillie were, according to Wood, so numerous that Magdalen College was "seldom or never without one," our "Lyly" was soon confounded with one gentleman who hailed from Kent, and another who died in London. For a moment I leave these various species of lily in the category of "mixed bulbs."

The third and last mask I wish to trouble you with is "Thomas Kyd." Sporting Kyd, as Ben Jonson called him, was the acknowledged parent of the play of "Cornelia," and the name upon which the "Spanish Tragedy," published anonymously in two parts, was eventually fathered. Mr. Swinburne recognised the "Spanish Tragedy" as the work of Shakespeare. If he will go a step further, and say it is the work of the writer of Shakespeare, I can agree with him. There is really no doubt about its thoroughly "Shakesperian" style. Read it for yourselves. In the hope of tempting even Mr. Swinburne to my point of view—I shall need some strong friends—let me draw attention to the dedication in "Cornelia." This play was licensed in January, 1593, as by Thomas Kydde. It was printed in 1594. The dedication is to the Countess of Sussex, and says:—

"And as vouchsafing, but the passing of Winter's week with desolate Cornelia, I will assure your ladyship my next summer better travell with the tragedy of Portia."

If you will refer, as I did, to Mr. Sidney Lee's "Life of Shakespeare," you will find it stated that a Venetian Comedy, which Mr. Lee identifies as the "Merchant of Venice" was produced by Henslow, on

25th August, 1594, though not printed until 1600. Upon other authority, I had put the year of its production as 1595, but Mr. Lee may probably be right. At any rate we have the sequence—Cornelia followed closely by the play in which Portia is the chief figure.

To go back to Lyly; it will be seen that his letter to Lord Burleigh, of July, 1582, is inconsistent with his being the John Lillie, who was entered in the day book of Magdalene College for 1584, as owing 23s. 10d. for his battels (provisions), while the letter of 1590 from Lyly to the Queen in which he begs for advancement, and refers to his ten years at Court synchronises with the date, 1580, when Francis first became a pensioner in attendance at the Court. His letter of 1593 to the Queen on the same errand in which he speaks of "thirteen years your highness' servant, and yet nothing," is further corroboration.

The letter prefixed by "Lyly" to "Watson's" poems in 1582 is quite in accordance with the practice Francis Tudor made use of in commending under one of his *noms de plume* work published under another. When we come to think of it, the necessity for a frequent change of name was most real. Producing literature in such vast quantities, doing that anonymously, owing to the possibilities of his position, it was absolutely necessary he should frequently change his name, and often the place of publication, in order to avoid remark. In this I discern the reason for the Rosicrucian rule as to change of name and place, for which see Appendix I. The success which attended a practice originally devised to meet his own necessities was such as to lead to its adoption by the members of his Secret Society.

I find plenty of satisfactory reasons for suspecting Francis to be Euphues. You will obtain the explanation of the name in Ascham's "Schoolmaster" (Arber reprint). It appears to have been written just after his return from abroad. I think the letter to Eubulus is to his old friend and adviser, Gabriel Harvey, who, possibly, published the book. The letter to Botonio was probably to Anthony Bacon, who, in 1579, was sent to live abroad.

The biographers say that John Lillie was M.P. for Hendon, 1589; Aylesbury, 1593; Appleby, 1597; Aylesbury again in 1601, and that he died in 1606. In face of that allegation I ask, why did this public man, if the author of Euphues, of which many editions were published, cease writing this very successful prose?

On the same assumption, why did he stop writing plays at a very early period of his life? What was he doing to allow "Robert Greene" to adopt his style, to publish as his own "Euphues, his censure to Philautus," and to say that "by chance some of Euphues' loose papers came to my hand wherein he writ to his friend Philautus from Silixedra concerning certain principles necessary to be observed by every souldier."

Sir Philip Sidney was in 1586 in the Low Countries, and as this paper was printed in 1587, it is possibly a copy of something Francis wrote to Philip. But my immediate purpose is to enquire why, on the biographical theory, the M.P. was letting his papers wander about in this fashion? Why again did he permit Lodge, in 1590, to publish "Rosalynde, Euphues Golden Legacy, found after his death in his cell at Silixedra." If the gentleman was not dead, why did he discontinue to be his own publisher? Was it because he was Member of Parliament? No; the children's Play of "Woman in the Moon" was printed in 1597, with the name John Lyllie. I observe the biographical notes prefixed to the Arber reprint, omit the M.P. allegation. Was this accident or honest doubt? There is just one more thing I should like to know, Is Euphuism catching; for if so, I should like to be infected with the malady. When I read what some literary gentlemen have to say about Shakespeare I am struck with his absorbent capacity. Unlike Mark Twain's "Aurelia's unfortunate young man," who was in for all sorts of fevers and mishaps, Shakespeare was able to acquire the majesty of Marlowe's verse, the delicate wit of Greene, the humour of Peele, the poetic imagery of Spenser, while the Euphuisms of Shakespeare are the subject of a special book. I would like to know how the capacity for antithetical statement, which I understand to be Euphuism, not a style but a peculiar mental activity, can be acquired?

APPENDIX IV.

THE CONCEALED POET A CONCEALED
TEACHER OF THE ART OF POETRY.

WITH a view to stimulate enquiry I have already made many assertions and speculations, and possibly have advanced some proofs. But at the risk of making this little booklet resemble a comet, through being longer in the tail than body, I wish to direct attention to another object for research and study.

When Queen Elizabeth died, and John Davies went north, to join in meeting King James I., his friend, Francis Bacon, wrote to him, and concluded his letter as follows :--

“ So desiring you to be good *to concealed poets* I continue,” &c.

As Francis Bacon, Tidir, Tudor, Tidder, or whatever his correct name was, took such pains to teach to his generation and the next ages the philosophical and scientific knowledge he admittedly possessed, it has occurred to me to enquire, now the cipher story repeats his claim to be a poet, where are his published teachings of the poetic art ?

In pursuit of that quest, I recently purchased the two fine volumes of “ Ancient Critical Essays on English Poets and Poesie,” published in 1811 by Joseph Hazlewood.

Having read them and the “ Apologie for Poetrie ” (Arber’s reprint), I again put my coat in the arena so that somebody can “ thrid on the tail ov it.”

I affirm the following works to carry a strong suspicion of being the composition of Francis :

1. “ Certayne Notes of Instruction concerning the Making of Verse or Ryme in English. From the Poesies of George Gascoigne, Esquire.” Anon. Printed 1575.
2. A “ Discourse of English Poetrie.” By “ William Webbe,” Graduate. Printed 1586.
3. The “ Arte of English Poesie.” Anon. Printed 1589.

4. "An Apologie for Poetrie." By Sir Philip Sidney. Printed 1595.

5. "Observations on the Art of English Poesie." By Thomas Campion. Printed 1602.

I take them in the above order.

1. The biographers have no authority for placing the name of Gascoigne as the author of the "Notes."

I am disposed to think the paper was written by Francis when at Cambridge in 1575, or that the date of printing is given incorrectly. My reasons for thinking so are that Gascoigne was a sort of soldier of fortune, and appears to have spent three or four years from 1572 in the wars of the Low Countries (see his biography in Dic. Nat. Biography). I doubt whether any man engaged in the excitement of war would be in condition to discuss poetry as a serious art. Besides, I must judge a man by his friends, and when I find "Webbe," "Puttenham," "Meres" Gabriel Harvey, and "Edmund Bolton," at various dates, all speaking well of the "Notes," I begin to smell rats!

2. I am tolerably sure Francis wrote "A Discourse of English Poetrie," published 1586. "William Webbe" cannot be traced, and is, doubtless, one of the changes of name which Francis, if a Rosicrucian, would enjoy. The writer seems to be very pleased with "The Shepheard's Calendar" and suspiciously familiar with its method of composition.

3. "The Arte of English Poesie" is long. It occupies practically the whole of the first volume of Hazlewood, and I fear I skipped some of it. Vita brevis. In 1589, it appeared anonymously. This practice imposes a great strain on biographers, with whom I have now learnt to sympathise. They had to find the author, and this is how they did it. A certain Richard Carew wrote an essay on the "Excellency of the English Tongue" which was not in the 1605, but appears, we are told, in the 1623 edition of "Camden's Remains," in which the names of Sir Philip Sidney, Master Puttenham, Master Stanihurst, and divers more are vouched as to the copious possibilities of the English language for versification.

The next "proof" is the testimony of one "Edmund Bolton" in

the "Hypercritica," supposed to have been written about 1618, but not printed until 1722. This "Bolton" says :—

"Queen Elizabeth's verses, those which I have seen and read, some extant in the elegant, witty, and artificial book of the Art of English Poetry, the work (as the Fame is) of one of her gentlemen pensioners, Puttenham, are Princely as her Prose."

2.4. (The "Hypercritica" is printed in the second volume of Hazlewood and is either a Rosicrucian document or it is nonsense. On the former, and probably correct supposition, *it is a guide to the methods of writing and reading secret history.*)

The biographers having settled upon "Puttenham" as the melodious surname of the author of "The Arte," next dealt with his "Christian" name. As the result you can select either "George" or "Webster." I will explain :—

The anonymous author, in his work, stated that he gave Queen Elizabeth certain verses called Partheniades.

In 1788, verses entitled Partheniades were printed from the Cotton MS. as part of "Progresses" second volume.

The first address of the Partheniades is stated to be in the nature of a New Year's gift.

It ends :—

"Well hopes my Muse to skape all manner blame
Uttering your honours, to hyde her owner's name.

The biographers find that Queen Elizabeth had a cook named George Webster, who in 1561, gave her for a New Year's Gift, a marchepane (which is a sort of sweetened bread or biscuit). Hence George Puttenham or Webster Puttenham. Take your choice !

Master "Puttenham" judging by the "Arte" was a courtier, a travelled, and very learned man. In fact, I find little to choose between him and "William Webbe." The latter "author" appears to have made in 1586, the preliminary examination of the ground which the former (who writes of Elizabeth having reigned 31 years) in 1589, completely surveys.

Neither "Webbe" nor "Puttenham" appear to differ in their views of poetry. Both start with the statement that a poet is a "maker"

and both are discursive and interesting. Both, moreover, are the despair of the biographers. *Nothing is known about them.*

4. "An Apologie for Poetrie" was printed in 1595. Sir Philip Sidney, whose name was printed as the author, was not likely to suffer by the attribution, even if wrong. Until his death in 1586, he was a close friend of Francis. His writings were published posthumously.

His friend Fulke Grevill, wrote to Walsingham (Sidney's father-in-law) as to the publication of the "Arcadia" and certain other works in MS. This was in November, 1586. No mention is made of the existence of "The Apologie."

A critic, whose name I do not know, says in "Notes on Shakespeare's Plays" (published by Walter Husband, Birmingham, 1895):—

"The germ and a great deal besides of the essential principle of (Bacon's) 'Wisdom of the Ancients' may be traced in this remarkable book."

The writer shews the familiarity of "Spenser" with Gower and Chaucer, a knowledge of Latin and Greek authors like Francis Bacon, an acquaintance like that of "Greene" with the Italian writers. Like "Webbe" and "Puttenham," he says, "Poet cometh of a Greek word meaning to make." He also agrees with them "that poetrie is an arte of imitation." He questions whether "the fayned image of poetrie or the regular instruction of philosophy hath the more force in teaching." He is well up in tragedies and comedies. He asks, "Doth the lawyer lie then, when under the names of John a Stile and John a Noakes, he puts his case?" Like "Webbe," he has a good word for the "Shepherd's Calendar." Like "Puttenham," he compares oratory with poetry. Like myself, he complains of those "Cumbersome differences of Cases, Genders, Moodes, and Tenses, which I think was a piece of the Tower of Babylon's curse!"

He asks for belief "that there are many misteries contained in poetrie, which of purpose were written darkly, lest by profane wits it should be abused."

Finally, he threatens us with the penalty of living in love and never getting favour, and of dying without memoir for want of an Epitaph:—

"If you be borne so near the dull making Cataract of Nilus that you cannot heare the planet like music of poetry."

This is, I apprehend, why the biographers and myself have been in such a maze, and why the "Hypercritica" of "Edmund Bolton" holds the key to the position!

5. I will only deal very slightly with "Observations on the Art of English Poesie," by "Thomas Campion," 1602. He, poor fellow, has no biography worth speaking of. Like "Webbe," "Puttenham," and "Sidney," he is very troubled with the then prevailing "vulgar and inartificial custom of riming." In "The Writer's Address to his Book,"

"Whither thou haste my little book so fast?"

I am reminded of the verse prefixed in 1580 to the "Shepherd's Calendar."

"Go little booke, thyself present,
As one whose parent is un kent."

"Campion" was a person who, by writing letters, worried after the formation of a Royal Academy, and nominated a number of the early Freemasons, like Inigo Jones, and prominent men like Ben Jonson, Toby Mathew, John Selden, Digges, Wootton, and others, as its first Members.

"Campion" was *specially associated with the class of verse appropriate to be set to music*. His is a case for further enquiry.

My readers will by this time have concluded, I am become somewhat prejudiced towards the acceptance of any remarkable claim which may turn up in the investigation of "The Strange Case of Francis Tidir."

Diogenes, when asked why he was wandering round the Market Place with a lighted candle, replied, I am looking for a MAN.

In such a search I have tried to assist.

Valuable

APPENDIX V.

TWO ITEMS.

Item 1.—Since printing my second article I have been furnished by the kindness of a London friend with a copy of an entry in the baptismal records of the Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London. It is as follows :—

1560, Jan. 25.

Baptizatus fuit Franciscus Bacon filius Dm Nich^o Bacon Magni,
Anglie sigilli custodis.

I am informed that it is one of the earliest records of the Church baptisms. Allowing fourteen days as a reasonable time for a baptismal ceremony to follow the birth, I hold the date of 11th January, 1560, given by Montagu, to be correct.

Item 2.—A friend has, also been good enough to transcribe at Somerset House, and lend me a copy of the Will of Sir Nicholas Bacon. It was prepared not long before his death, and was evidently drawn up with care and deliberation. It made provision for the children of his first marriage, and for Anthony, the admitted child of the second marriage. Francis received no positive benefit whatever. If Anthony died without heirs of his body, Gorhambury and some leaseholds left to Anthony were to go to Francis. Anthony was to have half the household furniture at Gorhambury on his mother's death, but if he did not live to the age of 24, Francis was to have it. As a matter of direct and assured benefit, Francis was not so well off as the widow Shakspeare, with her husband's bequest of his "second best bed" and the appertaining furniture.

The statement (based, I believe, on Rawley's "Memoir"), that Francis shared in some money with the children of Sir Nicholas, is not in any way confirmed by the Will.

APPENDIX VI.

WORKS CONSULTED.

-
1. "Life and Letters of Francis Bacon." Spedding.
 2. "Life and Works of Francis Bacon." Montagu.
 3. "Lives of the Queens of England." Strickland.
 4. "History of England." Froude.
 5. "History of England." Lingard.
 6. "Life of Shakespeare." Lee.
 7. "Lives of the Earls of Essex." Devereux.
 8. "Dictionary National Biography."
 9. "Imperial Dictionary of Biography."
 10. "Dictionary of Printers." Timperley,
 11. "Life and Works of Marlowe." Dyce.
 12. "Memoir of Spenser." Church.
 13. "Life and Works of Spenser." Grosart.
 14. "Anatomy of Melancholy." Ed. by Shilleto.
 15. "Works of Philip Sidney." Grosart.
 16. "Memoir of Philip Sidney." Fox Bourne.
 17. "Life and Times of Sir C. Hatton." Nicholas.
 18. "Chronology of History." Nicholas.
 19. "Life and Works of Greene." Grosart.
 20. "Romance of the Peerage." Craik.
 21. "Old Plays." Dodsley.
 22. "Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama."
J. A. Symonds.
 23. "Our English Homer." White.
 24. "Personal History of Francis Bacon." Dixon.
 25. "Study of Shakespeare." Swinburne.
 26. "Great Cryptogram." Donnelly.
 27. "Francis Bacon and his Secret Society." Pott.
 28. "Shakespeare Bacon and the Rosicrucians." Wigston.
 29. "Word Cipher." Orville Owen.
 30. "Bilateral Cipher." Gallup.

31. "Bacon Journal."
32. "Baconiana." 1892—1900.
33. "Gentleman's Magazine, 1854." Article by E. A. Freeman.
34. "Guide to the Beauchamp Tower." Dick.
35. "History of English Poetry." Warton.
36. "Ancient Critical Essays on English Poets." Hazlewood.

FINIS.



... the number ... small ...

RA

OCT 15 1957



