BACONIANA

VOL. VII., NEW SERIES, 1899.

BACONIANA.

EDITED BY
A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE BACON SOCIETY.

Published Quarterly.
Annual Subscription, Five Shillings, post free.

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

CONTENTS, 1899.—Nos. 25—28.

	PAGE
A Brief Controversy	90
Bacon's "Essay of Envy"	157
Bacon's "Essay of Love"	53
Bacon-Shakespeare Problem, The	97
Bacon, the Painter-Poet	27
Ben Jonson's "Poet Ape"	135
Chronicle Plays, The	60, 120, 141
Correspondence	95, 140, 171
"From the Dust of Old Oblivion Raked"	137
Links in the Chain	12
Mr. S. Lee's "Life of Shakespeare"	74
Mythology	43
Notes	94
Notes on the Procemium to the Great Instauration	130
Quarterly Review, The	1
Rosicrucian Document Connected with Sir Francis Bacon, A	87
Sketches of Francis Bacon's Character and Genius	19
"Wolsey's Farewell"	165

INDEX.

PAGE

Abbott, E. A , D.D.... 56
Adonis, Garden of 3, 79
Advancement of Learning, 11, 21, 33, 162
" " Style Of 55
Alderson, E. S. ... 59, 136, 164
Alleyn, Edward 10, 93
"Alphabet," Bacon's 110
Antitheta 146
Apelles, "Venus" of 31
Apophthegms 141
Appleton-Morgan, Dr. ... 81, 94
Aristocratic Spirit of Plays ... 84
Aristotle 5
Armardo, Don 40
Bacon, Delia 2
Bacon, Francis, A Poet, 8, 106—110
" " Aims and Work 130
" " Character and Genius 19
Bacon, Francis, Compared to Moses 27
Bacon, Francis, Compared to Rubens, Vandyke... 28
Bacon, Francis, Compared to Zeuxis, Apolles 28
Bacon, Francis, Concealed Poet ... 110
" " Contemporary Opinions of ... ... 22—24
Bacon, Francis, Ill-health... ... 20
" " Interest in Ciphers 98, 171
Bacon, Francis, Knowledge of Human Nature 23, 114
Bacon, Francis, MS. containing "Rich. II.," and "Rich. III."... 116
Bacon, Francis, Mythology in his Works 43
Bacon, Francis, Poverty 10
" " Reasons for not Acknowledging the Plays, 11, 95, 140
Bacon, Francis, Rosicrucian document connected with 87
Bacon, Francis, Solitary Enterprize 130
Bacon, Francis, Stage a Hobby, 21, 111
" " Style ... 54—56
" " Supposed Low Idea of Love 53, 57

PAGE

Barthus, Jasper 15
Baynes, Prof. 101
Biddulph, L.... 90
Brandes, Dr.... 2
Bright, John 2
Burgoyne 96
Campbell, Lord, on Law in Shakespeare 80, 115
Campbell, Lord, on Bacon's Poetry 107
Chronicle Plays, The 60, 120, 141
Ciphers Described in De Augmentis 98
Ciphers, Worked out on Bacon's Instructions 171
Classical Learning in Plays, 2—7, 79, 100
Coleridge 2
Collaboration, Evidences of in Plays 113
Cowley 15, 28
Cryptogram, Donnelly's 97
Cupids, the Two 44
Dares Phrygius 3
"Device of Essex," Bacon's ... 55
Donnelly, I. 2, 97
Dowden, Prof. 2
Dudley, Earl of Leicester 138
Elizabeth, Queen 137
Emerson 9
"Envy, Essay of" 157
Essex 137
Euripides' Hellene 3
Fiske 81
Furness, H. H. 8
Gallup, Mrs.... 172
Grant White, R. 80, 99
Greenstreet 85
Hallam 9
Halliwell-Philips 92
Heard, F. F.... 81
"Henry VIII." 165
Holmes, Oliver Wendell 2
Honorificabilitudino 116
Jonson, Ben, Opinion of Bacon, 8, 109
" " " Shakespeare 8, 24, 106, 135
Jonson, Ben, "Poet-Ape 135
Kesselstadt Mask of Shakespeare... 9

PAGE

Law in Shakespeare ... 7, 80, 115
Lee, Sidney 7, 74, 92
Leicester, Earl of 138
"Love," Bacon's "Essay of" 53, 57
Love, Bacon's and Shakespeare's Ideas on ... ... 53, 56—59
Lytton, Lord... 9
Macaulay on Bacon's Poetry ... 107
" " Style ... 54
Marriot, Miss E. 53
Marston's (John) Satyus 95
Martin, Sir Theodore 78
Matthew, Sir Tobie... ... 22, 110
Mede, Joseph 15
Medical Knowledge in Plays 7, 80
Mythology in Bacon's Works ... 43
"Nonpareil" type 94
Nobility compared to Statues ... 146
Osborne, Francis 23
Owen, Dr. 171
Palmerston, Lord 2
Pan 43
Parallelisms in Bacon's Works and the Shakespeare Plays, 5, 6, 62, 120, 141, 157
Pope 3
Pott, Mrs. H., on Mythology ... 43
" " Ciphers 171
Promus 117
Procemium, Notes on the 130
"Praise," Bacon's Essay on ... 141
"Quarterly Review" ... 1, 97
Raleigh, Sir W. 24
Rawley, Dr. 25
Richard II., Character of 142
Romeo and Juliet 57, 119
Rosicrucian Document, A... ... 87
Royal Society, The 28
Rubens, Bacon Compared to 28, 31
Sarpi, Fia Paolo 15
Self-knowledge 148
Shakespeare, Bust of 93
" Daughter of 103
" Income 10
" Indifference to Publication of Plays 85

PAGE

Shakespeare, Known Facts Concerning 99
Shakespeare, Sidney Lee's Life of 74
Shakespeare's Plays, The Aristocratic Spirit in 84
Shakespeare's Plays Enlarged after Death of Shakespeare 104
Shakespeare's Plays, The Evidences of Collaboration in 113
Shakespeare's Plays. The Knowledge of the Classics in 2, 7, 79, 100
Shakespeare's Plays, The Knowledge of Italian in 83
Shakespeare's Plays, The Knowledge of Law in 7, 80, 115
Shakespeare's Plays, The Parallels in Bacon's Prose 5, 6, 62, 120, 141, 157
Shakespeare's Plays, The Scholastic Tone in 100, 101
Shelley on Bacon's Poetry... ... 9
Sidney, Sir Philip 15
Solomon's House 132
Spedding 2, 8, 10
Stewart, H. H. 140
Stopes, Mrs.... ... ... 99, 118
Stow's Annals 9
Strang, "The Bacon-Shakespeare Problem" 97
"Stratford-on-Avon Herald," The 90
Stronach 12
Stubbs, Dean 140
Style, Bacon's ... ... 54—56
Swinburne 2
Tacitus 141
Taine, M. 108
Tanner 95
Tennison, Archbishop 28
Tennyson 53
Thales 148
Trajano Boccalini 87
Vandyke 2, 8, 31
Venus and Adonis 100
Whateley 114
Wigston, W. C. F., 43, 73, 114, 121, 157
"Wolsey's Farewell" 165
Zeuxis 31

Baconiana.

Vol. VI.—*New Series.* JANUARY, 1899. No. 25.

"THE QUARTERLY REVIEW."

IF it *was* the *Quarterly* that killed poor Keats, it is far from likely that such a consummation will be effected by the writer of the article in the July number entitled, "Shakespeare and Bacon," which will not even scotch the cause that the members of the Bacon Society have strenuously advocated—and with growing success—for many years. The article professes to be based on such ancient history as:—

> Bacon and Shakespeare. By W. H. Smith, 1857;
> The Authorship of Shakespeare. By N. Holmes, 1875;
> The Great Cryptogram. By I. Donnelly, 1888;
> The Promus of Formularies. By Mrs. H. Pott;

together with the following recent publications (described as "and other works" in the contents), tacked on, to bring the article up to date, presumably, and give it a *raison d'être*:—

> William Shakespeare. By George Brandes, 1898.
> Shakespeare. By Sidney Lee. In the "Dictionary of National Biography," 1897.

Dr. Brandes and Mr. Sidney Lee are disposed of in eleven lines—the remainder of the eighteen pages being devoted to a bitter attack on those who support the Baconian theory of the authorship of the Shakespearean dramas. The imposing article, however, is built entirely of straws, so that when we come forth to battle, we find very little to bombard. The article starts with the statement that "the hypothesis that the works of Shakespeare were written by Bacon . . . has been totally neglected by scholars. Perhaps their indifference may seem wise, for an opinion that can only be entertained by levity and ignorance may appear to need no confirmation." This is the key-note of the reviewer's article, and he at once launches sarcastically out on "the learning, the logic, and the general intellect of people who form themselves into Baconian Societies, to prove that the poems and plays of Shakespeare were written by Bacon. Thus a light is thrown," he adds, "on the nature

and origin of popular delusions." Then he summons to his aid Mr. Spedding, Mr. H. H. Furness, Dr. Brandes, "the Danish biographer and critic," Mr. Swinburne, and Mr. Sidney Lee. Against such authorities our opinions can only "be entertained by levity and ignorance," although these opinions were entertained by Lord Palmerston, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and John Bright, who declared that "Anyone who believes William Shakespeare, of Stratford, wrote *Hamlet* and *Lear* must be a fool."

After a page of criticism of Delia Bacon, the reviewer introduces Dr. Brandes on the scene. This is what he (the former) says:—"It was necessary to prove, therefore, that the author of the plays had—what Shakespeare had not—plenty of Latin and Greek, yet none 'but the less than half educated,' as Dr. Brandes says, could believe that the plays contain proof of classical learning."

Well, although a graduate of Edinburgh University, a prizeman in Professor Masson's Class of English Literature, and a "constant reader" of the Shakespearean dramas, I am quite content to be dubbed "less than half educated," happy to err in the best of good company, that of men who maintain that the plays throughout contain the highest evidences of "classical learning." Professor Dowden speaks of the "frequency of classical allusions" in the dramas. Coleridge maintains that "the habits of William Shakespeare had been scholastic and those of a student." But take away the plays, and let us confine ourselves to *Venus and Adonis* ("the first heir of my invention") and *Lucrece*. Is there no "classical learning" displayed in these poems? I would ask the *Quarterly* reviewer. Of these productions the Cowden Clarkes say:—"*Venus and Adonis* and the *Lucrece* bear palpable tokens of college elegance and predilection, both in story and in treatment. The air of niceness and stiffness, almost peculiar to the schools, invests these efforts of the youthful genius with almost unmistakable signs of having been written by a schoolman. Then his famous acquaintance with college terms and usages makes for the conclusion that he had enjoyed the privilege of a University education." Sir Theodore Martin once declared that "before Shakespeare left Stratford he had probably written *Venus and Adonis*." I would ask the *Quarterly* reviewer—How did Shakespeare accomplish this feat?

This is the explanation given by Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, in his "Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare":—"Although the information at present accessible does not enable us to determine the exact nature of Shakespeare's occupations from his

fourteenth to his eighteenth year—that is to say, from 1577 to 1582—there can be no hesitation in concluding that, during that animated and receptive period of life, he was mercifully released from what, to a spirit like his, must have been the deleterious monotony of a school education. Whether he passed these years as a butcher or a wool-dealer does not greatly matter. In either capacity, or in any other that could then have been found at Stratford, he was unconsciously acquiring a more perfect knowledge of the world and human nature than could have been derived from a study of the classics." The picture is perfect. One can see Shakespeare sitting in the butcher's shop writing *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*, for which "a study of the classics" was by no means necessary, all that was requisite being "a more perfect knowledge of the world and human nature." He leaves for London, with the MS. of *Venus and Adonis* in his pocket, according to Sir Theodore Martin, and gets it printed on his arrival. Well might Halliwell-Phillipps say: "It is extremely improbable that a poem so highly finished and so completely devoid of *patois* as the 'Venus and Adonis' could have been produced under the circumstances of his then domestic surroundings."

In the absence of "classical learning," can the reviewer explain the following? In 1 Henry VI. appear the lines:—

> "Thy promises are like Adonis' gardens,
> That one day bloomed and fruitful were the next."

Richard Grant White says:—"No mention of any such garden in the classic writings of Greece and Rome is known to scholars."

But it has been discovered that mention of such a garden, and named the "Garden of Adonis," with exactly similar characteristics, is made in the Phædrus of Plato, of which there was no English translation till the beginning of the eighteenth century. The man "of little Latin and less Greek" had read the *Phædrus !*

So much for Shakespeare's "classical learning"—not a requisite, according to Dr. Brandes and the *Quarterly* reviewer, for the writing of the Shakespearean dramas.

Next our reviewer attacks Mr. Holmes, an advocate of the Bacon theory for the heinous mistake of referring to "a Greek play by Euripides, called 'Hellene.' There is, we need not say, no Greek play of the name of 'Hellene' . . . a name which only exists in the fancy of Mr. Nathaniel Holmes." Well, the Greek form of the title of the play referred to is "CΕΛΕΝΗ" otherwise "Helene"—so that the interpolated 'l' seems a very slender thread on which to hang an argument against the Bacon

theory extending to half a page. The reviewer does not claim that Shakespeare was a "classical scholar." Neither do we insist upon Mr. Holmes' "classical scholarship." But it certainly shows the weakness of the opposition when it is reduced to the necessity of working such a trifling point as this to the death. Moreover, the reviewer's criticism is unworthy of him, if he wishes to be considered a fair and truthful critic. One may say of it that the reviewer has "economized truth in a manner that closely boarders on mendacity." The reviewer then turns to the "resemblances," and attempts to floor Mr. Donnelly for the following "coincidence." In *Macbeth* we find—

> 'All our yesterdays have lighted fools
> The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle.'

"This is 'traced,' says Mr. Donnelly "—says our reviewer, "to Catullus, quoting :—

> 'Soles occidere et redire possunt ;
> Nobis, cum semel occidit brevis lux,
> Nox est perpetua una dormienda.'

"The parallel is got by translating Catullus thus :—

> 'The *lights* of heaven go out and return ;
> When once our *brief candle* goes out,
> One night is to be perpetually slept.'

But *soles* are not *lights*, and *brevis lux* is not *brief candle*. If they were, the passages have no resemblance." Apart from the actual words, the resemblance in idea is clear to any unprejudiced mind. But our reviewer will not have any resemblances in ideas between Shakespeare and Bacon—or even Shakespeare (or Bacon) and Catullus. When he is in this humour, what does he say to the following "coincidence" in both thought and expression, which has been used frequently—but not too often—in our arguments ?

The reviewer then makes an onslaught on Mr. Donnelly for daring to follow Pope in the statement that Dares Phrygius was a "Greek author," and insists that Dares P. was not a Greek author, because no Greek version of his romance exists. In Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Biography*, it is stated :—" Dares was, according to the Iliad, a priest of Hephæstus, at Troy. There existed in antiquity an Iliad . . . . which was believed to be more ancient than the Homeric poems, and in fact to be the work of Dares . . . . In the time of Ælian, the Iliad of Dares, which he calls Φρυγία Ἰλιάς "*was still known to exist.*" So that, according to Ælian, Dares *is* a Greek author, as a manuscript in Greek of his Iliad was at one time extant.

In the *Advancement of Learning*, Bacon quotes Aristotle as saying that "young men are no fit auditors of *moral* philosophy, because they are not settled from the boiling heat of their affections, nor attempered with time and experience." In *Troilus and Cressida* (with which Bacon had nothing to do, of course, according to our learned critic of the *Quarterly*), we find the following:—

> "Not much
> Unlike young men, whom Aristotle thought
> Unfit to hear *moral* philosophy.
> The reasons you allege do more conduce
> To the hot passion of distempered blood
> Than to make up a free determination
> 'Twixt right and wrong."

"But what's in that?" asks the *Quarterly;* both Bacon and Shakespeare (the latter "with little Latin and less Greek") may have read Aristotle. True enough, but unfortunately Aristotle's strictures were applied to *political*, not *moral*, philosophy, and both philosopher and dramatist made the same mistake. How does the explanatory reviewer explain this? Possibly on the supposition that Bacon borrowed the error from the man of Stratford! Mr. Sidney Lee endeavours to get out of the difficulty by stating that Aristotle *meant* "political" for "moral." So that both Bacon and Shakespeare knew what Aristotle *meant*, and corrected him accordingly.

Throughout his article there is one strong Baconian argument which the reviewer does not venture to meet fairly and squarely—the thousand and one parallelisms to be found in the works of Bacon and Shakespeare, parallelisms which can scarcely be construed into plagiarisms when both writers were contemporaries. He does it in a way, but he brings forward the least resembling coincidences, a habit Shakespeareans have of "ignoring the strongest resemblances, and selecting the least striking and putting them forth as the strongest." Here are a few others for his consideration—close enough in language surely:—

"A beast that wants discourse of reason."—*Shakespeare.*

"In discourse of reason."—*Bacon.*

[Can the reviewer find an earlier use of this phrase, and where? Critics maintained that the "of" should be "and," till the expression was discovered repeatedly in Bacon's works.]

"Minister to a mind diseased."—*Shakespeare.*

"Minister to all the diseases of the mind."—*Bacon.*

"Cowards die many times."—*Shakespeare.*
"Men have their time, and die many times."—*Bacon.*

"The waters swell before a boisterous storm."—*Shakespeare.*
"Secret swelling of seas before a tempest."—*Bacon.*

"Sound and fury, signifying nothing."—*Shakespeare.*
"Sound than signify anything."—*Bacon.*

"As being slippery standers."—*Shakespeare.*
"The standing slippery."—*Bacon.*

"The expense of spirit in a waste of shame."—*Shakespeare.*
"The course of dimness of sight in the expense of spirit."—*Bacon.*

"I am never merry when I hear sweet music;
The reason is, your spirits are attentive."—*Shakespeare.*
"Some noises help sleep, as . . . soft singing. The cause is that they move in the spirits a gentle attention."—*Bacon.*

"Love must creep in service where it cannot go."—*Shakespeare.*
"Love must creep where it cannot go."—*Bacon.*

"Nothing almost sees miracles but misery."—*Shakespeare.*
"If miracles be the command over nature they appear most in adversity."—*Bacon.*

[No Shakesperean annotator has ever given a right interpretation of the expression in *King Lear*, which can only be understood by the light of Bacon's philosophy.]

"I saw him after a gilded butterfly; and when he caught it. he let it go again; and after it again."—*Shakespeare.*

"To be like a child following a bird, which, when he is nearest, flyeth away and 'lighteth a little before; and then the child after it again."—*Bacon.*

[The former extract is from *Coriolanus*, written after 1610, first printed 1623. The latter is from a letter from Lord Bacon written 1605, first printed in the *Resuscitatio*, 1657.]

These are only a few examples out of many hundreds, which have appeared over and over again in the pages of the *Bacon Journal* and *Baconiana*, and other Baconian writings. Mr. Sidney Lee maintains, with regard to the parallelisms brought forward by the Baconians, that "most of those that are commonly quoted are phrases in ordinary use by all writers of the day." Yes, of the present day, perhaps, but not of Shakespeare's day.

Besides the parellelisms are not only matter of phraseology, but of original thought.

Then, continues the reviewer, "we cannot, of course, furnish a complete summary of all that the Baconians have said in their myriad pages . . . We are obliged to take the points which the Baconians regard as their strong cards." These "strong cards," which he takes, are in most cases not what the Baconians consider "court" cards, but are veritable "rags."

"We have dealt with the point of classical scholarship, and shown that the American writers are not scholars, and have no *locus standi*. We shall next take in order the contention that Bacon was a poet . . . Then we shall glance at Bacon's motives for writing plays by stealth, and blushing to find it fame." So shall I, my gentle reviewer.

This is what you aver. "Now, as to scholarship, the knowledge shown in the plays is not that of a scholar. The legal and medical lore is no way beyond the 'general information' which genius inevitably amasses from reading, conversation, reflection, and experience." Well, I shall take seventy-five out of every hundred ardent Shakespeareans to combat the statement that the author of the Shakespearean dramas was not a *scholar*. As for "genius" (that "heaven sent inspiration" to which Sir Theodore Martin ascribed Shakespeare's knowledge of everything under the sun) accounting for Shakespeare's legal lore in the manner he ascribes—what does Lord Chief Justice Campbell say?

"While novelists and dramatists are constantly making mistakes as to the law of marriage, of wills, and of inheritance, to Shakespeare's law, lavishly as he propounds it, there can be neither demurrer, nor bill of exception, nor writ of error." Mr. Richard Grant White asks:—How then can we account for the fact, that in an age when it was the common practice for young lawyers to write plays, one playwright left upon his plays a stronger, a sharper legal stamp than appears upon any of his contemporaries, and that the characters of this stamp are those of the complicated law of real property?" I confess I cannot answer Mr. White's interrogatory. I leave it to Mr. Sidney Lee, who says in the "Dictionary of National Biography":—"His accurate use of legal terms *may be* attributable in part to his observance of the many legal processes in which his father was involved, and in part to early intercourse with members of the Inns of Court," combined with his "intuitive power of realising life in almost every aspect *by force of his imagination*."

The reviewer gives Rudyard Kipling and Jeanne d'Arc as instances of "rare ability" amassing out-of-the-way knowledge,

just as Sir Theodore Martin instanced Robert Burns, Da Vinci, Keats, and Turner, as in this respect being the counterparts of Shakespeare by means of "heaven sent inspiration;" but in the case of a serious illness or an intricate lawsuit I expect the *Quarterly* reviewer, Mr. Sidney Lee, and Sir Theodore Martin would have more confidence in a doctor or a lawyer, who has made his profession the business of his life, than in an individual whose credentials consisted of "heaven-sent inspiration," or "an intuitive power of realising life."

The reviewer tells us "it is necessary to show that Bacon possessed poetic genius. The proof cannot possibly be found in his prose works." If the reviewer has never read Bacon's *Essays* and made the discovery that Bacon was a poet, that is his misfortune, not our fault. On this point he sets off against a few of the Baconians the names of "Mr. Spedding, the chief authority on Bacon, and Mr. H. H. Furness, the learned and witty American editor of the "Variorum Shakespeare?" although all other Americans—on the Baconian side—he thoroughly despises. But what says Mr. Spedding, "the chief authority," on Bacon's poetry?—"Bacon had all the natural faculties which a poet wants; a fine ear for metre, a fine feeling for imaginative effect in words, and a vein of poetic passion. The truth is that Bacon was not without the 'fine phrensy' of the poet; but the world into which it transported him was one which, while it promised visions more glorious than any poet could imagine, promised them upon the express condition that fiction should be utterly prohibited and excluded. Had it taken the ordinary direction, I have little doubt that it would have carried him to a place among the great poets . . . The heroic couplet could hardly do its work better in the hands of Dryden." So much for Mr. Spedding, whom the reviewer gives as evidence against Bacon's poetic claim to the dramas.

As for Mr. Furness—what brief does the reviewer hold from this brilliant commentator in favour of his contention, in face of the same Mr. Furness's statement:—"Had these plays come down to us anonymously, had the labour of discovering the author been imposed upon future generations, we could have found no one of that day but Francis Bacon to whom to assign the crown. In this case it would have been resting now upon his head by almost common consent." And these are two of the men whom the reviewer depends upon as his authorities for quashing the Baconian argument.

Both the modern Spedding and the modern Furness can blow hot or cold as the occasion demands—just as did "rare old Ben," ("the leader of the learned fraternity of log-rollers," according to

Mr. George Wyndham) when he described Shakespeare in the first folio of 1623 as excelling all "that insolent Greece or haughty Rome" had done, and subsequently informed a different set of readers in his *Discoveries*, of date 1641, that Bacon "performed that in our tongue which may be compared, or preferred, either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome." This would appear a poor compliment to Shakespeare—to apply to Bacon the identical words of praise which he had accorded to the "Bard of Avon" nearly twenty years before—but as the *Quarterly* reviewer says—' Bacon is dead" so it didn't matter! A dead man cannot very well quarrel with his epitaph!

Shelley—who, perhaps, the *Quarterly* reviewer may acknowledge to have known a little about poetry—wrote: "Lord Bacon was a poet," and referred to "the sweet and majestic rhythm of his language;" while Hallam, the historian, says: "We as little feel the power of identifying the young man who came up from Stratford, was afterwards an indifferent player in a London theatre, and retired to his native place in middle life, with the author of *Macbeth* and *Lear*." Emerson says: "The Egyptian verdict of the Shakespearean societies comes to mind, that he was a jovial actor and manager. I cannot marry this fact to his verse. " Then Macaulay says: "The poetical faculty was powerful in Bacon's mind." Lord Lytton says:—"Poetry pervaded the thoughts, it inspired the similes, it hymned the majestic sentences of the wisest of manhood." Lord Campbell says:—"Few poets deal in finer imagery than is to be found in Bacon . . . . His prose is poetry." But Shelley, Hallam, Emerson, Macaulay, Lytton and Campbell were not *Quarterly* reviewers, or they might have thought differently.

That Bacon was not without honour as a poet even in his own day is proved by the inclusion of his name in the list of Elizabethan poets in Stow's *Annales*, of which an augmented edition by Edmond Howes, was published in 1615. This is what appears in the *Annales*: "Our moderne, and present excellent poets which worthely florish in their own workes, and all of them in my owne knowledge lived togeather in this Queenes raigne, according to their priorities as neere as I could, I have orderly set downe. Then follow the names of Gascoigne, Churchyard, Dyer, Spenser, Sidney, Harrington, Chaloner, Bacon, Davies, Lyly, Chapman, Warner, Shakespeare, Daniell, Drayton, Marlowe, Jonson, Meeres, Sylvester, Dekker, Fletcher, Webster, Heywood, Middleton, Withers. If Bacon is not a poet, he appears here in excellent poetic company.

The next point which the reviewer takes up is one in which he displays supreme ignorance of the position held by the Baconians,

"What had he (Bacon)," the reviewer asks, "to gain by vamping or by patching? Certainly not money . . . An ambitious lawyer passes his nights in retouching stock pieces, from which he can reap neither fame nor profit . . ." This is one point on which the *Quarterly* reviewer is entirely wrong. The Baconian argument is that Bacon, under *necessity*, wrote the plays and supplied them to Shakespeare for profit. "We are asked to believe that Bacon," he confidently asserts, "for the sake of some *five or six pounds*, toiled at re-fashioning old plays, and handed the fair manuscripts to Shakespeare." Why, "five or six pounds?" Why not five or six thousand? It is not known what was the value of the real estate which Shakespeare amassed, apart from the money left in his will (£2,800), but Vicar Ward of Stratford tells us Shakespeare spent at the rate of £1,000 per annum during his last years. Mr. Sidney Lee, says: "Over £130 (equal to £1,040 of to-day) would be Shakespeare's annual revenue before 1599," and "Shakespeare in the later period of his life was earning above £600 a year in money of the period"—that is, £4,800 of to-day. Then we know that a contemporary theatre-manager and "bear-master," Edward Alleyn (founder of Dulwich College) purchased the Manor of Dulwich for £10,000 (in money of his own day—equal to £80,000 of our day), and devoted it, with much other property, to public uses, at the same time making ample provision for his family out of the residue of his estate. Shakespeare could scarcely make less profit than Alleyn as a manager, so that the business would prove eminently profitable to Shakespeare and Bacon, if both were concerned in the production of the plays. If Bacon received but a moiety of the profits as his share, he would be content to let Shakespeare have all the credit. Those who have read Spedding's "Life and Letters" know that Bacon, till he obtained office, was in desperate straits for lack of money. Time after time was he passed over when appointments became vacant. In a letter to Essex, 1595, Bacon expresses a wish to retire from the practice of the law and to devote himself to philosophy. Professor Gardiner on this point says: "His pecuniary embarrassments, which were the greater from his long expectancy of office, probably stood in the way." What more likely than that he took to playwriting to obtain the money he wanted? No Shakespearean play was published till 1597; and all the plays seem to have originated in that period of time during which Bacon was poor and unemployed, and they ceased to appear when Bacon was appointed Attorney-General (1613—the date of Henry VIII.), and three years before the death of Shakespeare; when Shakespeare was not fifty years old, and as capable of literary work as ever he had been.

As Charles Knight says:—"At a period of life when Chaucer began to write the 'Canterbury Tales,' Shakspere, according to his biographers, was suddenly and utterly to cease to write. We cannot believe it."

The reviewer then makes the assertion: "That Bacon should be a vamper and a playwright for no appreciable profit, that, having produced his immortal works, he should make no sign, has, in fact, staggered even the great credulity of Baconians." Mr. Donnelly answers this latter argument very completely, when he says: "The last years of his life were years of dishonour. He had been cast down from the place of Lord Chancellor for bribery, for selling justice for money. He had been sentenced to prison; he held his liberty by the King's grace. He was denied access to the Court. He was a ruined man, 'a very subject for fits,' as he says himself. For a man thus living under a cloud to have said, 'In my youth I wrote plays for the stage, I wrote them for money, I used Shakespere as a mask; I divided with him the money taken in at the gate of the play-houses from the scum and refuse of London,' would only have invited upon his head greater ignominy and disgrace . . . He sought to be the Aristotle of a new philosophy. Such an avowal would have smirched the *Novum Organum* and the *Advancement of Learning*." He had obtained all he wanted from the plays, and was done with them. Shakespeare had also obtained all *he* wanted from them, and was likewise done with them—*as "the immortal works" are not even mentioned in his will.* For this there was some excuse for Bacon, if he was the author of the plays, as he knew his fame with posterity was assured by means of his great philosophical treatises. There was no excuse for Shakespeare, if *he* was the author, in making absolutely no provision for the preservation of the foresaid "immortal works."

The reviewer instances Sir Walter Scott as one great author who chose to conceal his identity, but "he finally confessed." Very unwillingly, as we know—the secret had to be dragged from him, after several denials. And for what reason? What was his answer to his friend Morritt, when urged to declare himself the author of the novels? "I shall *not* own 'Waverly'; my chief reason is, that it would prevent me the pleasure of writing again . . . In truth I am not sure it would be considered quite decorous for me, as a Clerk of Session, to write novels." If with Scott and novel-writing—why not with Bacon and play-writing? Halliwell-Phillipps says that in Shakespeare's day "the vocation of a dramatic writer was considered scarcely respectable;" and Dr. Ingleby says actors were deemed "runaways and vagrants."

Our reviewer does not expend much argument on the statement that "Shakespeare's signatures are clearly the signatures of a man who had simply learnt to write his name." (In his will he actually spells his surname in two different ways.) Such an accusation was beneath the notice of a *Quarterly* reviewer, who insists upon the literal accuracy of Ben Jonson's statement that Shakespeare "never blotted out a line" of his manuscript. It is *this* which has "staggered the Baconians," who have studied the few extant autographs of Shakespeare—all that remains of the voluminous writings—and not one of them resembling its neighbour.

George Stronach, M.A.

"LINKS IN THE CHAIN."

Part VI.

IN April, 1895, we commenced, under the title of "*Links in the Chain*," a series of papers bearing upon similarities in the life, aim, and work, of Francis Bacon, and those of the friends, associates, and helpers, who as we believe, and confidently affirm to have been the many "Masks" behind which he concealed himself, the many "Engines" and "Instruments" by means of which his "Cabinet and Presses full" of MSS. were by degrees emptied, scattered abroad, and published.

We hoped that others would have acted in the spirit of Bacon's "Brethren" and "Sons of Science," lending a hand to the forging of these *Links*, which when industriously joined together will be found, as has been already said, "to connect Francis Bacon with everything, social, scientific, and literary, in the age of which he was the glory." To this it may be added that these *Links*, esteemed perhaps by some slight and valueless, will prove to be a means of revealing Francis Bacon not only as the Great Philosopher, Experimentalist, Dramatist and Poet, but further as the Greatest Theologian, Mystic, Antiquarian, and Historian; the Centre, Pivot or motive power of a Secret Society, *universal* alike in its aims and extent which should be as a Lever to lift Humanity from the abyss of ignorance and superstition into which it had sunk.

No such effort has been made, and once more we return to the anvil and do our little best with a hammer too heavy for a

weak arm. It may be remembered that we began by calling attention to the remarkable number of unusually gifted and learned boys, who (in days when learning was, according to Bacon, at a very low ebb) thought, wrote, things grave and gay, translations from the Classics, Plays, Poems, Discourses, etc., which were considered by *his* elders worthy of publication even when the author *himself* was but ten, twelve or fifteen years of age. The boys here enumerated were:—

Sir Philip Sydney	Richard Crashaw	Thomas Vaughan
Edmund Spenser	Michl. de Montaigne	Joseph Mede
Abraham Cowley	Sir John Suckling	D'Aubigny
Gaspar Barthius	John Heydon	George Wither
Sir Henry Wotton	Calderon de la Barca	

Part II. of the *Links* enumerated some of the Poets and poetical writers or wits who said of themselves and others that their fame should *live* in the *monuments* of their wit and learning, not in brass and marble, with statues and gilded epitaphs. These things very emphatically stated by Bacon, are repeated *by* and *of*:—

Shakespeare	Burton	The Earl of Northumberland
Ben Jonson	Casaubon	Pope
Sir. P. Sidney	J. Shirley	Cleveland
George Sandys	Donne	Butler
Michael Drayton	Florio	Lord Hundsdon
Du Bartas	Cowley	Lord Charles Howard
Sir T. Browne	Hooker	
Spenser	Boyle	
Sir T. Browne	Milton	

(Many other similar repetitions of the words of Bacon might be produced.)

Next we come to authors pronounced to be *the first*, *best*, and *rarest of their kind*, whose mind could not be painted without his own hand to guide the brush. Again appear the familiar names.

Sydney	Du Bartas	A. Cowley
Shakespeare	J. Fletcher	G. Lucy
Ben Jonson	Drummond of Hawthornden	Phillips
Ford	Thos. Sackville	Crashaw
Webster	Thos. Carew	Hooker
Donne	Ed. Spenser	Montaigne
R. Burton		

Having in Part IV. again reviewed the detached facts, analogies or coincidences concerning, the abnormal powers in childhood

and beardless youth of many of these supposed poets—the predictions that their works should be their living monuments—that each was the rarest of his kind, and their minds inexpressible in their portraits, we proceeded to consider the authors described as "concealed" and who wished "to keep state" in their affairs and writings for the future ages" and for "posterity" as Francis Bacon described himself as doing or desiring to do.

Here again we have in the list :—

Sidney	Ben Jonson to	R. Burton
Shakespeare	J. Selden and the	Robert Fludd
Cowley	Earl of Salisbury	

Next we reviewed the Tombs with ambiguous or paradoxical epitaphs, and "authors" whose burial places are unknown, or known only by tradition. Under these headings are included :

Anthony and Francis Bacon	S. Butler	Wither
	Edward Alleyn	G. Sandys
Sir P. Sydney	Marston	T. Hobbes
Ed. Spenser	Marlowe	Drayton
Beaumont	Massinger	R. Burton
Fletcher	Webster	Dryden
Shakespeare	J. Sandys	Baster
Ben Jonson	J. Mede	Montaigne
Cowley	G. Herbert	

We were able to show of several of these supposed Authors that very little is known—seldom even the dates of their birth and death (the list could now be considerably enlarged).

We passed on in the same paper to a notice of some of the Authors who are said (like Bacon and Shakespeare) to have "*surpassed Greece and Rome*," and again many of the same names appear on the list by various fresh Authors, and with the addition of the names of "the philologist," *Franciscus Junius*, "the Alchymist" or Rosicrucian," *Dr. John Dee*, and the "French Dramatist," *Molière.*

In the last paper published on these subjects a few further instances were added to the former, and we then pass on to the link which tells us in an infinite number of places the same that is stated in Ben Jonson's *Discoveries* of Bacon, and in the same writer's "*Underwoods*" of *Shakespeare*, namely that with the death of this poet, Art, Science, Wit and Wisdom alike fade and fail. We know now how this same sentiment is reached by thirty poets in the *Shades of Verulam*, memorial verses collected by Dr. Rawley. But the sentiment is not applied to

Bacon and Shakespeare alone. The same that Ben Jonson says of *them*, is equally applied to *himself* by Rutter, Feltham, and an anonymous writer. Cary also says the same of *John Donne.* Finally, with regard to the "speed," "celerity," and facility which Bacon had, according to Rawley, in a pre-eminent degree, we shall find if we look, that precisely the same is said of Cowley, of Barthius, of Molière, and (*by himself*) of Montaigne. A score of other instances will here also reward the industrious reader of old "*Lives*" and memorial verses. For the present we press on, and merge the subject speed and facility, with that of the "Versatility," which is our present theme.

Versatile writers who treated of many different subjects with extraordinary rapidity and facility.

SIR PHILIP SIDNEY.

"Some souls are of such narrow capacities, that they affoard onely stowage on receipt for one science, where as such *the ubiquitariness* of Sir *Philip*, that at the same time *it could attend All Arts*." (Life of Sir P. S., *Arcadia*, 1662.)

JASPER BARTHIUS.

"One of the most learned men and fertile pens of his age. He had a marvellous facility in making verses . . . he learnt the living languages, and by his translations from Spanish and Italian works, we see that he had not a superficial acquaintance with these languages. It is astonishing the number of authors which his *Adversaria* and his *Commentaries* bear witness to his having read . . . *He did not limit himself to profane Authors . . . but acquired a great acquaintance with ecclesiastical writers* . . . his work made so prodigious a mass that one has difficulty in conceiving how a single man sufficed for such things. "*In three days*," he says, "*I made a Latin translation of the first of the three books of the Iliad; which translation contained rather more than* 1,000 *verses, etc.*" (*See Bayle's Dictionary.*)

FRA PAOLO SARPI.

"He was supreme as a thinker, as a man of action, and as a transcript and pattern of every Christian principle. In the domain of astronomy Galileo called him 'my father and my master,' as a mathematician he said no man in Europe surpasses Master Paolo Sarpi in the science of mathematics. As an anatomist making invaluable discoveries such as that of the valves of the veins . . . the circulation of the blood, called by the famous surgeon of Padua (Acquapendente) 'the oracle of this

century.' Vieta and Robert Anderson sent him their books on algebra and geometry for revision. As a metaphysician, in his 'Art of Thinking well' he anticipated Locke in his 'Essay of the Human Understanding," and the same holds true in regard to some of the discoveries of Kepler . . . Modern Italian history is the outcome of the principles he laid down in his voluminous State Papers . . . It was he who gave to Professor Santorio of Padua the idea of *Animal statics. Optics* was another branch much advanced by him. *Heat and Light* were searched into by him . . . he divides with Galileo the honour of inventing the *Thermometer* . . . *Sound and Colour* he also treated of . . . *Reflection* and *Refraction* were investigated by him . . . In *Pneumatics* he made many interesting experiments . . . he gave to Torricelli the thoughts he developed in his book on 'Atmospheric Pressure.' *Hydrostatics*, too, received his careful investigation . . . of *Magnetism* Fra Paolo knew perhaps more than any one of his time . . . In *Mathematics* he knew no rival . . . wrote a valuable book entitled 'Recognition of Equations,' and in his 'Pensieri' notes of his studies on *Conic Sections. Jurisprudence* was another department of learning which he made his own. Other subjects that Fra Paolo studied were *Metaphysics and Chemistry* . . . *Architecture* . . . *Botany* . . . (he is said to have laid out the first Botanical garden in Padua) . . . In *Geology, Mineralogy, Animal and Vegetable Physiology*, and in *Herbs and Medicine* he was deeply read. He was a great *Mechanician*, all inventors brought their instruments and contrivances to him. Every one who consulted him went away satisfied, and feeling as if Fra Paolo had devoted his whole life to that one subject in which he himself happened to be interested; for there was no department of human knowledge about which he did not know everything that had been ascertained by others, and few to which he did not make substantial contributions." (*Fra Paolo Sarpi*, by Rev. A. Robertson.)

"Porta, Fabricius, Galileo, all confessed obligations to him. So Gilbert of Terrestrial Magnetism and Giambattista della Porta. It is possible that he foresaw the invention of the telescope. He wrote treatises on the Tides, Barometer, Projectiles and war engines of the Ancients . . . A Treatise on Algebra, etc., and infinite mechanical inventions . . . he studied Vivisection and accepted no conclusion which he could not verify by experiment."

JOSEPH MEDE, B.D.

His skill in Geography and History appeared betimes . . . He drew up a *Method of History* . . . a *Biblioteca Theologica*, and three *Epistolary Discourses* . . . Advices and Instructions about

the study of Theology, the Arts, and History, and a short book . . . (of notes) briefly observed out of the Ancients . . . He had an equal skill in the History of Nature, and Philosophy. . . (in some of his letters) he treated *De Motu Gravium et Levium*, as likewise touching the *Equality of Natural Motions*. . . . the *Nature of Comets* . . . quares about *Shooting or managing the Long-bow*; as also about the best *Methods of teaching the Deaf and Dumb* to cast accompts, with other *Mathematical Calculations* . . . and of the *Art of Writing*, and of *Civil Life and Conversation*.

For the Languages, particularly the Oriental . . . Hebrew especially, his knowledge herein was more than mean and ordinary, yea, such as showed him to be a man of rare perspicacity in the Genius and Proprieties of the Sacred Language . . . (He wrote the) *Clavis*, and *Commentationes Apocalypticæ*, and (amongst a large number of Posthumous papers) a Treatise of the *Doctrine of Dæmons*, and a number of *Diatribes* or *Discourses*, Collections out of the Egyptian Antiquities, Tracts, Advertisements, and other pieces. In a word, what is related in the Life of *Padre Paolo, the Oracle of Venice* . . . was a happy *conjunction* of those excellencies which rarely meet in one and the same subject.* Knowledge and Humility; Prudence and Meekness; Retiredness and Officiousness; Learning and Pleasantness Brevity and Clearness; Sweetness and Solidity.

(*The Works of Joseph Mede, Vol. II., Gen. Preface*).

COWLEY.

"He *cyphered and decyphered* with his own hand, the greater part of the letters which passed between their Majesties. . . He had nearly beheld the splendour of the highest part of Mankind. . . The variety of arguments that he has managed is so large that *there is scarce any particular of all the passions of Men, or Works of Nature or Providence, which he has passed by undescribed*. . . The subject of his *Davideis* was truly Divine, the matter of his own invention, with *all the Treasures of Knowledge and History in the Bible*. The Model of it comprehended *all the Learning of the East*. . . In all other matters *his wit excelled most other men's*. . . In his Latin poems he expressed to admiration *all the numbers of Verse, and Figures of Poesie that are scattered up and down amongst the ancients* . . . (*a thing*) *never yet performed by any single poet of the Ancient Romans themselves*. . . He applied himself to *the Study of Physick*, made many *Anatomical Dissertations* . . . and proceeded to *the consideration*

* "Those abilities which commonly go single in other men, though of prime and observable parts, were all *conjoined* and met in him."
Dr. Rawley's "*Life of Bacon*."

of Simples . . . he speedily mastered that part of *the Art of Medicine*, and presently digested it into the form of . . . two Books of Herbs . . . the Third and Fourth Discourses were of *Flowers* . . . the last two, of *Trees*.

In his speech, neither the Pleasantness excluded Gravity, nor the sobriety, delight. No man parted willingly with his Discourse. . . His wit was so tempered that no one had ever reason to wish it less.

His Learning was large and profound, well composed of all ancient and modern knowledge. He was accomplished with all manner of abilities for the greater business. He always professed that he went out of the World as it was Man's, and into the same world, as it was Nature's and God's. *The whole compass of the Creation, and all the wonderful effects of the Divine Wisdom were the constant prospect of his senses and his thoughts. . . This labour about Natural Science was the perpetual and interrupted task of the obscure portion of his life. . .* He had an earnest intention of taking *a Review of the original Principles of the Primitive Church," etc.*

Is it possible that anyone acquainted with the *contemporary* descriptions of Francis Bacon, with his own statement of his aims and aspirations, and with the scheme which he drew out and more or less carried out—is it, we repeat, possible that anyone who has truly studied his life and work, should fail to see the reflection of his portrait in such "*feigned histories*" as those of which a few examples have been given?

Further research, since the publication of previous papers on this topic, strengthens conviction that, in *one or other* of the various editions of works by "feigned poets" and other authors who were in effect, mere masks for Bacon—such Links as those already collected will be found, though not all are introduced into the same volume, at the same time.

As yet the Links may seem few—the workman is but little encouraged to hammer at them. Let others take a turn at the anvil, and courage, good friends! "Things done with care exempt themselves from fear," and when our chain of "Instances strong as Pluto's gates" shall be complete, we are confident that most of those who read these pages will confess that with them, "*the end was unknown to the beginning.*"

SKETCHES OF FRANCIS BACON'S CHARACTER AND GENIUS.

Compared with the Character and Genius of Shakespeare, as represented by the most eminent critics.

THE following slight sketches of Francis Bacon's character and genius, are simply collated from the works of eminent biographers, or from contemporaneous descriptions of him, given by some of those who knew and loved him best. Surely even those who cannot bring themselves to accept him as the author of the plays, will, after reading such extracts as the following, concede at least so much as this: that the character and genius of Francis Bacon corresponded in almost every particular with the various attributes with which admirers of Shakespeare have endowed that "ideal man," from the internal evidence which the plays afford of their author's character.*

In boyhood, we read, Francis Bacon was sprightly and intelligent beyond his years. Attention seems to have been drawn to him on account of his displaying the same precosity and brightness which Gloucester observes in the little prattling Duke of York. "O 'tis a parlous boy, bold, quick, ingenious, capable; he is the mother's from the top to toe." The Queen, who was taken with the smartness of his answers, used to try him with questions on various subjects, and it is said that, once, when she asked him how old he was, his reply was ingeniously complimentary:—"I am just two years younger than your Majesty's happy reign."

Having a father distinguished as a lawyer and statesman, and a mother of universal abilities, he was, from the first, placed in a most favourable position for forming a learned and brilliant character. His success in life was to depend upon favour at Court, and this, joined to the fact that his mother, whom he highly respected, was a strict Puritan, must have had a great effect in forming his political and religious views.

"With such antecedents, we may presume that the first breath of Bacon's public life was drawn in a very contagious atmosphere of loyalty and anti-popery." † This bias is traceable throughout his speeches and writings, where he never loses an opportunity of upholding the King's Prerogative and the Divine

* Mr. Spedding freely admitted this to the present writer: "There can be no doubt," he said, "that Bacon possessed every qualification for writing the plays *if he had chosen to do so*."

† "Life and Letters," Spedding, Vol. I.

Right of Kings—nor of remonstrating against "Popish Superstition" and the "Trash of Rome."

But his brilliant life had its drawbacks—first in ill-health, of which there are indications, from the time of his residence at Cambridge, when we learn that there were frequent payments to the "*pothigarie*" in Whitgift's accounts, until his latter years when he wrote for himself a collection of prescriptions or "medical recipes," which seem to point out dyspepsia (with melancholy and depression as its attendants), and latterly gout, as his chief sources of ill-health.

It will be seen in the chapter on the "Doctrine of the Human Body," how the depression of spirits, and "moodiness," which Bacon ascribes to indigestion, produced by unquiet meals and a harassed mind, are traced by the Abbess in the *Comedy of Errors*, to precisely the same causes, and how, too, the nervous affections and the want of sleep are similarly connected and remarked upon in many passages in the plays. It is hard to doubt that those descriptions of the body out of tune, were written by one who had himself experienced the symptoms so minutely recorded.

In Bacon's "Private Memoranda," he says, "I have found now twice upon amendment of my fortune, disposition to melancholy, and distaste, especially the same happening against the long vacation, when company failed and business both ; for upon my solicitor's place, I grew indisposed and inclined to superstition. Now upon Mill's place, I find a relapse into my old symptom, as I was wont to have it many years ago, as after sleeps, strife at meats, strangeness, clouds, etc." Elsewhere he speaks of "strangeness and cloudyness," of "Melancholia coelestem," etc.*

Do not these words depict the very state of health, which, working upon a highly imaginative and thoughtful disposition, would tend to the production of such works as the tragedies of Shakespeare ?

"When the temperament is quick and sensitive, the desire of knowledge strong and the faculties so vigorous, obedient, and equally developed, that they find almost all things easy, the mind will commonly fasten on the first object of interest with the ardour of a first love," and this observation which is introduced in tracing the source of the great impulses which began to work in Bacon almost from boyhood, applies, equally to the manner in which the plays were written, and the subjects of them suggested to his imagination. His mind seems to have fastened upon the chief thing which attracted his attention at the time, and in

* See Spedding's "Letters and Life," IV., pp. 28-30.

working up his ideas into poetical poems, he wove in with them the subjects of study which were at the time prominent in his mind.

This does not seem to be a fitting place for a comparison of the plays as a whole with events in Bacon's life, or with subjects of study which occupied his mind whilst touching upon the historical plays at different periods. Such a comparison will be attempted in another place. Meanwhile, it should be borne in mind, whilst touching upon the historical plays, that, in the *Advancement of Learning*, Bacon advocates the encouragement of theatrical representations, and of plays, as a means for inculcating morals and politics and for teaching history. Unless he were himself the author of the series of historical plays then appearing at the Bankside Theatre (and we know that he was devoted to stage representations), it seems more than strange that he should not mention Shakespeare, who would have appeared to him the very incarnation of all that he desired to see achieved in this direction.

There are few persons with whom a desire for knowledge is strong, and who believe that they are possessed of certain knowledge which is for the most part lacking to others—there are few such, excepting the most selfish of beings, who do not feel driven or constrained as it were, to impart to others truths which they believe to be beneficial. Now in *Bacon's* days, let us remember, there were no newspapers, no magazines, no cheap literature, or other means by which any new idea, or ridicule of any old idea, could be brought within the reach of the million. But there *was* one powerful engine for moving the popular mind—the stage. Bacon knew that, he speaks of it many times in his prose works—is it not probable, is it not more in accordance with his character that he should have employed this engine than that he should not? For when and where do we find him advocating as desirable, a thing that he has taken no pains to help forward in a practical manner? It seems, then, to the present writer that it was not solely for "recreation" that Bacon wrote these plays—but that by their means he desired to ventilate many questions which would not have so readily been listened to if put forward in any other way, and to ridicule absurdities of speech, dress and behaviour without hurting the feelings of any. For, as he quotes in his "Promus" from Horace's 1st Satire, "What prevents one from speaking truth with a laughing face;" and again, "Ridicule often decides matters of importance more effectually, and in a better manner than bitterness of speech or keen sarcasm."

To return to the personal character of Bacon, it seems well

to present in contrast to the erroneous opinions which have been impressed upon the popular mind with regard to him—especially as a *young* man, for that chiefly concerns the question now in hand—a few extracts from the writings of his contemporaries and friends, the first being Sir Tobie Matthew, whom Bacon calls his "kind inquisitor." A close college friendship grew up between the two men, and a literary correspondence was maintained between them throughout their lives. No one could be a more competent judge of Bacon's character and powers than Sir Tobie, and this is what he says in his preface to a collection of letters of which there will be occasion to speak by-and-by more at length.

"We have also rare compositions of minds amongst us, which look so many fair ways at once, that I doubt it will go near to pose any other nation of Europe to muster out in any age four men who, in so many respects, shall excel four such as we are able to show—Cardinal Wolsey, Sir Thomas More, Sir Philip Sidney, and Sir Francis Bacon; for they were all a kind of monsters in their several ways. . . The fourth was a creature of incomparable abilities of mind, of a sharp and catching apprehension, large and faithful memory, plentiful and sprouting invention, deep and solid judgment, for as much as might concern the understanding part: a man so rare in knowledge, of so many several kinds, indued with the facility and felicity of expressing it all, in so elegant, significant, so abundant and yet so choice and ravishing a way of words, of metaphors, and allusions, as perhaps the world has not seen since it was a world.

"I know this may seem a great hyperpole and strange kind of riotous excess of speech; but the best means of putting me to shame will be for you to place any man of yours by this of mine. And, in the meantime, even this little makes a shift to show that the Genius of England is still not only eminent, but predominant, for the assembling great variety of those rare parts, in some single man, which used to be incompatible anywhere else."

Address to the Reader—Preface to a Collection of Letters made by Sir Tobie Matthew, Kt., Pub. London, 1660.

This writer is the same who added to a letter on business matters this famous though mysterious postscript—

"P.S.—The most prodigious wit that ever I knew of my nation, and of this side of the sea, is of your Lordship's name, *though he be known by another.*"

It may be thought that the testimony of so great a personal friend as Sir Tobie Matthew proved himself to be, is too favourable

to be entirely trustworthy, but here is the opinion of one, Francis Osborne, a contemporary, but apparently not an intimate acquaintance of Bacon's. He is describing the points of character which are most patent to the ordinary observer.*

"My memory neither doth (nor I believe possibly ever can) direct me to an example more splendid in this kind than the Lord Bacon, Earl of St. Albans, who in all companies did appear a good proficient, if not a master, in those arts entertained for the subject of every one's discourse. So as I dare maintain, without the least affectation of flattery or hyperbole, that his most casual talk deserveth to be written, as I have been told his first or foulest copies required no great labour to render them competent for the nicest judgments; high perfection attainable only by use and treating with every man in his respective profession, and which he was most versed in.

"So as I have heard him entertain a country lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and dogs, and at another time outcant a London chirurgeon. Thus he did not only learn himself, but gratify such as taught him, who looked upon their calling as honoured by his notice. Nor did an easy falling into arguments (not unjustly taken for a blemish in the most) appear less than an ornament in him; the ears of his hearers receiving more gratification than trouble; and no less sorry when he came to conclude, than displeased with any that did interrupt him. Now the general knowledge that he had in all things, husbanded by his wit and dignified with so majestical a carriage he was known to own, struck such an awful reverence in those he questioned, that they durst not conceal the most intrinsic part of their mysteries from him, for fear of appearing ignorant or saucy. All which rendered him no less necessary than admirable at the council table, when, in reference to impositions, monopolies, etc., the meanest manufactures were an usual argument; and, as I have heard, he did in this, baffle the Earl of Middlesex, who was born and bred a citizen, etc. Yet without any great (if at all) interrupting his abler studies, as is not hard to be imagined of a quick apprehension, in which he was admirable."

It will be observed that the evidence of this witness completely discredits the opinion that Bacon was "destitute of human sympathies." On the contrary, it shows him to have been more than commonly endowed with such human sensibilities, and to have possessed in an extraordinary degree the power of throwing himself into the interests and pursuits of others, a power which is as charming as it is rarely to be met with. No selfish person,

* Quoted by Mr. W. H. Smith, in his "Bacon and Shakespeare."

nor one who talks simply for the sake of display, ever has the faculty of drawing out the minds of others, and of delighting his hearers whilst gaining knowledge himself, as Francis Bacon did.

The evidence of Sir Walter Raleigh is of the same kind as Sir Tobie Matthew's. He says that Bacon "combined the most rare gifts; for while Cecil could talk and not write, Howard write and not talk, *he alone* could both talk and write."

But the most striking evidence in favour not only of Bacon's genius as a writer and speaker, but of his personal graces, his winning manner, and the magnanimity and true greatness of his character, is supplied by Ben Jonson, who as his scribe, translator and frequent attendant, had excellent means of forming a judgment.

Amongst Ben Jonson's unpublished papers were found some which he entitles "Sylva," "Timber; or, Discoveries made upon Men and Matter, as they have flowed out of his daily readings, or had their reflux to his peculiar notion of the Times." Upon this work, we are told by his biographer, he probably continued to write while he could hold a pen.* The title was probably suggested by the "Sylva Sylvarum" of Bacon, and the sentiments and expressions which are contained in its paragraphs are often mere reflections of the teachings of that "Great Master" whom Ben Jonson names not only as "the mark and ἀκμή of our language," but as "one of the greatest men, and most worthy of admiration, that hath been in many ages."†

For the sake of those who do not possess a complete edition of Ben Jonson's works, the following passages (being all that concern Bacon), are extracted from Ben Jonson's "Discoveries." After a series of paragraphs on the difference of wits in men, of ignorance, knowledge, ease and relaxation, studies, men eminent in style and oratory, etc., we come to the following: "*Dominus Verulamius.* One, though he be excellent and the chief, is not to be imitated alone: for no imitator ever grew up to his author; likeness is always on this side truth. Yet there happened in my time one noble speaker who was full of gravity in his speaking. His language (*where he could spare or pass by a jest*), was nobly censorius. No man ever spake more neatly, more pressly, more weightily, or suffered less emptiness, less idleness, in what he uttered. *No member of his speech but consisted of his own graces.* His hearers could not cough nor look aside

* The works of Ben Jonson, with a Memoir by W. Gifford. London, 1838, p. 749. Ben Jonson died in 1637, so that the Eulogy of Bacon which follows was written some ten years after the death of Bacon.

† *Ib.*

from him without loss. He commanded where he spoke, and had his judges angry and pleased at his devotion. No man had their affections more in his power. The fear of every man that heard him was lest he should make an end."

"*Scriptorum Catalogus.**—Cicero is said to be the only wit that the people of Rome had equalled to their empire. *Ingenium par imperio.* We have had many, and in their several ages (to take in but the former *seculum*) Sir Thos. Moore, the elder Wyatt, Henry, Earl of Surrey, Chaloner, Smith, Eliot, B. Gardiner, were for their times admirable; and the more, because they began eloquence with us. Sir Nicholas Bacon was singular, and almost alone, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's time. Sir Philip Sidney and Mr. Hooker (in different matter) grew great masters of wit and language, and in whom all vigour of invention and strength of judgment met. The Earl of Essex, noble and high, and Sir Walter Raleigh, not to be contemned, either for judgment or style. Sir Henry Savile, grave and truly lettered; Sir Edwin Sandys, excellent in both; Lord Egerton the chancellor, a grave and great orator, and best when he was provoked. But his learned and able (though unfortunate) successor, is he who hath filled up all numbers, and performed that in our tongue, which may be compared or preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome. In short, within his view, and about his times, were all the wits born that could honour a language or help study. Now things daily fall, wits grow downward, and eloquence grows backward: so that he may be named, and stand as the mark and ἀκμη of our language."

"*De augmentis scientarum.—Julius Cæsar.—Lord St. Alban.*—I have ever observed it to have been the office of a wise patriot, amongst the greatest affairs of the State, to take care of the commonwealth of learning. For schools, they are the seminaries of State; and nothing is worthier the study of a statesman, than that part of the Republic which we call the advancement of letters. Witness the case of Julius Cæsar, who in the heat of the Civil War, writ his books of Analogy, and dedicated them to Tully. This made the late Lord St. Alban entitle his work the *Novum Organum:* which though by the most superficial of men, who cannot get beyond the title of nominals, it is not penetrated,

* Sir Thomas Moore. Sir Thomas Wyatt. Henry, Earl of Surrey. Sir Thomas Chaloner. Sir Thomas Smith. Sir Thomas Eliot. Bishop Gardiner. Sir Nicholas Bacon, L.K. Sir Philip Sidney. Dr. Richard Hooker. Robert, Earl of Essex. Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Henry Savile, Sir Edwin Sandys, Sir Thomas Egerton, L.C., and Sir Francis Bacon, "who filled up all numbers, and who stands as the acmé of our language."—But where is Shakespeare?

nor understood, it really openeth all defects of learning whatsoever, and is a book

Qui longum noto scriptori proroget ævum.

My conceit of his person was never increased toward him by his place or honours; but I have and do reverence him, for the greatness that was only proper to himself, in that he seemed to me ever, by his work, one of the greatest men, and most worthy of admiration that had been in many ages. In his adversity I ever prayed that God would give him strength, for greatness he could not want. Neither could I condole in a word or syllable for him, as knowing no accident could do harm to virtue, but rather help to make it manifest."

"*De Corruptela Morum.*—There cannot be one colour of the mind, another of the wit."

There exists a short memoir of Bacon, which was drawn up by Dr. Rawley in 1657, and prefixed to the *Resuscitatio*, which Mr. Spedding considered to be (next to Bacon's own writings) the most important and authentic evidence concerning him that we possess.* In this memoir Rawley says: "There is a commemoration due as well to his abilities and virtues as to the course of his life. Those abilities which commonly go single in other men, though of prime and observable parts, were all conjoined and met in him. Those are *sharpness of wit, memory, judgment,* and *elocution.* In the former three his books do abundantly speak them, which † with what sufficiency he wrote, let the world judge; but *with what celerity he wrote them*, I can best testify." Rawley then repeats Sir W. Raleigh's saying regarding Bacon's elocution, and continues:—"I have been induced to think, that if there were a beam of knowledge derived from God upon any man in these modern times, it was upon him. For though he was a great reader of books, yet he had not his knowledge from books, but from some grounds and notions from within himself; which, notwithstanding, he vented with great caution and circumspection. . . . I myself have seen at the least twelve copies of the *Instauration*, revised year by year one after another, and every year altered and amended in

* Sped. Works, Vol. I. p. 9-10. Dr. Rawley was an early friend of Bacon. "It was in special compliment to Bacon that he was presented on the 18th of January, 1616-17 (being then 28 years old) to the rectory of Landbeach, a living in the gift of Benet's College, Cambridge. Shortly after, Bacon becoming Lord Keeper, selected him for his chaplain, and during the last five years of his life, employed him constantly as a kind of literary secretary."

† The Latin version adds *ut de Julio Cæsare Hirtius.* Sped. Works, Vol. I. p. 10.

the frame thereof, till at last it came to that model in which it was committed to the press, as many living creatures do lick their young ones, till they bring them to their strength of limbs.

"In the composing of his books he did rather drive at a masculine and clear expression than at any fineness or affectation of phrases, and would often ask if the meaning were expressed plainly enough, as being one that accounted words to be but subservient or ministerial to matter, and not the principal. And if his style were polite, it was because he would do no otherwise. Neither was he given to any light conceits, or descanting upon words, but did ever purposely and industriously avoid them, for he held such things to be but digressions or diversions from the scope intended, and to derogate from the weight and dignity of the style.

"He was no plodder upon books; though he read much, and that with great judgment and rejection."

BACON, THE PAINTER POET.

Critics and anti-Baconians may be very well imagined asking for some sort of direct, unequivocal evidence, as to the authorship of the poems and plays attributed to Shakespeare. They may be imagined contending, that the universality of the plays is such, that anything in the way of parallels may be discovered in them, particularly in the case where two such encyclopædic literatures as the plays and Bacon's Instauration are collated. We can conceive one of these critics to be exclaiming:—"You show us a great deal of what you presume is Lord Bacon's in the plays, by means of ingenious parallels, but can you point to any line or passage, directly taken from the poems or plays and applied to Bacon by a third person, or independent witness? In the last case, *the evidence or testimony of any author of repute who lived near or about Bacon's age, would be of great value,* seeing such a witness cannot be classed with modern theorists, and whatever weight there may be in the evidence, must be attributed, not to ingenuity, or original discovery, of a theoretical kind, *but to a known or traditional oral fact of authorship.*"

We accept this challenge. Everybody has heard of the comparison of Francis Bacon to Moses, standing upon Mount Pisgah, and contemplating therefrom the Promised Land, as typical of all that Bacon foresaw and anticipated (but could not himself

attain to), from the results of his inductive system in the future. It is perhaps a metaphor more quoted in connection with Bacon than any other, and it was first introduced by Abraham Cowley, in a poem dedicated to Bacon, and addressed to the Royal Society during the seventeenth century. Archbishop Tenison has thought fit to republish it in his "Remains of the Lord Verulam," entitled "BACONIANA," and published 1679. The poem may be found printed as a conclusion to the volume, upon pages 267, 268, 269, 270. We quote the fourth verse only:—

From Words, which are but Pictures of the Thought,
(Though we our Thoughts from them perversely drew)
To Things, the Mind's right Object, he it brought,
Like foolish Birds to painted Grapes we flew;
He fought and gather'd for our use the true;
And when, on heaps, the chosen Bunches lay,
He pressed them wisely the Mechanic way,
'Till all their Juice did, in one Vessel join,
Ferment into a nourishment Divine,
The thirsty Soul's refreshing Wine.
Who to the Life an exact Piece would make,
Must not from others Work a Copy take;
No, not from *Reubens*, or *Vandike;*
Much less content himself to make it like
Th' Ideas, and the Images which lie
In his own Fancy, or his Memory.
No, He, before his fight, must place
The natural and living Face;
The real Object must command
Each judgment of his Eye, and motion of his Hand.

Before we proceed to comment upon this poem, we would first prepare the mind of the reader by a few preliminary remarks, taken from the life of Lord Bacon, written by his faithful friend and devoted secretary, William Rawley, to whose pen we owe almost everything of value as to Lord Bacon's life. In an *Epistle to the Reader,* prefixed to the "Resuscitatio" (and other of Bacon's works), Rawley, in alluding to Bacon's *Collection of the Felicities of Queen Elizabeth,* says: "I was induced many years ago to put the same into the English tongue; not *adverbum,* for that had been but flat and injudicious; but (as far as my slender ability could reach) according to the expressions which I conceived his Lordship would have rendered it in, if he had written the same in English. Yet ever acknowledging *that Zeuxis' or Apelles' pencil could not be attained but by Zeuxis or Apelles himself*" (*Resuscitatio,* "Epistle to Reader," 1661).

It is to these last words we would call attention, Bacon being compared to two of the *greatest artists and painters* of classical antiquity—Zeuxis and Apelles! Presently we shall be able to point out the value of this extraordinary parallel; meanwhile I may be allowed to say that painting and poetry constitute what might be termed twinned arts. In all ages they have been allied, and an old Latin epigram expresses this close art relationship by the words, applied to a good picture:

Falsa veritas, et muta poesis,

which signifies that an excellent picture, or painting, is *a false truth, a dumb poem.* A very happy example of the art of painting introduced and brought in, as it were, to assist poetry, is to be found in the poem of Lucrece, where we are presented with a painting of the Siege of Troy. The description of Sinon, the Phrygian Shepheard, bound and brought before the Trojans, is singularly striking, when delivered through the comments of Lucrece. It is interesting, because Bacon has borrowed the character of Sinon as an ideal of deceitful, or *coloured craft,* with which to fittingly introduce his *Colours of Good and Evil.**

* In him the *painter* laboured with his skill
To hide deceit, and give the harmless show
An humble gait, calm looks, eyes waiting still,
A brow unbent, that seem'd to welcome woe,
Cheeks neither red nor pale, but mingled so
That blushing red no guilty instance gave,
Nor ashy pale the fear that false hearts have.

But like a constant and confirmed devil,
He entertained a show so seeming just,
And therein so ensconced his secret evil,
That jealousy itself could not mistrust
False creeping craft and perjury should thrust
Into so bright a day such black-faced storms,
Or blot with hell-born sin such saint-like forms.

This *picture* she advisedly perused,
And chid the *painter* for his wondrous skill,
Saying, some shape in Sinon's was abused;
So fair a form lodged not a mind so ill.
And still on him she gazed, and gazing still,
Such signs of truth in his plain face she spied,
That she concludes the *picture* was belied.—*Lucrece*, 1506–1533.

It is this character which so struck Francis Bacon's imagination that he presents him to us, just as he is presented here, as the Phrygian Shepheard, bound before the Trojans, and concluding his speech with those wonderful words (Bacon quotes) which saved his life:

Hoc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atridæ.

It is with this line Bacon introduces his key for his crafty characters, such as Cæsar, Richard the Third, etc., and whatever else sails under false colours, i.e., his *Colours of Good and Evil.*

In this poem of Abraham Cowley's, quoted it will be noticed how he also compares Bacon to two great painters—*Rubens and Vandike.* The object of this article, and indeed, a discovery of some importance, which we wish to draw attention to, is to found in this fourth verse of Cowley's poem, and particularly in the lines:

E'en as poor birds deceived with painted grapes,
Do surfeit by the eye, and pine the maw,
(*Venus and Adonis*, 601),

taken from the poem of *Venus and Adonis.* If the reader will collate these lines with the fourth line of verse four of Cowley's poem to Bacon, he will find them identical—

Like foolish birds to painted grapes we flew.

But there is yet a far more important point to register. The two lines from *Venus and Adonis* are universally understood and allowed to be, an allusion or reference, to the art of the celebrated Græcian painter Zeuxis, *who imitated some grapes so admirably that the birds pecked at them thinking them real!* Now the reader will perceive for himself the importance of Rawley's comparison of Bacon to Zeuxis; indeed, we may certainly assume, from the evidence, that both Rawley and Cowley, *purposely and with full inspiration of knowledge entered the parallel?* As critics are certain to dispute this assertion, let us draw attention to a few points of importance. Observe how Cowley, in the same verse of his poem where these lines occur, compares Bacon to *Rubens*, who of all modern painters in the world, is the one whose style, both of subject and coloring, nearest approaches the style and subject of the poem of *Venus and Adonis!* Cowley evidently was quite aware of the connection of Zeuxis with the story he cites from *Venus and Adonis*, for thinking of the art of Zeuxis (through the episode described), he immediately introduces *another painter* (Rubens) as a hint for the authorship of the poem from which he quotes. Rawley also knew, because his comparison of Bacon to Apelles is pregnant with the same fact. Apelles is celebrated as a painter of the VENUS rising from the sea, and lived at the time of Alexander the Great, who gave him Camcaspe as wife, with whom the painter had fallen in love after painting her. It is important to point out how Bacon, in his essay upon Beauty, mentions Apelles, whose VENUS, he observes, was the result of "*taking the best part out of divers faces to make one excellent*" ("Beauty"). Cicero mentions the story at the beginning of his work *De Inventione*, how Zeuxis took the most beautiful features and members of several beautiful women, to make a more beautiful one than any in his *Helen.* Bacon

writes: "That is the best part of beauty *which a picture cannot express*; no, nor the first sight of the life. There is no excellent beauty that hath not some strangeness in the proportions. A man cannot tell whether *Apelles* or *Albert Durer* were the more trifler. Whereof the one would make a personage by geometrical proportions, the other by taking the best parts out of divers faces to make an excellent. Such effigies, or images, I think, would please nobody." (*Essay*, "Beauty," 1625.) It was evidently the *Venus of Apelles* Bacon was thinking of, for in his proposal of a grammar of languages (anticipating modern comparative philology) he says: "But without question that would be a most excellent grammar (as we suppose), if some man thoroughly instructed in many languages, as well learned, as mother tongues, should write a treatise of the diverse properties of languages, showing in what points every particular language did excel; and in what points it was deficient. For so tongues might be enriched and perfected by mutual intertraffic one with another, *and a most fair image of speech—(like the Venus of Apelles)*;—and a goodly pattern for the true expression of the inward sense of the mind might be drawn from every part which is excellent in every language" (p. 261, Liber vi. *Advancement of Learning*.) Anyone who knows the paintings of Peter Paul Rubens will in a moment seize the profound hint Cowley presents, comparing Bacon to this master, in swift sequence of connotation with, an unmistakable extract from the poem of *Venus and Adonis*. Rubens is best known for his full-bodied, round-limbed females of the Venus type. Mr. R. A. M. Stevenson, in his recent Portfolio Monograph upon Rubens, remarks:—"In the imagined world of art you may allow Rubens to open the door upon a bevy of rich beauties that offer to the flood of warm light, succulent forms, ample shapes, curved, colored and creamy surfaces." Almost all the female beauties of Rubens, in the nude (or partial nude), are ideal Venuses, whose charms are more fleshly than spiritual; and nobody can doubt that Rubens, if he did not paint the subject of Venus and Adonis, could have certainly done it ample justice! The temptress of Adonis, with all her self-described charms, is to be seen upon many a canvas bearing the name of Rubens.

With regard to Vandike, the allusion is not less happy. For Vandike was the prince of *portrait painters*, and what is dramatic art of the historic sort, but *portrait painting?* Bacon writes:—"Civil History is of three kinds, not unfitly to be compared to the *three sort of pictures or images*" (page 91, *Advancement of Learning*, 1640).

This is an excellent comparison, though Bacon does not define,

or enumerate these three classes; but it is certain *Civil History* must most closely approximate to the *images* presented by *portrait painting*, seeing history, particularly *Chronicle, or historical plays*, are chiefly composed of the *portraits* of Kings, Queens, Ministers, Soldiers, and great personages; whose characters are copied from other histories, registers, memorials, and archives. Indeed what are the *images*, presented in the plays, of such characters as King John, Richard the Second, Henry the Fourth, Henry the Fifth and Henry the Sixth, Richard the Third, Henry the Eighth, Cardinal Wolsey, and all the well-known *dramatis personæ* of these Chronicle plays, if they are not exquisite miniature paintings, or portraits, expressing the life and spirit of those they represent, and mimic in action?—Vandike is celebrated for the *spirit and life* expressed in the likenesses of his portraits. His art answers very closely in subtle depth, to what Bacon describes, as—"furnishing, the best part of beauty which a picture cannot express"—a seeming paradox (or Irishism), but which is *something* which we discover either by study, or instinct, later on! It is the spirit or life—the mind of the artist, latent behind his work, the ideal soul, or excellence, Bacon indicates in his Essay upon Beauty.

Very remarkable is the way, Bacon connotes the art of *painting* with the art of the theatre (or *mimetic art*), as follows:—"Nothing is more variable than *men's faces and countenances*; yet the *memory* retains the infinite distinctions of them. Nay a *painter with a few shells of colours*, the benefit of his eye, the habit of his *imagination*, and the steadiness of his hand, can imitate and draw with his pencil, all *faces** that are, have been, or ever shall be, if they were brought before him.

"Nothing more variable than *man's voice*; yet we can easily discern their differences in every particular person, nay you shall have a *Buffoon*, or *Pantomimus* will render and express to the life, as many as he pleaseth." (Chap. II. Book VI., p. 189, *Advancement of Learning*, 1640). The reader will note the immediate sequence of thought expressed in this treading of the theatre on the heels of the painter's art? When Bacon confines himself to *portrait painting* (without mentioning landscape) it is impossible to forego the conviction, he is thinking of his own dramatic art, particularly since he introduces *memory* and *imagination* (in this description of painting), which constitute two of the fundamental divisions of his Instauration, answering to *history* and *poesy*. Bacon writes:—"That is the truest partition of human

* Compare this, said of Don Adriano de Armado:—
He's a God or a painter, for he makes faces. (*Love's Labour Lost* V. ii.)

learning, which have reference to the three faculties of man's soul, which is the seat of learning. *History* is referred to *memory*, *Poesy* to the *imagination*, Philosophy to reason." (Cap. I. Liber II. p. 77, *Advancement of Learning*.)

"*Poesy*, in that sense we have expounded it, *is likewise of individuals*, fancied to the similitude of those things which in true history are recorded. Poesy composeth and introduceth *as painting doth*." (*Ib.*)

Observe how entirely this definition applies to *dramatic poesy*. Why does Bacon confine this definition *to individuals ?* Is there no such thing as lyric and descriptive poetry, in which individuals play a minor part? But to return to our first subject, observe how the *men's faces*, or painter's portraits, presently change into the *man's voice* or *pantomimic*. Indeed, what is the dramatic art but a *species* of imaginative poetic painting of men's faces or characters? What again is the Buffoon or Pantomimus, but the actor, with his histrionic art of mimicry? It is the voice which constitutes with gestures the actor's art, and it is the actor who utters or acts with his voice and mimicry just those portraits of men's faces the poet has painted. Bacon is simply indicating author and actor—the one the copier of characters and faces, the other the Pantomimus, or universal mimicry of the theatre in action.

In chapter four, of the first book, of the *Advancement of Learning* ("De Augmentis"), we find Bacon treating of the three "*distempers of Learning from Learned men's studies*,"—which he divides into *Phantastical Learning*, *Contentious Learning*, and *Delicate Learning*. Bacon writes: "I find, therefore, chiefly three vanities and vacuities, in Learning, which have given occasion to the reproach and disgrace thereof. For those things are esteemed *vain* which are either *false*, or *frivolous ;* namely, wherein there is, either no truth, or no use; *those persons* we esteem vain, which are either credulous in things false, or *curious* in things of little use. And *curiosity* is either in *matter* or in *words ;* that is when either labour is spent *in vain matters, or time is wasted in the delicacy of fine words*. So that it is agreeable as well to true reason as approved experience, to set down three distempers of Learning. The first is *phantastical Learning ;* the second, *contentious Learning ;* the third, *painted, or delicate Learning :* or thus—*vain imaginations—vain altercations—vain affectations*. And with the last I will begin. This Distemper, seated in the superfluity and profuseness of speech, about Luther's time, got up mightily into credit and estimation. The heat and efficacy of preaching, to win and draw on the people, began chiefly about that time to flourish; and this

required a popular kind of expression, and so it came to pass a little after, *that a greater care was taken for words than matter;* and many affected rather comptness of style; a round and clean period; the sweet falling of the clauses; and illustrations by Tropes and figures; than the weight of matter, soundness of argument, life of invention, or depth of judgement. Then sprang up the flowing and watery vein of *Osorius*, the Portuguese Bishop, to be in price and request. Then did *Sturmius* spend such infinite and curious pains upon *Cicero* the orator, and Hermogines the rhetorician. Then did our *Carr* and Ascham, in their lectures and writings almost deify *Cicero* and Demosthenes. In sum, the whole inclination and bent of those times was rather upon copy than weight. Here we see the first distemper of Learning, when, as we have said, *men study words, and not matter.*"

"But yet, notwithstanding, it is a thing not hastily to be condemned to illustrate and polish the obscurity and roughness of philosophy, with the splendour of words and sensible elocution. For, hereof, we have great examples in *Xenophon*, *Cicero*, *Seneca*, *Plutarch*, and even in Plato himself, and the use hereof is great. But the excess of this is so justly contemptible, that, *as Hercules, when he saw the image of Adonis, Venus' minion, in the Temple, said Nil Sacri es*, so there is none of Hercules followers in Learning, I mean, the more industrious and severe inquirers into Truth, but will despise those *delicacies and affectations*, as indeed capable of no divineness," (pages 27-28, chapter iv., Lib. i., *Advancement of Learning*, 1640).

It will be observed, that there runs a strange parallel between Cowley's verses and this passage by Bacon! Both writers allude to the same subject, and both introduce, indirectly, *Venus and Adonis*, in context with it! Cowley's line (cited):—

"From words which are but pictures of the thought"

expresses the same idea as Bacon's *painted Learning*. Cowley's *painted grapes* are a further illustration of the *pictures of the thought*, which deceive us, even as the art of Zeuxis deceived birds. At the same time it is Adonis, in the poem, who is likened unto the *painted grapes*. Bacon likewise, in holding up to scorn this *vanity of words* (painted learning), illustrates it by the *statue, or image of Adonis*. The deep observer may perceive in this point, a hint for Bacon's reprehension of idols, which he has divided into four classes. Cowley tells us (in his verse), that Bacon's object was to recall us from *the deceptions of Art—an art so profound, so wonderful in its imitation of nature, that we are unaware of the deception practised upon us*. That art is hinted at by a double allusion, pointing at once to the first heir of the

poets' invention—the poem of *Venus and Adonis*—and also to the most marvellous artist of ancient times, Zeuxis, to whom Bacon is directly compared by his secretary, Rawley. Cowley tells us that words (or rather, painted art) without life behind them, or reason, are deceptions, and dead, however inimitable, or excellent. The following passage upon the same point (painted learning, or the vanity of words), illustrates Bacon's meaning. "And it seems to me that Pigmalion's frenzy is a good emblem and portraiture of this vanity; for what are words but the *images of matter*, and except they be animated with the *spirit of reason*, to fall in love with them, is all one as to fall in love with a *picture*" (page 28, Liber i., *Advancement of Learning*, 1640).

The story of Pigmalion everybody knows,—he carved a female *statue out of marble*, and fell in love with it,—and Bacon (upon the same page) illustrates the same idea, by the *statue of Adonis*, which Hercules saw in a temple. It is therefore of very great importance to point out, that we find Venus *addressing Adonis, in the poem*, AS BOTH A STATUE, AN IDOL, AND A PICTURE!

> "*Fie, lifeless picture, cold and senseless* STONE,
> *Well-painted idol, image dull and dead,*
> *Statue contenting but the eye alone,*
> *Thing like a man, but of no woman bred!*"
> (*Venus and Adonis*, 211-214.)

It is important to note, we have a striking parallel to the story of Pigmalion, presented us in the statue of Hermione* (*which comes to life*) in the play of the *Winter's Tale*. We find in the description of this *tableau vivant*, just the same connotation of the ideas of a *picture and stone image*, as in the above four lines addressed to Adonis.

Paulina.—Indeed, my lord,
If I had thought the sight of my poor *image*
Would thus have wrought you,—for the *stone* is mine—
I'd not have shown it—

Leontes.—Do not draw the curtain—

Paulina.—No longer shall you gaze on't, lest your fancy
May think anon it moves.

Leontes.—Let be, let be,
Would I were dead, but that methinks, already—
What was he that did made it? See, my lord,
Would you not deem it breathed? And that those veins
Did verily bear blood?

*In the case of Hermione it is to be observed, how the artist's skill in *both painting and sculpture* is harped upon in the play!

Third Gent.—"The princess hearing of her mother's statue, which is in the *Keeping of Paulina—a piece many years in doing* and now newly performed by that rare Italian Master, JULIO ROMANO, who had he himself eternity and could put breath into his work, would beguile nature of her custom, so perfectly he is her ape. He so near to Hermione hath done Hermione, that they say one would speak to her and stand in hope of answer."

(*Winter's Tale*, Act V. x. 1.)

This is another instance of painting being brought in as an adjunct to poetry. Moreover, the reader will recognize in this miracle of art, just what was excellent in the "*painted grapes*" of Zeuxis—an art which is life itself since it mocks art in the life! Many paintings of Julio Romano still exist, particularly in the Pitti Palace at Florence. He was famed for mythological subjects, and his ceilings are generally groups taken from the Pantheon of Antiquity.

In this *statue* of Hermione, or *painting* (both are indicated) we seem to hear Bacon, when he remarks:—"For as *statues and pictures* are dumb histories, so histories are *speaking pictures.*"—(A letter to the Lord Chancellor, touching the History of Britain, p. 28, Part two, Resuscitatio, 1661.)

Polixenes.—Masterly done.
The very life seems warm upon her lip,—
Leontes.—The fixture of her eye has motion in 't,
As we are mocked with art.

* * * *

There is an air comes from her: what fine chisel
Could ever yet cut breath? Let no man mock me,
For I will kiss her.
Paulina.—Good my lord forbear.
The ruddiness upon her cheek is wet;
You'll mar it if you kiss it, *stain your own*
With oily painting.

(*Winter's Tale*, Act V. iii.)

It appears as if Adonis was an early idea, which, later on, found a more complete realization in the feigned death of Hermione. The reader will perceive in both cases how alike are the situations and ideas called forth by the *painted grapes* of Zeuxis, and the statue of Hermione, wherein the idea is, *an excellence that makes us "mocked with art."* Only observe the difference,—Zeuxis gave an air of life to dead things,—Bacon's end is to show that things *which appear dead may be alive.* When art is no longer painting, but animated with the spirit and life of reason, then truly it may be said to resuscitate!—and painting becomes no longer mere painting. In the Induction to the *Taming of the Shrew*, we read:—

Dost thou love *pictures?* We will fetch thee straight
Adonis painted by a running brook,
And Cytherea all in sedges hid,
Which seem to move and wanton with her breath,
Even as the waving sedges play with wind.

(Scene ii.)

There can be very little doubt Bacon's "*vain affectations*" (in speech), and his "*painted learning*" (constituting his third, or last distemper, or disease of learning), may be found reflected in the play of *Love's Labour Lost.* It is just this "*affectation*" in the choice of "*delicacies of fine words,*" which speaks in this passage of Biron's, wherein he renounces what was known as *Euphuism,* during the Elizabethan reign.

Biron.—Taffeta phrases, silken terms precise
Three-piled hyperboles, spruce *affectation*
Figures pedantical; these summer flies
Have blown me full of maggot ostentation
I do forswear them; and I here protest,
By this white glove,—how white the hand God knows!
Henceforth my wooing mind shall be expressed
In russet yeas and honest Kersey noes.
And to begin wench,—so God help me la!—
My love to thee is sound, sans crack or flaw.
Ros.—Sans sans, I pray you.
Biron.—Yet I have a trick
Of the old rage: bear with me *I am sick*
I'll leave it by degrees. Soft, let us see:
Write, "Lord have mercy on us," on those three;
They are infected; *in their hearts it lies*;
They have the plague, and caught it of your eyes;
These lords are visited; you are not free
For the Lords token on you do I see.
(*Love's Labour Lost,* V. ii. 407.)

Observe, how exactly we find described, what Bacon calls "*delicacies,*" in choice of words,—that is, an effeminate or soft style, bred of boudoir affectations and conceits, expressing itself in "silken terms precise," with extravagances of "spruce affectation!" Biron repudiates, what Bacon terms, a style of speech that results in "time wasten in the delicacy of fine words," *i.e.* "a curiosity in words" full of vain affectations. The vanity of this style is summed up by Bacon, in the words "*painted learning*"—that is to say, a meretricious or false style, which is condemned under the description of "*painted rhetoric*" by Biron:—

Lend me the *flourish* of all gentle tongues,—
Fie painted rhetoric! O, she needs it not.
To things of sale a sellers praise belongs,
She passes praise, then praise too short doth blot.
(*Love's Labour Lost,* Act iv. iii. 239.)

Observe moreover, that this *distemper of learning*, constitutes with Biron's *a veritable plague, or distemper*, to which he confesses in the words, '*I am sick*,' and which he attributes to the other three lovers, in the words—"*They have the plague.*" That is to say, this vacuity of style, is accounted a distemper, or infection, in the play, as it is accounted by Bacon in his prose.

I want to point out, how exactly the style of the speech of Polonius, in the play of Hamlet, parallels in every particular, Bacon's category touching some of his three distempers of learning, "*when men study words and not matter.*" Polonius exclaims to Hamlet :—

Pol. —What do you read my lord?
Ham.—Words, words, words—
Pol. —What is the matter, my lord?
Ham.—Between who?
Pol. —I mean the *matter* that you read, my lord.
Ham.—Slanders, sir. For the satirical rogue says here that old men have grey beards, that their faces are wrinkled, their eyes purging thick amber and plum-tree gum, and that they have a plentiful lack of wit, together with most weak hams; all which, sir, though I most powerfully and potently believe, yet I hold it not honesty to have it thus set down, for yourself sir, should be old as I am, if like a crab you could go backward. (Act II., scene ii.)

The portrait and the words are identical, and the portrait is an ironical caricature of Polonius himself, whose style is summed up in *words or vacuity of matter*, as Bacon expresses it! For example take this :—

Pol.—My liege and madam, to expostulate
What majesty should be, what duty is,
Why day is day, night night, and time is time,
Were nothing but to waste night, day and time.
Therefore, since brevity is the soul of wit,
And tediousness the limbs and outward flourishes,
I will be brief: your noble son is mad:
Mad call I it; for, to define true madness,
What is 't but to be nothing else but mad?
But let that go.
Queen.—*More matter with less art.* (Act. II. ii.)

We seem to hear Bacon (in the voice of the Queen) complaining of the *vacuity of matter** (in a speech cunningly repeated), where a

* To use too many circumstances, *ere one come to the matter* is wearisome. (Essays Discourse).

greater care is taken for words than matter! It may be noticed how the style of Polonius, also corresponds, to some of Bacon's remarks upon the second disease, or distemper of learning, i.e. *Contentious subtlety and vanity of matter*, which Bacon calls, "*worse than the vanity of words.*" Now, in the speeches of Polonius, it may be remarked, that there is always what Bacon calls a *superfluity and profuseness of speech*, as when he exclaims:—"The best actors in the world, either for tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical, tragical-comical-historical pastoral, scene individual, or poem unlimited: Seneca cannot be too heavy, nor Plautus too light." (Act II. ii.). This passage illustrates what Bacon terms curiosity in words. Bacon would call these repetitions "*vain affectations.*" Polonius entirely answers to the description Bacon gives us, of *vain persons who are credulous in things false, or curious in things of little use.* For example Hamlet exclaims:—

Ham.—Do you see yonder cloud that's almost in shape of a camel?
Pol. —By the mass, and 'tis like a camel indeed.
Ham.—Methinks it is like a weasel.
Pol. —It is backed like a weasel.
Ham.—Or like a whale.
Pol. —Very like a whale. (Act III. ii.)

Here we have the credulity of what Bacon calls "vain imaginations!" And indeed when Hamlet exclaims of Polonius: "These tedious old fools"—we seem to hear Bacon (upon subtlety or curiosity) saying,

"Verba ista sunt senum otiosorum—these are the words of idle old men." Observe, that the distemper of the "superfluity and profuseness of speech, which Bacon says, *got up about Luther's time*," is very closely connected with the University of *Wittenberg*, where Hamlet purposes going, and from whence Horatio has come. This town is where Luther burnt the Pope's bull, and figures therefore, for a remarkable period introducing the Reformation. Also note that Polonius once played Julius Cæsar, and was killed by Brutus, a part Hamlet plays in reality later on. That is to say we have in Polonius a tyranny of authority (already in its dotage) of thought and style (of the Schoolmen) which was about to perish at the hands of the new and advanced age.

Bacon's "*fantastical learning*" is powerfully reflected in the character of Don Adriano de Armado, in the play of *Love's Labour Lost*, in whom we recognize also, what Bacon con-

demns, as "*an affectation of novelty and strangeness of terms,*" in his second distemper of learning. Don Armado is described as a *fantastical* Spaniard, and also as:—

A man of *fire-new words*, fashions own knight.
(*Love's Labour Lost*, Act I., i.)

* * * * *

A man in all the worlds *new fashion planted*,
That hath a mint of phrases in his brain;
One whom the music of his own *vain* tongue
Doth ravish like enchanting harmony.
(*Ibid.*)

The superfluity and profuseness of speech, when, as Bacon writes, "*men study words and not matter,*" is summed up in the description Holofernes gives of the style of speech used by Don Armado:—

He draweth out the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument. (*Love's Labour Lost*, Act IV., sc. i.)

Observe that Bacon's condemnation of "*Labours spent in vain matters, or time wasted* in the delicacy of fine words," almost sums up the title "*Love's Labour Lost,*"—in the words, "labours spent," or "time wasted (lost) in *vain studies,*" which is reflected, in the speech of the King's Courtier, Biron, thus summed up:—

Why, all delights are *vain*, but that most *vain*,
Which with pain purchased doth inherit pain:
As, painfully to pore upon a book
To seek the light of truth; while truth the while
Doth falsely blind the eyesight of his look.
(*Love's Labour Lost*, Act I., i.)

This speech refers to the *studies*, which the King of Navarre, and his bookmen, propose to carry out for three years.

As the mere *outside*, or natural man (corporeal and visible), we find this frequent, and painted comparison, which for profound irony, cannot perhaps be surpassed in literature:—

Timon.—What have you there my friend?

Painter.—A piece of painting, which I do beseech your lordship to accept.

Timon.—Painting is welcome.
The painting is almost the natural man;
For since dishonour traffics with man's nature
He is but outside. (*Timon*, Act I. i.)

This indeed, is the characteristic of a certain class of person, who may be epitomised in the words, *clothes, and outside appearance;*

o whom everything material, and external, is of first importance, and to whom, what Bacon calls, colour, and cover, are all their arts in life. But it is open to question how the poet understands the words "*natural man?*" I am inclined to believe that it is introduced here, with the plenary inspiration with which Bacon separates the Natural from the Spiritual man, *toto genere*.

Timon's steward exclaims of Timon:—

> To have his pomp and all what state compounds
> But only *painted* like his varnished friends?
>
> (*Timon*, Act IV. ii.)

Compare this—(where Polonius causes Ophelia to pretend to read):—

> *Polonius.*—Read on this book;
> That *show* of such *an* exercise may *colour*
> Your loneliness, we are oft to blame in this,—
> 'Tis too much proved—that with devotion's visage
> And pious action we do sugar o'er
> The devil himself.
>
> *King* [*aside*] O, 'tis too true!
> How smart a lash that speech doth give my conscience!
> The harlot's cheek, beautified with plastering art,
> Is not more ugly to the thing that helps it
> *Than is my deed to my most painted word.**
>
> (*Hamlet*, Act III. i.)

'Painted words,' 'painted rhetoric,' 'painted grapes,' 'painted learning,' 'painted friends,' all class together, and belong to Bacon's collection of Colours, wherein Evil puts on a false outside to appear as if real—true and good. The student may recognize in the above quotations from *Hamlet*, Bacon's *Colours of Good and Evil*, at work! Polonius' speech, is a perfect illustration of the text (of the Reprehension) of Bacon's fourth Colour of Good and Evil:—"That which is evil *approacheth to Good for concealment*," "*and protection; so wicked persons betake themselves to the sanctuary of the Gods*, and vice itself assumes the shape and shadow of virtue."

> Sæpe latet vitium proximitate boni.
>
> (p. 214 Liber VI. *Advancement of Learning*, 1640.)

This is '*devotions visage*' that *colours* (with a show) the devil itself!

It is therefore almost certain, the word *painting*, is introduced for something false, or superficial, connected closely with *color*,

* Court life is called *painted pomp* ("*As You Like It*").

or appearance—falsehood, or deceit! The connotation of *painting*, with *idols*, and *idol worship*, is strongly reflected in the following ironical portrait (Thersites presents) of Achilles, in the play of *Troilus and Cressida* :—

> Why thou *picture* of what thou seems't, and *idol* of idiot worshippers.
>
> (*Troilus and Cressida*, Act V. i.)

Still more Baconian is the following—

> Poor Ophelia
> Divided from herself and her fair judgment,
> *Without the which we are pictures or mere beasts.*
>
> (*Hamlet*, Act IV. v.)

On the other hand, Bacon says that "Virtue *if she could be seen*, would move much love and affection."

This finds a perfect parallel :—

> Virtue is beauty, but the beauteous evil
> Are empty trunks o'erflourished by the devil.
>
> (*Twelfth Night*, Act III. iv.)

In the Epistle to the Reader, profacing the Resusticatio of Bacon, William Rawley writes—

"*To give the true value, to his Lordship's wroth, there were more need of another Homer, to be the trumpet of Achilles' virtues.*"

("The Epistle to the Reader, Resuscitatio, 1661.")

There is something in this panegyric, which must immediately remind students of Virgil, of the latter's ecloque, entitled *Pharmaceutria*—in which *Pollio the concealed poet and Roman playwright*, is thus addressed by Virgil—

> Could I rehearse
> Thy lofty tragic scenes, thy labour'd verse,
> The world another Sophocles in thee,
> Another Homer should behold in me!
>
> (Dryden's Translation.)

This is the praise of one poet by another poet,—for who so fitting as a poet to give another poet his due? But it will naturally be objected that Sophocles and Achilles are widely apart as a comparison. I am not at all convinced myself, however, that Achilles is not here introduced, as possibly some hint profound for Shakespeare.

Everybody has heard of the celebrated *spear* of Achilles called *Pelias*. In the poem of Lucrece, this *spear* is thus introduced in the painting of Troy, and its seige, described by Lucrece—

For much imaginary work was there;
Conceit deceitful, so compact, so kind,
That for Achilles' image stood his spear,
Griped in an armed hand; himself behind,
Was left unseen, save to the eye of mind:
A hand, a foot, a face, a leg, a head,
Stood for the whole to be imagined.

Lucrece, 1422.

That the emblem of the spear entered into Shakespeare's conception of his own name, is evident in his coat of arms, where the lance, or spear, figures chiefly. So in the plays, Mars is prefigured as

The omnipotent Mars, of lances the almighty.

(*Love's Labour Lost*, Act V. ii.)

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

MYTHOLOGY (I.)

"This is the silliest stuff that e'er I heard.
The best in this kind are but shadows, and the worst are no worse if imagination amend them." (*Midsummer Night's Dream*, v. 1).

THE TWO CUPIDS. FRIENDSHIP, LOVE OF THE SOUL. PASSION. LOVE OF THE WORLD, OR SELF-LOVE.

IT would be beyond the scope of this article to attempt an exhaustive analysis of the allusions to Mythology in the Literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. All that can be done is to notice a few of the classical myths which are woven in with Bacon's theories, spoken of in his works and (when associated with high and beautiful thoughts) almost sure to reappear in some form or other in the woodcuts.

In the ordinary course of things, "Pan, or Nature Explained of Natural Philosophy," would come first. It is nearly three times as long as any other fable in *The Wisdom of the Ancients*, excepting "Prometheus," and Bacon describes it as "perhaps the noblest of all antiquity, pregnant with the secrets of nature." But a chapter has been already devoted to Pan, and we pass from this fable (for which we seem to be chiefly indebted to Homer,*) to the myth of "Cupid or an Atom, explained of the Corpuscular Philosophy," which we owe to Plato.

* *Homer's Hymn to Pan.*

This story of Cupid, as related by Bacon, bears (we think) an intimate relation to that of Pan,* although the threads which knit the two together do not appear on the surface.

"The particulars related by the poets of Cupid, or Love, do not properly agree to the same person; yet they differ only so far, that, if the confusion of persons be rejected, the correspondence may hold.†

"They say that Love was the most ancient of all the Gods, and existed before everything else, except chaos, which was held coeval therewith. But for chaos, the ancients never paid divine honours, nor gave the title of God thereto. Love is represented as absolutely without progenitor, excepting only that he is said to have proceeded from the egg of Nox. His attributes are four, *viz.* (1) perpetual infancy; (2) blindness; (3) nakedness; and (4) archery.

"There was also another Cupid, or Love, the youngest son of the Gods, born of Venus; and upon him the attributes of the elder are transferred, with some degree of correspondence."

This fable, says the Essayist, "points, at and enters, *the cradle of nature.*"

"Love seems to be the appetite or incentive of the primitive matter . . . this being the most ancient and only power, that made and wrought all things out of matter. It is absolutely without a parent, that is, without cause; for causes are as parents to effects; but this power or efficacy could have no natural cause; for excepting God, *nothing was before it*, and therefore it could have no efficient in Nature."

"Cupid," he presently continues, "is elegantly drawn *a perpetual child*; for compounds are larger things, and have their periods of age; but the first seeds or atoms of bodies are small, and remain in a perpetual infant state."

"He is again justly represented as *naked;* as all compounds may be said to be dressed and clothed, or to assume a personage; whence nothing remains truly naked, but original particles of things."

These passages seem to explain the presence in our woodcuts of a multitude of little fat boys, not the conventional Cupids

* It is also intimately connected with the fable of *Cœlum*, or Beginnings, explained of the Origin of all things. (Lit. Arts. xii.)

† Thus at the very commencement of his Essay, Bacon separates Heavenly love, the love of "married souls," from Earthly love—mere passion—the love "by gazing fed." Attentive readers will observe how these thoughts permeate the Plays, where all noble love between man and woman blends into one, the *two Cupids*, making all happiness depend upon the "Exquisite Sympathies" of heart and soul.

with wings, bows and arrows; but "perpetual children," neither "dressed and clothed" (like Bacon's "compounds" nor "assuming a personage"—for each is like the other, without individual characteristics. These wingless cupids swarm in old books (especially in ornamental letters), and some are usually found in one or other of the headlines.

Are these the atoms, the primitive principles of things, the weak beginnings, infants without parents, whom Bacon identifies with the First or Ancient Cupid, the Eros of Plato? Freemason designers and architects can surely answer.

The analogies between the fables of Cupid and Pan soon begin to make themselves felt. Just as Love was without progenitors, an emanation from chaos, so Pan is said to have sprung "from the confused seeds of things." Again, as "the body of Nature is justly described as biform, because of the difference of its superior and inferior parts" (the earth and humanity, and the heavens or the spiritual nature), so Pan is represented as goat-footed, *clambering* between the earth and the heavens—and so too these wingless Cupids, as "vital spirits of nature," are often represented with goats' feet, here again forming a point of contact with the Satyrs and *the youth of things*, whom we saw dancing about Pan.

And then, lastly, we observe that, when Pan, supposed to be married to Echo (the voices of the world), fell in love with the nymph Syriux (*the Pen, or the Art of Writing*), it was Cupid (Love of Beauty) who inflamed him, in revenge for Pan's insolent challenge to a wrestling match, when of course he was worsted, for how could Nature get the better of Love?

Possibly some of these little unclothed, sturdy children, may be the "heirs of invention," "children of the brain," "unswaddled" offspring of imagination and of the mind, such as Bacon speaks of alike in prose and poetry, seeds and weak beginnings,

> "The baby figure of the giant mass
> Of things to come at large." *

And since Truth, Bacon says, is the daughter of Time, and

> "Time the nurse and breeder of all good," †

perhaps this large nursery of babies may be her progeny, "begot in the ventricle of memory, nourished in the womb of *pia mater*, and delivered upon the mellowing of occasion." ‡

* *Troilus and Cressida*, i. 3.

† *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, iii. 2.

‡ *Love's Labour Lost*, iii. 2.

Spedding says,* speaking of Bacon's treatment of the fable of Cupid, that "his design was to give a philosophical exposition of two myths, namely, that of the primæval Eros or Cupid, and that of Uranus or Cœlum. Only the first, however, is discussed in the fragment which we now have, and even that is left incomplete."

This is one of many instances in which Bacon leaves *as a fragment*, a work in itself unfinished, but in which he has said all that is necessary for his purpose. It was not his purpose to criticise Plato's *Symposium*, whence, apparently, he derived this theory of the Two Cupids, but he did wish to bring before the minds of his disciples, the thought that Love is the only true parent and motive power of all work or effort, "the summary or collective law of Nature, or the principle of Love, impressed by God upon the original particles of all things."

Too much space would be demanded by the introduction into this chapter of all the passages where we find this theory of the Two Cupids, illustrated by examples in Baconian literature, but it is a study which we think may be legitimately pressed upon the attention of the *Shakespeare* reader especially, and we will give as a specimen of the *concealed allusions* to which we refer some passages in *Romeo and Juliet*, which in the first instance led us to researches into Bacon's Mythology.

"The blindness of Cupid contains a deep allegory, for this same Cupid or Love, or appetite of the world, seems to have very little foresight, but directs his steps and motions conformably to what he finds next him, as blind men do when they feel out their way." †

> " Alas, that Love whose view is muffled still
> Should, without eyes, see pathways to his will."‡

"The love impressed by God upon the particles of all things, makes them *attack one another*, " And come together."§

> "O *brawling* love!"‖

And love was created out of nothing—and "is absolutely without progenitor."

> "O brawling Love! O loving Hate!
> O anything *from nothing first create.*"¶

"Love existed before anything else, *except chaos*, which is held coeval therewith."**

* *De Principiis atque Originibus Prof.* The *Essay of Cœlum* should be compared with this.

† *Essay of Cupid.*

‡ *Romeo and Juliet*, i. i. 76-7.

§ *Essay.*

‖ *Romeo and Juliet*, i. 1. 181.

¶ ib. 182.

** *Essay.*

O heavy lightness! serious vanity!
Misshapen Chaos of well-seeming forms!*

This last line has surely little meaning, unread by the light of Bacon's exposition. In the rhapsody which follows, a picture is presented of the excess of this passion. Bacon says in the *Essay of Love*,† that "there never was a proud man thought so absurdly well of himself, as the lover doth of the person loved; and therefore it was well said that *it is impossible to love and be wise*." This excess he regards as something curious, and amusing to watch.

"It is a strange thing to note the excess of this passion, and how it braves the nature and value of things, by this, that *the speaking in perpetual hyperbole is comely in nothing but in love*."‡

"Feather of lead, bright smoke, cold fire, sick health!
Still waking sleep that is not what it is!
This love feel I, that feel no love in this."§

And now we come to the explanation and illustration of the doctrine of the Two Cupids.

"*The other* Cupid was the youngest son of the gods, born of Venus, and upon him the attributes of the elder are transferred with some degree of correspondence. The description given us of him, transfers the allegory to morality, though he still retains some resemblance with the ancient Cupid; for as Venus universally excites the affection of association, and the desire for procreation" (*of things, works, knowledge, from crude material*) her son Cupid applies the affection to individuals; so that the general disposition proceeds from Venus, but the more close sympathy from Cupid. The former depends upon "a near approximation of causes, but the latter upon deeper, more necessitating, and uncontrollable principles, as if they proceeded from the ancient Cupid, on whom all exquisite sympathies depend."

When Romeo raves of his love for Juliet, Benvolio annoys him by laughing, instead of sympathising, as he expected his good friend to do:—

Rom.—Dost thou laugh?
Ben.— No, Coz, I rather weep.
Rom.—Good heart, at what?

* *Romeo and Juliet*, i. 1, 184.

† *Moral Essays* x. Compa re *Merchant of Venice*, iii. 2. *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, iv. 2. *Midsummer Night's Dream*, ii. 3. *Measure for Measure*, ii. 3. *Hamlet* i.

‡ *Essays of Love.*

§ *Romeo and Juliet*, i. 2. 105.

Ben.—At thy good hearts' oppression.
Rom.—Why, *such is love's transgression—*
Griefs of mine own lie heavy in my breast
Which thou wilt propagate to have it prest
With more of thine—This love that thou hast shown,
*Doth add more grief to too much of mine own.**

For "No receipt openeth the heart but a true friend, to whom you may impart griefs, joys, fears, hopes, suspicions, counsels, and whatsoever lieth upon the heart to oppress it, in a kind of civil shrift or confession† . . . Friendship redoubleth joys, and cutteth griefs in half."

Here we may perceive a hint of the contrast which Bacon notes between the deep and true affection of "the ancient Cupid, upon whom all exquisite sympathies depend," (Friendship, or Love of the Soul), and the mad, unreasoning love of the blind boy, Cupid.

This "other" Cupid, he says in the Moral Essay, "is, as to the stage, ever matter of comedies, and now and then of tragedies; but in life doth much mischief, sometimes like a Siren, sometimes like a Fury." Benvolio displays as much surprise as Bacon himself, at the "excess of hyperbole" into which Romeo's passionate love leads him, he does not agree with his cousin that this is "a madness most discreet," and soon afterwards, when again Benvolio is listening to and trying to comfort Romeo, this love-sick hero becomes so incoherent that Benvolio fears he is losing his wits.

Ben.—Why, Romeo, art thou mad?
Rom.—Not mad, but bound more than a madman is;
Shut up in prison, kept without my food,
Whipped and tormented.

In the Masque entitled a *Challenge at Tilt*,‡ Bacon's "new" Platonic doctrine of the two Cupids again appears, incidentally. The first Cupid threatens :—

"I will break my bow . . . *turn into chaos again, and dissolve the harmony of nature.*"

In *Love's Welcome*§ there is a still clearer reflection of Bacon's (or Plato's) ideas. The two Cupids, Eros and Anteros, are brothers with distinctive abilities. Auteros describes himself as "a Son of Venus," "a second self" to Eros, who declares that "the affection in our Will as in our Love," the *exquisite sympathy*

* *Romeo and Juliet*, i. 2.
† *Essay of Friendship.*
‡ Performed at a marriage, 1612, and attributed to Ben Johnson.
§ Performed at Bolsover, July 30th, 1634.

which has grown up between them, "is due to the pure school we live in, and is, of purer love a discipline."

Turning to other books which reveal by their water-marks, ornaments and illustrations, by their vocabulary, phraseology, metaphoric language, and matter, the mind of Bacon, we are sure, when Love and Beauty are the theme, to find these same rather abstruse ideas, variously applied to meet circumstances.

Here are some passages to the point from the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, a book invaluable for the light which it sheds upon obscurities in Bacon, and, if you will, *Shakespeare.*

"Beauty shines," Plato saith, "and by reason of its splendour, and shining causeth admiration; and the fairer the object is, the more eagerly it is sought. Beauty is a lively, shining, or glittering brightness, *resulting from effused good*" (here again is the emblem of *God as the Sun*), "by ideas, seeds, reasons, shadows, stirring up our minds, that by this good they may be united and made one . . . Beauty and grace are like those beams and shinings that come from the glorious and divine sun, which are diverse as they proceed from the diverse objects, to please and affect our several senses . . . . so that as Valesius infers, whatsoever pleaseth our ears, eyes and soul, must needs be beautiful, fair and delightsome to us.

"One beauty," he continues, "ariseth from God (of which and divine love many fathers have written just volumes)—another from His creatures. There is a beauty of the body, and a beauty of the soul; a beauty from virtue, which we see with the eyes of our mind; which, as Tully saith, if we could discern with these corporeal eyes, would cause admirable affections and ravish our souls."

This "other" beauty (as he spoke of the "other" Cupid) "which ariseth from those extreme qualities . . . graces, gestures, speeches, motions and proportions of creatures," including men and women, are almost infinite, and vary their names with their objects, like the three graces in the company of Venus, and holding up her train. Such are love of money, love of beauty, immoderate desire of any pleasure, friendship or goodwill, &c., which things are either virtue or vice, honest or dishonest, in excess or defect." The author distinguishes between Heroical Love and Religious Love, and argues from the conclusions of various learned men, that there are two Venuses and two Loves.* "One

***Amor et amicitia*, which Scaligor, Exercitat, 301, Valesius and Melancthon warrant out of Plato *φυλεῖν* and *ἐράν* from that speech of Pausanias which makes two Venuses and two Loves.

Venus is ancient without a mother, and descended from heaven, whom we call *Celestial*; the younger, begotten of Jupiter and Dione,* whom commonly we call Venus."

"Plato calls these two loves, two devils; or, *good and bad Angels, according to us, which are still hovering about our souls.*" "The one rears up to heaven, the other depresseth us to hell; the one good, which stirs us up to the contemplation of that divine beauty, for whose sake we perform justice and all godly offices, study philosophy, &c.; the other base, and though bad, yet to be respected; for indeed both are good in their own natures; procreation of children is as necessary as the finding out of truth, but called bad, because it is abused, and withdraws our soul from the speculation of that other, to viler objects."†

"Every creature is good, and may be loved ill or well? Two cities make two Loves, Jerusalem and Babylon, the love of God the one, the love of the world the other; of these two cities we are all citizens, as by examination of ourselves we may soon find, and of which."‡

Observe in the passage where the *Anatomist* quotes Plato's description of the two Loves rearing the soul to heaven or depressing it to hell, that he differs from Plato in calling these Loves "Devils." There are, according to his own ideas, *good and bad angels*. All this is reproduced in one of the Sonnets,§ where the bad spirit tempts the good one from his side, and almost makes him doubt if his good angel be not a fiend in disguise.

*Dione is De Ione, the Dove, at Dodona she was worshipped as the Queen of Jupiter (Venus), but she was also his daughter, being, Cicero declares, the Child of Heaven and Light. By the Hindus she is typified as the Lotus and the Lotus throne. This Lotus again is the same as Latona, and Lât the concealed. Pausanius says that she was called *The Bride*, the mother of celestial messengers to men. The House of our *dove-like religion*, says Tertullian, covertly alluding to this mystery of Christianity, which was in the days of the primitive Church well understood, is simple, built on high in open view; respecting the Light as the figure of the Holy Spirit, and the East as the figure of the annointed Messiah. (See Book of God, i., p. 96).

† Ficiuns.

‡ St. Augustine Lib. 15. De Civitat. Dei, and see Psalms lxiv. The Author continues to quote from St. Augustine, Thomas, Lucian, Beroaldus, Origen, Scaliger, Cardan, and Leon Hebræus, all to the same effect variously illustrated.

§ Sonnet cxliv. It is also reproduced (p. 67) in a curious little anonymous book "written in French" by Roland Freart, and rendered English by John Evelyn, 1668. This books seems to compare Painting to Poetry. It is thoroughly Baconian.

> *Two loves I have* of comfort and despair,
> Which, like two spirits do suggest me still:
> The better angel is a man right fair,
> The worser spirit a woman colour'd ill.
> To win me soon to hell, my female evil
> Tempted my better angel from my side,
> And would corrupt my saint to be a devil,
> Wooing his purity with her foul pride.
> And whether that my angel be turned fiend,
> Suspect I may, yet not directly tell;
> But being both from me, both to each friend,
> I guess one angel in another's hell.
> Yet this shall I ne'er know, but live in doubt,
> Till my bad angel fires my good one out.

The fable of Cupid and Psyche, like that of Persephone or Proserpine, and Narcissus, represents, according to some writers, the lapse of the soul from a celestial to an earthly sphere. Two loves meet Psyche or the Soul—the physical or earthly soul, a demon who would draw Psyche down to earthly things; and the heavenly, who directs the Soul's vision to the original, fair and divine, and who, gaining the victory over his rival, leads off the Soul as his bride.*

In the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Psyche is described as "the *Quintessence* of Beauty the *Non-pariel*,† the *Paragon* of the World"; of such surpassing loveliness that all the gods contended for her. This fair creature seems to be yet another impersonation of the Sovereign Lady Truth, or of the Soul aspiring to the attainment of her.

Just so does the Poet write of his Roselind "of many parts distilled."

> The *quintessence* of every sprite
> Heaven would *in a little* show.‡

Elsewhere we have "the *Nonpareil* of beauty,"* etc. "The earthly *paragon*," a maid that *paragons* description," etc.§

It is well also to observe that in the Rosicrucian Allegory, "The Chymical Marriage," The Bride and Bridegroom are first introduced to us as lifeless images of two "angelically fair babes," which are by the breathings of an old man, through a tube or pipe, kindled into life and imbued with souls. These babes may represent Poesy and the Drama, or Nature and Art, or any of the many means by which things material or things

* See "Book of God," ii. 261, 266, 440, 576.

† See *As You Like It*, iii. 2, *Celias' Song*.

‡ See *Cymbeline*, iii. 6, v. 5. *Othello*, ii. 1, etc.

§ *Twelfth Night*, i. 5. *Tempest*, iii. 2. *Macbeth*, iii. 4. *Anthony and Cleopatra*, ii. 2. *Cymbeline*, ii. 5.

spiritual were to be drawn together and united. The breathing of the old man (Time) through pipes is an idea analagous and more gracefully expressed in the *De Augmentis*, where Bacon speaking of the Fables of the Ancients, says: "I take them to be a kind of breath from the traditions of more ancient nations, which fell into the pipes of the Greeks."

C. M. P.

THE MOTLEY PRESS, 18, ELDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Baconiana.

Vol. VI—*New Series.* APRIL, 1899. No. 26.

BACON'S "ESSAY OF LOVE."

READING lately a pamphlet, entitled, "Bacon or Shakespeare," by Miss E. Marriott, I came across the following passage:—"In the second volume (p. 424) of the delightful biography which his (Lord Tennyson's) son has given us, it appears that someone had written to ask if he thought that Bacon wrote the Plays, and he says:—

"'I felt inclined to write back, "Sir, don't be a fool." The way in which Bacon speaks of love is enough to prove that he is not Shakespeare: "I know not how, but martial men are given to love. I think it is but as they are given to wine for perils like to be paid with pleasure." How can a man with such an idea of love have written *Romeo and Juliet?*'

"The passage Tennyson quotes occurs in the brief No. X. of the Essays and throughout is the literary antipodes to Shakespeare's idea, and ideals of love."

As this passage from the life of Tennyson is not unfrequently quoted against Baconians, it will not be unprofitable to enquire whether Bacon's views are quite at variance with those expressed by Shakespeare. It must be remembered that in this passage (which first appears in the Edition of 1,625), Bacon is speaking of the love to which "Martial men" are usually addicted, which can hardly be supposed to have much in common with the pure and ecstatic passion which constitutes the argument of *Romeo and Juliet.* Turning to Shakespeare we find the very same characteristics attributed to martial men.

"But we are soldiers,
And may that soldier, a mere recreant prove,
That means not, hath not, or is not in love."
—*Troilus and Cressida,* I. iii. 286.

"Sometimes she driveth o'er a soldier's neck,
And then he dreams of cutting foreign throats,
Of breaches, ambuscadoes, Spanish blades,
Of healths five-fathom deep."
—*Romeo and Juliet,* I. iv. 25.

So that in this case instead of the Essay being "the literary antipodes to Shakespeare's idea" we find Bacon and Shakespeare expressing exactly the same opinion, namely, that martial men are given to love and wine.

The argument that because a writer on a given occasion treats a subject in a certain way, he can treat it in no other, is, even if it be applicable in any case, wholly futile when dealing with Bacon, who was endowed perhaps more largely than any other English author with the gift of versatility of style. As this fact is not generally recognised and we are not unfrequently assured by people who judge of Bacon's style merely from the terse and epigrammatic writing employed in the earlier Essays, that the Plays could not have been written by the author of the Essays; I take the liberty to quote from Dr. Abbott's remarks on Bacon as a writer.* It should be borne in mind that Dr. Abbott is a careful and thoroughly competent critic, whose work has done much towards giving us a true insight into Bacon's character, both as a man and an author.

"Remarking on the difference in style between the earlier and later Editions of the Essays, Lord Macaulay has been led to the conclusion that in the works of Bacon, as in those of Burke, terseness in youth gives place to rich copiousness in old age—a reversal of the natural order of rhetorical development, and this opinion has been so generally adopted without question that a refutation of it may not be without use.

"I do not believe that Lord Macaulay would have come to this conclusion if he had had before him that complete collection of Bacon's works, for which these and later times will remain deeply indebted to Mr. Spedding. Bacon's style varied almost as much as his handwriting; but it was influenced more by the subject matter than by youth or old age. Few men have shewn equal versatility in adapting their language to the slightest shade of circumstance and purpose. His style depended whether he was addressing a king, or a great nobleman, or a philosopher, or a friend; whether he was composing a State paper, pleading in a State trial, magnifying the prerogative, extolling truth, discussing studies, exhorting a judge, sending a New Year's present, or sounding a trumpet to prepare the way for the kingdom of man over nature. It is a mistake to suppose that Bacon was never florid till he grew old. On the contrary, in the early *Devices*, written

*"Francis Bacon," an account of his life and works by E. A. Abbott, D.D., pp. 447, et seq. Macmillan, 1885.

during his connexion with Essex, he uses a rich exuberant style and poetic rhythm ; but he prefers the rhetorical question of appeal to the complex period.

On the other hand in all his formal philosophical works, even in the *Advancement of Learning*, published as early as 1,605, he uses the graver periodic structure, though often illustrated with rich metaphor. The Essays, both early and late, abound in pithy metaphor, as their natural illustration ; but in the later and weightier edition in which they were enlarged, not only in number, but also "in *weight* so that they are indeed a new work"—there is an intentional increase in rhetorical ornament and illustration, and in some of the later Essays on more serious subjects, there is somewhat more of the periodic structure, but this is caused by the weight of the subject not by weight of years. As instances, take first the following specimens of the early florid style (a comparison between the servant of Love and the servant of Self-love) from the *Device of Essex*, 1594—5 :—

"But give ear now to the comparison of my Master's condition, and acknowledge such a difference as betwixt the melting hailstone and the solid pearl. Indeed it seemeth to depend as the globe of the earth seemeth to hang in the air ; but yet it is firm and stable in itself. It is like a cube or die-form, which, toss it or throw it any way, it ever lighteth upon a square. . . . His falls are like the falls of Antœus ; they renew his strength : his clouds are like the clouds of harvest, which makes the sun break forth with greater force ; his wanes and changes are like the moon, whose globe is all light towards the sun, when it is all dark towards the world ; such is the excellency of her nature and of his estate."

Next take a passage from the *Advancement of Learning* (1,605). Though published twenty years before the last edition of the Essays it is no less periodic in structure and hardly less rich in style than the passage quoted by Lord Macaulay from the latter.

"Neither is certainly that other merit of learning, in repressing the inconveniences which grow from man to man, much inferior to the former, of relieving the necessities which arise from nature ; which merit was lively set forth by the ancients in that feigned relation of Orpheus' theatre ; where all the beasts and birds assembled, and forgetting their several appetites, some of prey, some of game, some of quarrel, stood all sociably together listening to the airs and accords of the

harp; the sound thereof no sooner ceased or was drowned by some louder noise, but every beast returned to his own nature. Wherein is aptly described the condition of men; who are full of savage and unreclaimed desires of profit, of lust, of revenge; which as long as they give ear to precepts, to laws, to religion, sweetly touched with eloquence, and persuasion of books, of sermons, of harangues, so long is society and peace maintained; but if these instruments be silent, or that sedition and tumult make them not audible, all things dissolve into anarchy and confusion."

On the other hand, the History of Henry VII., written 1,621, although for the most part periodic in structure, yet by its abruptness and occasional roughness, its collogical phrases and homely metaphor, often reminds us of the earlier Essays. . . . It would seem that Bacon's habit of collecting choice words and phrases, to express his meaning exactly, briefly or ornately, had from a very early date the effect of repelling some of his hearers by the interspersion of unusual expressions and metaphors. Fresh from hearing an argument of Mr. Francis Bacon in the year 1,594, "in a most famous Chequer Chamber case," a young lawyer thus records his impressions:—

"His argument contracted by the time, seemed a *bataille serrèe* as hard to be discovered as conquered. The unusual words wherewith he had spangled his speech were rather gracious for their propriety than strange for their novelty, and like to serve both for occasions to report and means to remember his argument. Certain sentences of his, somewhat obscure, and as it were presuming on their capacities, will, I fear, make some of them admire rather than commend him." . . . "It would, therefore, be more in accordance with fact to call attention to this singularity of language, largeness of vocabulary, and richness of illustrations as distinguishing Bacon's style to some extent *in every period, and especially in his early period*, than to lay stress upon any imaginary development of the bold early style into a late florid one."—Abbott's "Francis Bacon."

Bearing in mind that the *Essay of Love* first appeared in the year 1612, when Bacon was 52 years of age, if we turn again to Lord Tennyson, we shall find his dictum, "Sir, don't be a fool," if not strictly original, at any rate excellent advice; but the question naturally arises, What constitutes a fool? It is usually allowed that a person who gives sentence in a cause which he does not fully understand without having made any attempt to investigate the evidence, may be placed

in this category; but at least it is rather hard that Baconians should be charged with fatuity because they consider that a poet, in cold blood, at the age of 52, sitting down to write an essay on love, need not necessarily treat of the passion in the language in which Romeo in the orchard or Juliet at the window express themselves. Bacon had by this time learned that "whosoever esteemeth too much of amorous affection quitteth both riches and wisdom. . . . As if man, made for the contemplation of Heaven and all noble objects, should do nothing but kneel before a little idol, and make himself subject not of the mouth (as beasts are), yet of the eye, which was given him for higher purposes."—*Essay of Love.*

Taking these things into consideration, it is not surprising to find Bacon speaking rather in the language of Mercutio than that of Romeo.

Says Bacon: "Speaking in a perpetual hyperbole is comely in nothing but in love. . . . For there was never proud man thought so absurdly well of himself, as the lover does of the person loved."

Mercutio.—"Now is he for the numbers that Petrarch flowed in. Laura to his lady was but a kitchen-wench. Dido a dowdy, Cleopatra a gipsy, Helen and Hero hildings and harlots, Thesbe a grey eye or so, but not to the purpose."—*Rom. Juliet* II. iv. 37.

> "The lover all as frantic,
> Sees Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt."
> —*M. N. D.*, V. i. 10.

Bacon.—"And therefore it was well said it is impossible to love and be wise."

Shakespeare.—

> "For to be wise and love,
> Exceeds man's might that dwells with gods above."
> —*Troilus and Cressida* iii. 2.

"You may observe that amongst all the great and worthy persons (whereof the memory remaineth either ancient or recent) there is not one that has been transported to the mad degree of love, which shows that great spirits and great business do keep out this weak passion. You must except, nevertheless, Marcus Antonius, the half-partner of the Empire of Rome, and Appius Claudius."

It is to be observed that in the Plays Mark Anthony is the only "great and worthy person" who is "transported to the mad degree of love"—that is, who is so blinded by love as

to become oblivious to his better interests. Henry V., Henry VIII., Hector, Julius Cæsar, though "they cannot but admit love, yet make it keep quarter." Othello's ruin is due to jealousy, not love. A commentary on a text found in Bacon's *Essay of Suspicion :* "Suspicions that are artificially nourished and put into men's heads by the tales and whisperings of others have stings."

"This passion has his floods in the very times of weakness, which are great prosperity and great adversity, though this latter hath been less observed."—*Essay of Love.*

It is hardly necessary to point out to any reader of Shakespeare how much the latter point, that adversity is an incentive to love, is brought out in the Plays: the keynote is struck in the *Midsummer Night's Dream,* "The course of true love never did run smooth," and from this Play to *Winter's Tale,* the goal of true love, as approached by the straight path of adversity.

Thus we find that Bacon's *Essay of Love,* instead of being "throughout at the Antipodes to Shakespeare ideas and ideals of love," actually agrees at least in six distinct features with the opinions expressed in the Plays—namely, that martial men are given to love as they are given to wine; that speaking in a perpetual hyperbole is allowable in love; that there was never proud man thought so absurdly well of himself as the lover does of the person loved; that it is impossible to love and to be wise; that great and worthy persons are not transported to the mad degree of love, and that love hath his floods in times of great adversity.

There can be little doubt that Bacon, mature in years and judgment, had come to look on love rather as a hindrance than a help to man in accomplishing what he held to be the aim and object of his being "the contemplation of Heaven and all noble objects." Indeed the whole spirit and intention of the Essay is to warn men against allowing their higher and nobler parts to become entangled in the meshes of the senses. It is curious to find Hamlet giving voice to the same warning almost in the words of the Essay:—

> "What is a man,
> If the chief good and market of his time
> Be but to sleep and feed ? a beast, no more.
> Sure he that made us with such large discourse,
> Looking before and after gave us not
> That capability and god-like reason,
> To fust in us unused."—*Hamlet,* iv. 4.

Let anyone who considers that Bacon's style is altogether unlike that of Shakespeare turn again to the quotations given by Dr. Abbot (who, by the way, does not believe that Bacon wrote the Plays, and cannot therefore be accused of giving prominence to these passages in Baconian interests). Let him take the passage dealing with "Orpheus' Theatre," and compare it with a similar passage in the *Merchant of Venice*. By Bacon "the airs and accords of the harp" are used to illustrate the influence of learning, by Shakespeare the power of music; in each instance the effect is the subduing of "savage and unreclaimed desires" and the bringing into play of the gentler and purer emotions. With regard to the style, it is interesting to note how naturally Shakespeare falls into the triple mode of expression which is one of the characteristics of Bacon's prose:—

"Therefore the poet
Did feign that Orpheus drew *trees, stones, and floods;*
Since nought so *stockish, hard, and full of rage,*
But music for the time doth change his nature."
—*Merchant of Venice*, v. I.

Compare this with the closing lines of the passage quoted above. The impressions of the young lawyer quoted by Dr. Abbot from Spedding deserve the attention of all Baconians, because they represent Bacon in 1594 employing in his "Argument" a peculiarity of style which must have struck even the most casual reader of Shakespeare—the use of unusual words, "rather gracious for their propriety than strange for their novelty." The daring with which Shakespeare introduces unusual words is only surpassed by the wonderful appropriateness with which they are used. Even after three hundred years, we marvel at their "novelty," but feel at the same time that no other word is so exactly suitable. Dr. Abbot calls attention to Bacon's "largeness of vocabulary." Professor Craik tells us that Shakespeare had a vocabulary of twenty-one thousand words, three times that of Milton, more than four times that of Thackeray, and yet we are asked to believe that the Plays were written by a Warwickshire peasant, whose knowledge of languages consisted in what he picked from Lily's Latin Grammar, and who, as far as we know, accomplished no journey but that from Stratford to London and back.

E. S. ALDERSON.

I.—THE CHRONICLE PLAYS.

IN *Advancement of Learning* (ii. 7) Bacon discusses, "*The partition of perfect history, into Chronicles of Times, Lives of Persons, Relations of Acts.*" Here Bacon comes in contact, and actually touches upon, the "*History of Great Brittany,*" and it is here we must seek, if anywhere, for allusions, or parallels, pointing to the Chronicle Plays, called Shakespeare's. Bacon commences :—

"*Just or perfect history* is of three kinds, according to the nature of the object, which it propounds to represent, for it either represents a portion of time, or some memorable person, or some famous act. The first we call *Chronicles or Annals;* the second *Lives;* the third *Relations.* Of these, *Chronicles* seem to excel for celebrity and name; *Lives*, for profit and examples; *Relations*, for sincerity and verity" (*Advt. Learning* vii. 93). After discussing the value of each of these divisions, Bacon proceeds to say: "As touching those points which seem *deficient* in these three kinds of history, without doubt there are many particular histories of some dignity or mediocrity; but leaving the stories of foreign nations to the care of foreign persons, I cannot fail to represent unto your Majesty, the indignity and unworthiness of the *History of England*, as it now is, in the main continuation thereof, as also the partiality and obliquity of that of Scotland, in the latest and largest author thereof" (*Advt. L.*, Book II., 94). In the three kinds of histories—*Chronicles, Lives,* and *Relations*—we have exactly what Bacon understands as perfect history. And when we turn to chap. xiii., Book II. *Advt. Learning* (pages 105, 106), we find Bacon, dividing poetry into exactly the same three divisions, under the same nomenclature. He writes:—

"Under the name of *Poesy* we treat only of *History* feigned at pleasure, the truest partition of *Poesy*, and most appropriate besides those divisions common to it with *History* (*for there are feigned Chronicles, feigned Lives, and feigned Relations*) is this, that it is either *Narrative*, or *Representative*, or *Allusive.* Narrative is a mere imitation of History, that in a manner it deceives us; but that often it extols matters above belief. *Dramatical, or Representative, is, as it were, a visible History; for it sets out the image of things, as if they were present,* and History as if they were past," (p. 106, *Advt. of Learning*, 1640).

Bacon's determination to identify his Chronicles of Times,

his Lives of Persons, and his Relations of Acts, with Poesy (as feigned Chronicles, feigned Lives, feigned Relations), is one of those transparencies, which tell us, that the Historical Chronicle Plays, belong to the realm of Poesy, and to that particular branch of it, which Bacon calls, a visible History—*i.e., Dramatical or Representative Poesy.* We have discovered Bacon introducing the subject of a History of Britain, under this head of a just, or perfect history—viz., embracing a mixture of the *Chronicles of Times, Lives of Persons, Relations of Acts,* and we meet again with these three, as divisions common to poetry, and dramatical, or representative poetry also. It is plain that some powerful, and cogent reason, urged Bacon to draw his definition, of *a just and perfect history, under the heading of Poesy and the Drama!* For what is a poetical history of England (like the Chronicle Plays) but the *Relations of Acts, the Lives of Persons,* and *the Chronicle of Times?* Indeed, under this "*seeming deficiency*" (p. 94), Bacon proposes somebody should write, "The story of England from the uniting of the Roses to the uniting of the kingdoms: a space of time, which in my judgment, contains more variety of rare events, than in like number of successions, ever was known in an hereditary kingdom, for it begins with the mixed title to a crown, partly by might, partly by right—an entry by arms, an establishment by marriage; so these followed times answerable to these beginnings: *like waves after a great tempest, retaining their swellings and agitations, but without extremity of storm, but well passed through by the wisdom of the pilot, being one of the most sufficient kings of all his predecessors*" (*Advt. of Learning* ii., p. 95).

Let it be noted, that Bacon complains only, "Of the indignity and unworthiness, of the history of England, as it now is, *in the main continuation thereof*" (p. 94), and that his recommendation to the king, of a history of England, and Scotland united (as Great Britain), is only to commence, from the date of the union of the Roses, under Henry VII. Perhaps Bacon was quite aware, that the history of England, prior to these events, had already been so performed, that it was scarcely necessary to propose a re-writing of it. Bacon speaks of the times, preceding the union of the Roses, *as a period of great agitation, of stress and storm, likened to a great tempest.* Now, it is just after this simile of swelling waves, and stormy waters, that we find the Wars of the Roses, described, in the Plays of *Henry VI.* and *Richard III.* For example, Queen Margaret likens her son Prince Edward of Lancaster, heir to the throne, *to the*

pilot of the ship of state, coming through the storms and shipwreck of civil war. Also, Bacon uses, just this same simile of *pilot* for Henry VII., who was the next Lancastrian successor to this Prince Edward, after Richard III. had fallen at Bosworth Field:—

> "Great lords, wise men ne'er sit and wail their loss,
> But cheerly seek how to redress their harms.
> What though the mast be now blown overboard,
> The cable broke, the holding anchor lost,
> And half our sailors swallowed in the flood?
> *Yet lives our pilot still.* Is't meet that he
> Should leave the helm, and like a fearful lad
> With tearful eyes add water to the sea,
> And give more strength to that which hath too much,
> Whiles, in his moan, the ship splits on the rock,
> Which industry and courage might have saved?
> Ah, what a shame! Ah, what a fault were this!
> Say Warwick was our anchor; what of that?
> And Montague our topmast; what of him?
> Our slaughtered friends the tackles; what of these?
> Why, is not Oxford here another anchor?
> And Somerset, another goodly mast?
> The friends of France our shrouds and tack-lines?
> And, though unskilful, *why not Ned and I,*
> *For once allow'd the skilful pilot's charge?*
> We will not from the helm to sit and weep,
> But keep our course, though the rough wind say no,
> From shelves and rock that threaten us with wreck.
> As good to chide the waves as speak them fair.
> And what is Edward but a ruthless sea?
> What Clarence but a quicksand of deceit?
> And Richard but a ragged, fatal rock?
> All these the enemies to our poor bark.
> Say you can swim; alas! 'tis but a while!
> Tread on the sand; why, there you quickly sink;
> Bestride the rock; the tide will wash you off,
> Or else you famish—that's a threefold death.
> This speak I, lords, to let you understand,
> In case some one of you would fly from us,
> That there's no hoped for mercy with the brothers,
> More than with ruthless waves, with sands and rocks."
> —3 *Henry VI.* 5, iv.

The "*extremity of storm,*" to which Bacon alludes, are the *tempestuous troubles* of the reign of Richard III., with whose end, the storms of the civil wars, of the Roses ceased, in the union by marriage, of the two houses. These troubles, caused by the minority of the young princes, are thus prophesied and alluded to in *Richard III.*:—

> *Third Cit.*—"Woe to that land that's governed by a child."
> *Second Cit.*—"In him there is a hope of government,
> That, in his nonage, council under him,
> And in his full and ripened years himself,
> No doubt, shall then and till then govern well."

First Cit.—"So stood the state when Henry the Sixth.
Was crown'd in Paris but at nine years old."

. . . . .

Third Cit.—"When clouds appear, wise men put on their cloaks;
When great leaves fall, the winter is at hand;
When the sun sets, who doth not look for night?
Untimely storms make men expect a dearth."

. . . . .

Third Cit.—"Before the times of change, still is it so:
By a divine instinct, men's minds mistrust
Ensuing dangers, as by proof we see
The waters swell before a boisterous storm,
But leave it all to God."
—*Rich. III.* 2, iii.

Here are Bacon's identical words—"*waters swell,*"—"*waves retaining their swellings,*"—with the only difference, that Bacon writes of these self-same troubles, as *after they were passed*, and the passage in the Play, is a presentiment of them *before they occurred!* But the real text, which touches this subject, is to be found, in the opening words, of Bacon's Essay upon *Seditions and Troubles:*—

"*Shepherds of people* had need know the *calendars of Tempests* in State, which are commonly greatest, when things grow to equality, as natural Tempests are greatest about the *Æquinoctia.* And as there are certain hollow blasts of wind, and *secret swelling of seas, before a Tempest,* so are there in states."

"Ille etiam cœcos instare tumultus
Sæpe monet, Fraudesque, et operta tumescere bella."

"He [*i.e.*, the Sun] also, often warns of threatening hidden tumults, and treacheries, and of secret wars, swelling to a head."—(Virgil, *Georgics* i. 465.)

We have in this passage the same image that Bacon uses for the troubles of State, that were known, as the Wars of the Roses,—"*Secret swelling of seas before a Tempest!*" This "agitation of stress and storm," belongs to that period, when the rival factions of the Houses of York and Lancaster, *grew to equality,* when Henry VI. was *the Shepherd of his people,* and also to the period when hidden tumults and troubles (such as the sedition of Jack Cade), grew to a head. The treacheries of Richard Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III., seem to be also here hinted at. But the passage is so wonderfully reflected in these Chronicle Plays, in every particular, that we propose to quote Virgil's original text upon the subject:—

"The sun reveals the secrets of the sky,
And who dares give the source of life the lie?
The change of Empires often he declares,
Fierce tumults, hidden treasons, open wars!
He first the fate of Cæsar did foretell,
And pitied Rome when Rome in Cæsar fell;
In inky clouds concealed the public light,
And impious mortals feared eternal night."
—*Georgics* (Dryden's Translation).

The greater part of the prodigies, or portents, which preceded the death of Julius Cæsar (*Jul. Cæs.*, I. ii.) seem to be borrowed from Virgil's first *Georgic*. But let us take Bacon's text regularly, and *verbatim*, and apply it literally, to the Chronicle Plays of Henry VI. and Richard III.

Bacon uses the expression, "*Shepherds of people,*" *—a very ancient expression, or image, for Kings, Protectors, or Governors of peoples! It is thus King David is styled in the Psalms. And directly we turn to the Plays in question, we find, first, the Protector Duke Humphrey, *styled a shepherd*, and Henry VI. also comparing himself to a shepherd. Good Duke Humphrey, when arrested, and deprived of the Protectorship, exclaims of himself:—

Gloucester.—"Ah! thus King Henry throws away his crutch
Before his legs be firm to bear his body.
Thus is the *Shepherd* beaten from thy side,
And wolves are gnarling who shall gnaw thee first."
—2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act III. i.

There is a deep philosophical and ethical purpose concealed behind the entire text and action of 3 *Henry VI.*, ii. 5. We first have the peaceful picture of a good king, watching the progress of the battle of Towton, and soliloquising upon the joys and happiness of a shepherd's life—*a life of peace and contemplation.*

"Ah what a life were this! how sweet! how lovely!
Gives not the hawthorn bush a sweeter shade
To *shepherds* looking on their silly sheep,
Than doth a rich embroidered canopy
To kings that fear their subjects treachery?

*Bacon writes: "To pass to the first event or occurrence after the Fall of Man, we see (as the Scriptures have infinite mysteries, not violating at all the truth of the story, or letter), *an image of the two states, the Contemplative and Active*, figured in the persons of Abel and Cain, and in their professions and primitive trades of life; whereof the one was a Shepherd, who by reason of his leisure, rest in a place, and free view of heaven, *is a lively image of a contemplative life;* the other a Husbandman, that is a man toiled and tired with working, and his countenance fixed upon the earth, *where we may see the favour and election of God went to the shepherd, and not to the tiller of ground.*"—*Advt. Learning*, Book I., p. 43.

O yes it doth; a thousand-fold it doth.
And to conclude the shepherd's homely curds,
His cold, thin drink out of his leather bottle,
His wonted sleep under a fresh tree's shade,
All which secure, and sweetly he enjoys,
Is far beyond a prince's delicates,
His viands sparkling in a golden cup,
His body couched in a curious bed,
When care, mistrust, and treason waits on him."
—3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II. v.

Immediately on the conclusion of this monologue, we have a horrible scene, or episode, borrowed from the battle-field—*a son who has killed his father dragging in the dead body;* and presently, another episode—*a father that has killed his son bringing in the dead body!*

That these two pictures, of the horrors of civil war, are intentionally introduced, with an ethical purpose, of contrast with the pacific character, and speech of the king, cannot be doubted, because Richmond (Henry VII.) is made to conclude the Play of *Richard III.* with words which refer to these horrors of the civil wars of the Roses:—

"England hath long been mad, and scarr'd herself;
The brother blindly shed the brother's blood,
The father rashly slaughter'd his own son,
The son, compell'd, been butcher to the sire:
All this divided York and Lancaster—
Divided in their dire division."—*Richard III.*, Act V. iii.

In the following passage will be perceived, Bacon's metaphor of contending day and night:—

King.—"This battle fares like to the morning's war,
When dying clouds contend with growing light,
What time the *shepherd*, blowing of his nails,
Can neither call it perfect day nor night.
Forced by the tide to combat with the wind:
Now sways it this way, like a mighty sea,
Now one the better, then another best;
Both tugging to be victors, breast to breast,
Yet neither conqueror, nor conquered:
So is the equal poise of this fell war."
—3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II. v.

This picture, applied not only to the battle, but to the entire war, illustrates fully Bacon's words, that Tempests of State are commonly greatest when things grow to equality, "as natural tempests are greatest about the *Æquinoctia*" (*Seditions and Troubles*). *Æquinoctia*, means equal day and equal night, or "*equal poise*," and the entire passage we cite, is pregnant with this hint, of "equal poise," compared to

a mighty tempest, or battle between wind and tide.* Bacon signifies that equality of parties, not only prolongs a struggle, but makes it fiercer, and to rage more violently, inasmuch as neither party can overcome the other—just as when dying clouds contend with growing light.

The most perfect example of these secrets, of the sun, and sky, showing, as it were, sympathy with fierce tumults, hidden treasons, open wars, is to be found, just before the battle of Shrewsbury, in the first part of *Henry IV.*, when the revolt, or sedition of Hotspur and Douglas was put down :—

> *King.*—"How bloodily the *sun* begins to peer
> Above yon busky hill! The day looks pale
> At his distemperature."
> *Prince.*—"The Southern wind
> Doth play the trumpet to his purposes,
> *And by his hollow whistling in the leaves*
> *Foretells a tempest and a blustering day.*"
> *King.*—"Then with the losers let it sympathise,
> For nothing can seem foul to those that win."
> —1 *Henry IV.*, Act V. i.

Observe Bacon's hand, "*certain hollow blasts of wind,*" in the two lines, placed in italics. What a magnificent prelude for the *tempest of battle* which follows this scene! How we seem to behold the character of the day, and feel the poet's divine awe, inspired into these outward portents, discordant and hollow voices of the air, tuning for the coming fray! So again, we find Edward and Richard, not long before the battle of Towton, beholding *three suns* :—

> *Edward.*—"Dazzle mine eyes, or I do see three suns?"
> *Richard.*—"Three glorious suns, each one a perfect sun;
> Not separated with the racking clouds,
> But sever'd in a pale, clear shining sky.
> See, see! they join, embrace, and seem to kiss,
> As if they vow'd some league inviolable:
> Now are they but one lamp, one light, one *sun*,
> *In this the heaven figures some event.*"
> —3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II. i.

* Salisbury exclaims of King Richard II. :—

> "Thy sun sets weeping in the lowly West,
> *Witnessing storms to come*, woe and unrest.
> Thy friends are fled to wait upon thy foes."
> —*K. Richard II.*, Act II. iv. 21.

Another passage illustrates Bacon :—"For that more men *adored the sun rising than the sun setting.*"—*Friendship Essays*, 1625. Compare:

> *Clifford.*—"Impairing Henry, strengthening misproud York,
> The common people swarm like summer flies;
> *And whither fly the gnats but to the sun?*"
> —3 *Henry VI.*, Act II. vi.

Let it be noticed that Bacon's words, "an entry by arms; an establishment by marriage," which alludes to the succession of King Henry VII., finds reflection in the Play of *Richard III.*, first, in the battle and victory of Bosworth, and in these words of the king :—

> "We will unite the white rose and the red;
> Smile, heaven, upon this fair conjunction,
> That long have frown'd upon their enmity."
> —*Richard III.*, Act V. iii.

Before the battle of Bosworth, Richmond exclaims :—

> "The weary *sun* hath made a golden set,
> And, by the bright track of his fiery car,
> Gives signal of a goodly day to-morrow."
> —*K. Richard III.*, Act V. ii.

On the other hand, we find King Richard III. asking for a *Calendar,* just before the battle, in order to consult *the time of sunrise.*

> *K. Richard.*—"Tell the clock there. Give me a *calendar.*
> Who saw the *sun* to-day?"
> *Ratcliff.*—"Not I, my lord."
> *K. Richard.*—"Then he disdains to shine; for by the book
> He should have braved the East an hour ago,
> *A black day will it be for somebody.*"
> *Richard III.*, Act V. iii. 280.

Let us recall Bacon's text:—"*Shepherds* of people had need know the *Calendar of Tempests** in state;" which paraphrased means, "Kings had need know the time (or hour) of political storms, and troubles, so as to be able to be prepared for them." Bacon intends also to illustrate the sympathy and antipathy of the heavens, and external nature, with the issues and fortunes of great events and battles upon the world's stage. Nature is not a mere spectator only, but gives secret tokens and presentiments of things to come. Thus Richard III. exclaims :—

> "The sun will not be seen to-day;
> The sky doth frown and lour upon our army.
> I would these dewy tears were from the ground,
> Not shine to-day! Why, what is that to me,
> More than to Richmond? For the self-same heaven,
> That frown on me looks sadly upon him."—*Ib.*

Let it be further pointed out, that the alternate successes and defeats, of the rival Houses of York and Lancaster, are

* Bacon's imagery of *tempests*, applied to wars and battles, is to be found abundantly in the Plays. Warwick exclaims to Clifford :—

> "To keep thee from the *tempest* of the field."
> —*Richard III.*, Act V. iii.

compared to the succession of winter and summer, or we might say, to the equinoxes. Richard III. directly he ascends the throne, exclaims :—

> "Now is the *winter* of our discontent
> Made glorious *summer* by this *sun* of York."
> *K. Richard III.* Act I. i.

So, in like manner, Richard's "glorious summer," *was made winter again*, by Richmond (at the battle of Bosworth), by the sun of Lancaster rising whilst the sun of York set. This is no fanciful theory, but is a metaphor very consistently, and widely applied to the Plays. In Richard II. we read :—

> "Men judge by the complexion of the sky
> The state and inclinations of the day."

And Bacon applies this idea politically, in a profound metaphor, which gives us a key for the authorship of these Chronicle Plays.

> "From Richard's night to Bolingbroke's fair day," (*Ib.*)

is the same sort of imagery, borrowed from the sun :—

> "See, see, King Richard doth himself appear,
> As doth the blushing, discontented sun.'—Act III. iii.

It is at the time of the equinoxes that winter and summer, in their struggle of light over darkness, and *vice versa*, commence. It is true we have two grades, or shades, of these oppositions, called spring and autumn, but practically it is at the equinoxes that light and darkness prevail over one another, and it is this idea, of the conflict of light and darkness, which Bacon has applied, to the rising and setting of the suns of the Houses of York and Lancaster, and their rival factions. But we go farther than this. Bacon applies to government the image of *Primum Mobile*, wherein (as presently quoted) the greatest persons in a Government are compared to the planets, "*carried swiftly by the highest motion and softly in their own motion*," meaning that as the King is the sun, so the nobles are planets obedient to the sun, yet revolving each in their particular or private motion. Compare this address of Henry IV. to the rebel nobles, Worcester and Vernon, just before the battle of Shrewsbury :—

> "What say you to it? Will you again unknit
> This churlish knot of all-abhorred war?
> And move in that obedient orb again
> Where you did give a fair and natural light,
> And be no more an exhaled meteor."
> 1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act V., i.

Bacon states that one of the causes of seditions and troubles, is *burthensome taxations.* The following passage illustrates this, and once more presents the seditions and troubles, arising in Ireland, and in England, from the approaching landing of Harry, Duke of Hereford, as a storm, or tempest!

> *Willoughby*:—"The King's grown bankrupt like a broken man."
> *Northumberland*:—"Reproach and dissolution hangeth over him."
> *Ross*:—"He hath not money for these Irish wars,
> His burthensome taxations notwithstanding;
> But by the robbing of the banish'd duke."
> *North*:—"His noble kinsman: most degenerate king!
> *But, lords, we hear this fearful tempest sing,*
> *Yet seek no shelter to avoid the storm;*
> We see the wind sit sore upon our sails,
> And yet we strike not, but securely perish."
> *K. Richard II.*, Act II. iii.

In like manner, Bolingbroke says:—

> "It is such crimson *tempest* should bedrench
> The fresh green lap of fair King Richard's land."
> —Act III. iii.

Bacon writes:—" Neither let any prince, or state, be secure concerning discontentments (the alienation of minds, and the increase of envy), because they have often, or have been long, and yet no peril has ensued. For, as it is true, *that every vapour, or fume, doth not turn into a storm;* so it is, nevertheless true, *that storms, though they blow over divers times, yet may fall at last."—Seditions and Troubles,* 1625.

Compare Edward IV.'s speech on Barnet battle-field:—

> *King*:—"I spy a black, suspicious, threatening cloud,
> That will encounter with our glorious sun,
> Ere he attain his easeful western bed:
> I mean, my lords, those powers that the Queen
> Hath raised in Gallia have arrived our coast,
> And, as we hear, march on to fight with us."
> *Clarence*:—"A little gale will soon disperse that cloud,
> And blow it to the source from whence it came:
> The very beams will dry those *vapours* up,
> *For every cloud engenders not a storm.*"
> 3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act V. iii.

Here are Bacon's own expressions, "vapour," "storm," in the same metaphors, applied to exactly the same things, risings and war troubles! The context fully carries out the hint Bacon gives us. Edward affected to fear, and Clarence to deprecate, the danger threatening from the invasion of Queen Margaret, who was joined by Somerset and Oxford—her forces being thirty thousand strong. Clarence's light treatment of the war cloud threatening the King, found its

rebuke in the battle of Tewkesbury, which immediately follows this dialogue quoted. Queen Margaret's speech opens Sc. iv., and to this speech we have already drawn attention.

Bacon writes: "It is commonly seen that men once placed, take in with the contrary faction to that by which they enter; thinking belike that they have the first sure, *and now are ready for a new purchase."—Essays. Faction.*

This change of coat, or party, is fully realized in the character of Earl Warwick, called the King-maker. Edward IV., alluding to this, exclaims:—

> "Write in the dust this sentence with thy blood,
> Windchanging Warwick now can change no more."
> 3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. i.

Bacon's wonderful insight into motives of this sort, is fully realized in the political arena of this present day. Men commence by being either Conservatives, or Liberals, and often go over to the other side, for the sake of the purchase price they obtain (by so doing), be it title, office, promotion, preferment, or social gain. Note, how Earl Warwick is *identified with the wind.* Bacon writes:—"That the people were like the sea, would be quiet *if the orators, like the wind, did not put them into agitation.*" (*Adv. L.*, Bk. *VII.*, p. 354). Warwick is described as follows:—

> "Ay, now begins a second storm to rise;
> For this is he that moves both wind and tide."
> —3 *K. Henry VI.*, Act III. iii.

The Duke of York exclaims:—

> "I will stir up in England some black *storm*,
> Shall blow ten thousand souls to heaven, or hell;
> And this fell *tempest* shall not cease to rage,
> Until the golden circuit on my head,
> Like to the glorious sun's transparent beams,
> Do calm the fury of this mad-bred flaw."
> —2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act III. i.

Observe the Baconian imagery—storm—tempest—sun. It was this Duke of York, who incited Jack Cade to sedition, and who stirred up trouble, expressly to further his ambition for the crown. Kings are always compared to suns in the Plays. For example, *Henry VIII.* and *Francis the First* are compared to suns:—

> *Buck.*— "When
> Those *suns of glory*, those two lights of men,
> Met in the field of Andren."—*Henry VIII.*, Act I. i.

Richard II.—"O that I were a mockery King of snow,
Standing before the *sun* of Bolingbroke;
To melt myself away in water drops."
—*K. Richard II.*, Act IV. i.

Henry V. is described :—

"His sparkling eyes, replete with wrathful fire,
More dazzled and drove back his enemies,
Than *mid-day sun* fierce bent against their faces."
—1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act I. i.

Bacon, on the accession of James the First, writes to Mr. Faules: "We all thirst after the King's coming, accounting all this, but as the dawning of the day, *before the rising of the sun*, till we have his presence" (letter to Mr. Faules, 28th March, 1603, p. 24, Resuscitatio 1661, letter). "Yet we account it, but a fair morn *before sun rising*, before his Majestie's presence" (Letter to Mr. Kemp, *Ib.*).

K. Henry V.—"But I will *rise there* with so full a glory,
That I will dazzle all the eyes of France;
Yea, strike the Dauphin blind to look on us."
—*Henry V.*, Act I. ii. 278.

In a very striking metaphor, Bacon compares, *civil war to a fever*, because it occurs, *within the body politic* :—"A civil war, indeed, *is like the heat of a fever*, but a foreign war, is like the heat of exercise" (*Greatness of Kingdoms*, 1625). Again :—"In the *politic body* (discontentments) are like to humours *in the natural* (*body*), which are apt to gather a praternatural heat, and to inflame" (*Essays Seditions and Troubles*, 1625).

This idea is fully carried out in the Plays, with regard to the civil wars of the reigns of *Richard II.* and *Henry IV.* The Archbishop of York exclaims :—

"Briefly to this end: we are all diseased,
And with our surfeiting and wanton hours,
Have brought ourselves into a burning fever,
And we must bleed for it; of which disease;
Our late King, Richard, being infected, died.
But, my most noble Lord of Westmoreland,
I take not on me here as a physician;
Nor do I as an enemy to peace,
Troop in the throngs of military men;
But rather show awhile like fearful war,
To diet rank minds, sick of happiness;
And purge the obstructions, which begin to stop
Our very veins of life."—2 *K. Henry IV.*, Act IV. i.

It is of war, of rebellion, of base and bloody insurrection, that this passage *alone refers to*. This Baconian sickness of the state, or body politic, once more appears in the following :—

> *King.*—"Then you perceive *the body of our Kingdom*,
> How foul it is; what rank diseases grow,
> And with what danger near the heart of it.'
> *Warwick.*—" It is but *as a body*, yet it is distemper'd;
> Which to his former strength may be restored,
> With good advice and little medicine."
> —2 *K. Henry IV.*, Act III. i.

In 1 *Henry VI.* we find Vernon and Basset (respectively of the White Rose, or York faction, and of the Red Rose, or Lancaster faction), openly quarrelling *in court, in the presence of the King and Gloucester*, and being reproved for so doing by the latter :—

> *Glou.*—" Confounded be your strife!
> And perish ye, with your audacious prate!
> Presumptuous vassals, are you not ashamed,
> With this immodest, clamorous outrage,
> To trouble and disturb the King and us?"
> —1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act IV. i. 123.

Exeter comments upon this open carrying of faction in court, thus :—

> " But howso'er, no simple man that sees,
> This jarring discord of nobility,
> *This shouldering of each other in the court,*
> *This factious bandying of their favorites,*
> But that it doth presage some ill event."—*Ib.*

In the same *Essay of Seditions and Troubles*, Bacon writes upon this point of *carrying faction openly*, as follows, wherein it will be perceived the text is exactly illustrated by the above lines cited. "Also, when discords, and quarrels, and *factions, are carried openly, and audaciously;* it is a sign, the reverence of government is lost. For the motions of the greatest persons, in a government, ought to be, as the motions of the planets, under *Primum Mobile;* according to the old opinion, which is, that everyone of them, is carried swiftly by the highest motion, and softly in their own motion. And therefore, when great ones, in their own particular motion move violently, and as Tacitus expresseth it well, '*Liberius quam ut Imperantium meminissent*,' it is a sign, the orbs are out of frame. For reverence is that wherewith princes are girt from God, who threatens the dissolving thereof, '*Solvam Cingula Regum.*' So when any of the four pillars of government, are mainly shaken, or weakened (which are Religion, Justice, Counsel, and Treasure) *men had used to pray for fair weather*" (*Seditions and Troubles*, 1625). In the Latin the word government is rendered "*Erga Principem*," towards the sovereign.

In the same scene, we find the King, *putting on a red rose*, and exclaiming :—

"Let me be umpire in this doubtful strife ;
I see no reason, if I wear this rose,"
(Putting on a red rose)
"That anyone should therefore be suspicious
I more incline to Somerset than York."
—1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act IV. i.

* * * * *

Nevertheless, this act of the King, was interpreted as a leaning towards the faction of Lancaster, as witness Exeter's remarks :—

Warwick.—"My Lord of York, I promise you, the King
Prettily, methought, did play the orator."
Exeter.—"And so he did, *but yet I like it not,*
In that he wears the badge of Somerset."—*Ib.*

This finds illustration in Bacon's words upon the causes of seditions and troubles :—"Also, as Macchiavel noteth well, when Princes that ought to be common parties, *make themselves as a party, and lean to a side, it is as a boat that is overthrown by uneven weight on the one side.* For when the authority of Princes is made but an accessory to a cause, and there be other bands that tie faster than the band of sovereignty, Kings begin to be put almost out of possession of authority" (*Seditions and Troubles*, 1625). This was completely realized in the case of Henry VI., who was almost put out of authority, by the factions, and bands, of the houses of York and Lancaster. The King in permitting the intrigue of Cardinal Beaufort, of the Queen, and Suffolk, to succeed in the deposing of good Duke Humphrey, of Gloucester, from the protectorship, sealed his own fate, and became lost in the rivalry of the factions, and the jealousies, which his leaning to one faction caused. The subject is too large a one to enter upon in this paper, but the "*factions and the bands,*" Bacon hints at, may be clearly realized in the power of Warwick, the King-maker, who possessed the secret of tieing, or binding together his party. A corroboration of Bacon's hint, is found in the fact, he repeats the observation in his Essay upon Faction. "Kings had need beware how they side themselves, and make themselves as of a faction or party" (Factioni alicui Subditorum suorum) (*Faction. Essays*, 1625).

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

MR. S. LEE'S *LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE.*

IN his Preface to his *Life of Shakespeare,* which was recently awarded a prize of fifty guineas by the Editor of *The Academy*, as one of the three best books of the year 1898, Mr. Lee states that "Shakesperean literature, as far as it is known to me, still lacks a book that shall supply within a brief compass an exhaustive and well-arranged statement of the facts of Shakespeare's career, achievement, and reputation; that shall reduce conjecture to the smallest dimensions consistent with coherence, and shall give verifiable references to all the original sources of information." That book is still to come, as Mr. Lee's *Life* is, from start to finish, not "a statement of facts," but a huge mass of conjecture.

Here are a few of the conjectures, picked out at haphazard from the work :—

"There is every probability that his ancestors."
"Probably his birthplace."
"Some doubt is justifiable as to the ordinarily accepted scene of his birth."
"All the evidence points to the conclusion."
"One of them doubtless the alleged birthplace."
"There is no inherent improbability in the tale."
"William probably entered the school."
"There seems good ground for regarding."
"Probably in 1577 he was enlisted by his father."
"It is possible that John's ill-luck."
"Shakespeare's friends may have called the attention of the strolling players to the homeless lad."
"The wedding probably took place."
"The circumstances make it highly improbable."
"Renders it improbable."
"It is unlikely that."
"It seems possible."
"Probably his ignorance of affairs."
"From such incidents doubtless sprang."
"He was doubtless another."
"His intellectual capacity and the amiability . . . . were probably soon recognised."
"It is unsafe to assume."
"But there seems no doubt."
"All the evidence points to the conclusion."
"It is fair to infer."

"Justice Shallow is beyond doubt a reminiscence."
"The Rose was doubtless the earliest scene."
"It was doubtless performing."
"He doubtless owed all (*i.e.*, his realistic portrayal of Italian life and sentiment) to the verbal reports of travelled friends, or to books."
"Shakespeare may be credited with."
"The whole of Shakespeare's dramatic work was probably begun."
"It was, doubtless, to Shakespeare's personal relations."
"Shakespeare doubtless gained."
"There is no external evidence."
"It is just possible."
"The tirade was probably inspired."
"The many references to travel in the *Sonnets* were, doubtless, reminiscences."
"That Shakespeare visited any part of the Continent is even less probable."
"That Shakespeare joined any of these expeditions is highly improbable."
"Renders it almost impossible that he could have gathered his knowledge of Northern Italy from personal observation."
"It is in fact unlikely that Shakespeare ever set foot on the Continent of Europe."
"Shakespeare had probably Latin enough for the purpose."
"It was not probably with the object."
"Shakespeare may have seen."
"It was, doubtless, with the calculated aim."
"Shakespeare might find."
"He might clearly have acquired his knowledge."
"Probably of Shakespeare's."
"He probably had a practical knowledge of Latin."
"It is possible that some of his labours."
"Depends largely on conjecture."
"The play was revised, probably, for a performance."
"It was probably founded on a play."
"After having, in all probability, undergone some revision."
"It is possible that Shakespeare."
"He would doubtless have shown in his writings."
"They were doubtless put on the stage."
"Within a brief interval, possibly for a revival."
"The theme was doubtless first suggested."
"Was doubtless taken in hand."
"Doubtless the popular interest."

"There is little doubt that Shakespeare."
"The scene was probably from the pen."
"In all probability the *Merry Wives*."
"We may assume."
"Tradition reports that Shakespeare joined."
"There is no ground for assuming."
"There is every indication that."
"There is a likelihood that." } (Within eight lines.)
"There is no reason to dispute."
"It was probably about 1571 that William."
"It was probably in 1596 that Shakespeare."
"It was doubtless under Shakespeare's guidance."
"There is every reason to believe."
"Shakespeare was doubtless withdrawn."
"If, as is possible, it be by Shakespeare."
"Shakespeare does not appear to have."
"But in all probability he drew."
"In all probability it was."
"English actors may have brought."
"It is likely enough that."
"It is hardly possible to doubt."
"There is a likelihood, too."
"It is hardly doubtful that."
"There is every likelihood that."
"Doubtless, William."
"Shakespeare, doubtless, travelled."
"His summons to act at Court was possibly due."

And Mr. Lee calls this a *Life!* The whole story he relates is not that Shakespeare was the author, but that the dramas were allowed without challenge—and without a claim on the part of the reputed author—to pass as his. The *Life*, certainly, as we have shown from our extracts, does infinite credit to Mr. Lee's powers of invention and imagination. It is a pleasant little fable, the construction of which must have been attended with considerable poetic rapture. The *Life* is very amusing and very romantic, but as for the history or logic of the case, both are conspicuously absent; "the muse of history returns to the nursery, where she dresses up a doll, and puts on grandma's spectacles," as was once aptly said in the *Journal of the Bacon Society*, when Mrs. Stopes declared that Shakespeare drank "nectar," and Bacon "wine and beer." Mrs. Stopes might have suggested where the "nectar" was brewed.

The title, *Life of William Shakespeare*, which Mr. Sidney Lee has given to his book is, therefore, a misnomer. It is not a *Life*, but a learned and elaborate treatise, in which conjecture takes the place of fact, with a catalogue *raisonné* of certain Poems and Plays which were associated with the name of William Shakespeare, which Mr. Lee says William Shakespeare never claimed as his own; and absolutely detached from this, is an account of what is known of the man, with question-begging embellishments derived from the *Poems* and *Sonnets*. All that Mr. Lee says about William Shakespeare—and it is about as little as Mr. Halliwell-Phillips had to say in his *Outlines*—might be omitted, and the value of the book would not be in the least impaired.

Bacon, of course, is never mentioned in the body of the work; but Mr. Lee dismisses the Baconian case in a brief and contemptuous (as well as contemptible) "Appendix," implying that no solid argument on our side exists, and that we "have no rational right to a hearing," ascribing to us "defective knowledge, and illogical or casuistical argument." (How different the opinion of Mr. Gladstone, who stated, "Considering what Bacon was, I have always regarded the discussion as one *perfectly serious and to be respected*.") At the same time Mr. Lee quotes, in a dozen lines, the impression of Shakespeare's personal character as recorded by Chettle, the Parnassus poet, Anthony Scoloker, and Ben Jonson—all of them of doubtful relevance, especially the latter, who abused Shakespeare during his life, and praised him after his death, on the principle of *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*. As Mr. George Wyndham says in his recent work on the *Sonnets*:—"Jonson praised Shakespeare after his death, but not before it. Jonson was the leader of the learned fraternity of log-rollers." And then Mr. Lee is brought to confess that "no other contemporary left on record any definite impression of William Shakespeare's personal character."

In regard to the "Parallelisms," Mr. Lee declares that "most of them that are commonly quoted are phrases in ordinary use by all writers of the day"—a statement very far removed from the truth. With reference to the mistake made both in Bacon and Shakespeare as to the use of the words "*moral* philosophy" for "*political* philosophy," Mr. Lee advances the ingenious argument (not at all "illogical" or "casuistical," like the arguments of the Baconians) that Aristotle meant "moral" when he wrote "political." As was stated in the last number of BACONIANA, the only way

out of the difficulty is that both Shakespeare and Bacon knew what Aristotle meant, and corrected Aristotle accordingly!

As to the "Parallelisms" consisting, as Mr. Lee declares, of "phrases in ordinary use by all writers of the day," here are two specimens to which perhaps Mr. Lee will supply a third parallel from any of the works of the contemporaries of Shakespeare and Bacon:—

SHAKESPEARE.	BACON.
"I saw him run after a gilded butterfly; and, when he caught it, he let it go again; and after it again."	"To be like a child following a bird, which, when he is nearest, flyeth away and lighteth a little before; and then the child after it again."

SHAKESPEARE.	BACON.
"Yet nature is made better by no mean. But nature makes that mean: so, over that art Which you say adds to nature, is an art That nature makes. . . . This is an art Which does mend nature, change it rather, but The art itself is nature."	"I am the more induced to set down the History of the Arts as a species of Natural History, because an opinion has been long prevalent that Art is something different from Nature, and things artificial from things natural. Whereas men ought, on the contrary, to be surely persuaded of this—that the artificial does not differ from the natural in form or essence, but only in the efficient, . . . it is Nature which governs everything. . . . All I mean is that Nature, like Proteus, is forced by Art to do that which, without Art, would not be done."

Can Mr. Lee produce a passage in any work by any other Elizabethan writer in which this axiom—that "art is nature"—is enunciated? If he fails, I maintain the resemblance cannot be accidental, unless he insists that in the first example Shakespeare plagiarised from Bacon's *unpublished* works, and in the second Bacon plagiarised from Shakespeare, and then claimed the result as his own original theory. The dates of the first Parallelism (*Coriolanus* and *Letter to Greville*) are 1609 and 1595 respectively, and of the other (*A Winter's Tale* and *Description of the Intellectual Globe*) 1611 and 1611 or 1612.

Mr. Lee will not have it (for, observe, these conclusions are so many manifestations of self-will) that Shakespeare knew Greek. He says:—"The rudiments of Greek were occasionally taught in Elizabethan grammar schools to very promising pupils; but such coincidences as have been detected between expressions in Greek plays and in Shakespeare seem due to

accident, and not to any study, either at school or elsewhere, of the Athenian drama." Well, that the writer of the Shakespearean dramas had a knowledge of Greek—I do not say the Greek drama—I think I can prove to Mr. Lee. I have no doubt that if I can show him that "Shakespeare" was acquainted with Plato in the original, he may acknowledge that "Shakespeare" knew more than "the rudiments of Greek occasionally taught in Elizabethan grammar schools."

In 1 *Henry VI.*, I. vi. appear the lines:—

> "Thy promises are like Adonis' gardens,
> That one day bloomed, and fruitful were the next."

On this Schmidt, in his *Lexicon*, remarks:—"Perhaps confounded with the garden of King Alcinous in the *Odyssey*." While the eminent Shakespearean scholar, R. S. White, says:—"No mention of any such garden in the classic writings of Greece and Rome is known to scholars." The reference has always been a puzzle to critics, till recently it was discovered that the couplet must have been suggested by Plato, in whose *Phaedrus*, as translated by Jowett, we find the following:—"Would a husbandman, said Socrates, who is a man of sense, take the seeds, which he values and which he wishes to be fruitful, and in sober earnest plant them during the heat of summer, *in some garden of Adonis*, that he may rejoice when he sees them in eight days appearing in beauty? Would he not do that, if at all, to please the spectators at a festival? But the seeds about which he is in earnest he sows in fitting soil, and practices husbandry, and is satisfied if in eight months they come to perfection."

"Oh," Mr. Sidney Lee will say, "what about that? Shakespeare got it from a translation." But unfortunately for this argument, although a *Greek* copy of the *Phaedrus* was published in 1581, there was no *English* translation till 1701. The writer of the Plays, therefore, could read Greek, and such Greek as *Phaedrus*. If I am wrong, I would ask Mr. Lee, Where did Shakespeare get his reference to "Adonis' gardens?"

With regard to the marvellous knowledge of law throughout the dramas, Mr. Lee says:—"In view of his general quickness of apprehension, Shakespeare's accurate use of legal terms, which deserves all the attention that has been paid it, may be attributable in part to the many legal processes in which his father was involved, and in part to early intercourse with members of the Inns of Court."

Is Mr. Lee serious in his contention that an acquaintance with his father's "legal processes" and "intercourse" with a few barristers could give Shakespeare the knowledge of law displayed in the dramas? Has Mr. Lee ever met with a case of this kind, in which accurate legal knowledge has been picked up from social intercourse with lawyers? Lord Chief Justice Campbell said the author of the plays showed himself "to be very familiar with some of the most abstruse proceedings in English jurisprudence," and that in the *Comedy of Errors* "a deep technical knowledge of the law is displayed." And again, "He uniformly lays down good law." "While novelists and dramatists," he adds, "are constantly making mistakes as to the law of marriage, of wills and of inheritance, to Shakespeare's law, lavishly as he propounds it, there can be neither dimurrer, nor bill of exception, nor writ of error." Of Sonnet xlvi. Lord Campbell says:—"I need not go farther than this Sonnet, which is so intensely legal in its language and imagery that without a considerable knowledge of English forensic procedure it cannot be fully understood."

Mr. Sidney Lee, Shakespearean scholar, is answered by Mr. Richard Grant White, Shakespearean scholar, to the following effect:—"As the Courts of Law in Shakespeare's time occupied public attention much more than they do now, it has been suggested that it was in attendance upon them that he picked up his legal vocabulary. But this supposition not only fails to account for Shakespeare's peculiar freedom and exactness in the use of that phraseology—it does not even place him in the way of learning those terms, his use of which is most remarkable, which are not such as he would have heard at ordinary proceedings at *nisi prius*, but such as refer to the tenure or transfer of real property—'fine and recovery,' 'statutes merchant,' 'purchase,' 'indenture,' 'tenure,' 'double voucher,' 'fee simple,' 'fee farm,' 'remainder,' 'reversion,' 'forfeiture,' etc." This conveyancer's jargon could not have been picked up by hanging around the Courts of Law in London 250 years ago, when suits as to the title to real property were comparatively so rare. And besides, Shakespeare uses his law just as freely in his early Plays, written in his first London years, as in those produced at a later period. Just as exactly, too; for the correctness and propriety with which these terms are introduced have compelled the admiration of a Chief Justice and a Lord Chancellor. Both Mr. Lee and Mr. White are agreed that Shakespeare was not a lawyer's clerk, the only point on which they appear to agree with regard to the legal lore found in the dramas.

Professor Newman once wrote:—"The late Judge, Lord Campbell, declares that no man can by genius know law; that Thackeray and Dickens often go wrong in law, but Shakespeare never."

In Mr. F. F. Heard's work, "Shakespeare a Lawyer," it is said: "Authors do not use technical terms in the familiar way in which Shakespeare speaks of the law, unless the terms really are familiar to them by frequent use; and we find these terms and allusions used by him in an apparently unconscious way as the natural turn of his thoughts."

Another Shakespearean, Mr. Appleton Morgan, declares: "Admitting William Shakespeare to have written that grave-yard scene [in *Hamlet*], William Shakespeare was a practising lawyer."

What has Mr. Lee to say to these statements? Perhaps he agrees with Mr. Fiske, who wrote in the *Atlantic Monthly*, that "The author of *Hamlet* might easily have got all the knowledge [*of law*] involved from an evening chat with some legal friend at an ale-house." If that is where Shakespeare obtained his legal knowledge, it must have cost him some money, at any rate, and the less said about it the better.

On page 33 of this work, from which conjecture is almost entirely banished, the following passage occurs:—"Shakespeare's friends [*at Stratford*] *may have* called the attention of the strolling players [*on a visit to Stratford*] to the homeless lad, rumours of whose search for employment about the London theatres had *doubtless* reached Stratford. From such incidents *seems* to have sprung the opportunity which offered Shakespeare fame and fortune. . . . His intellectual capacity, and the amiability with which he turned to account his versatile powers *were probably* soon recognised, and thenceforth his promotion was assured." It is quite affecting—this lively interest Shakespeare's friends in Stratford must have taken in the "homeless lad," who, according to Sir Theodore Martin and Mrs. Stopes, fled from Stratford after his deer-stealing exploits with the MS. of *Venus and Adonis* "in his pocket," and held horses at the stage door! "There is no inherent improbability in the tale," says Mr. Lee. Can Shakespearean "faith" such as this find its parallel in any item of the Baconian creed?

On page 30, Mr. Lee declares that "the knowledge of a soldier's life which Shakespeare exhibited in his plays is no greater and no less than that which he displayed of almost all other spheres of human activity, and to assume that he wrote

of all or of any from practical experience, unless the evidence be conclusive, is to underrate his intuitive power of realising life under almost every aspect *by force of his imagination.*" This is the sum total of the Shakespearean argument—"intuitive power of realising life under almost every aspect by force of his imagination." This, we are asked to believe, enabled Shakespeare "to master" (according to Schlegel) "all the things and relations of this world." As Mr. Edwin Reed well says: "No man ever did, and, it is safe to say, no man ever can acquire knowledge intuitively. The fruit of the tree of knowledge can be reached only by hard climbing, the sole instance on record in which it was plucked and handed down to the waiting recipient having proved a failure." Bacon did the hard climbing; as he tells his uncle, "he had taken all knowledge for his province." There is no proof forthcoming that Shakespeare climbed the tree of knowledge. According to Mr. Lee, there was no necessity. He stood below with his mouth open, and the fruit dropped down *intuitively.* Lucky Shakespeare!

Mr. Lee then tells us: "It is, in fact, unlikely that Shakespeare ever set foot on the continent of Europe in either a private or professional capacity," and that it is "almost impossible that he could have gathered his knowledge of Northern Italy from personal observation. He doubtless owed all to the verbal reports of travelled friends or to books, the contents of which he had a rare power of assimilating and vitalising." We are not told what books, or where the books are. On this argument of Mr. Lee's, *The Athenæum,* so far back as 13th September, 1856, had the following remarks by the Editor:—"The most striking difficulty, perhaps, lies in the descriptions of foreign scenes, particularly of Italian scenes, and of sea-life, interwoven with the text of the Plays—descriptions so numerous and so marvellously accurate that it is almost impossible to believe they were written by a man who lived in London and Stratford, who never left this island, and who saw the world only from a strollers' booth. Every reader of the Plays has felt this difficulty, and theories have been formed of imaginary Shakespeare travels, in order to account for the minute local truth and the prevalence of local colour. It is not easy to conceive the *Merchant of Venice* as coming from the brain of one who had never strolled on the Rialto, or sunned himself on the slopes of Monte Bello."

Professor Elze also brings direct evidence to prove that the writer of the Plays had visited Mantua, and knew Italian

localities and home-life as no mere untravelled book-worm could, and Professor Hales agrees with Elze. But perhaps Shakespeare had access to some Elizabethan Baedekers or Murrays, unknown to Baconians.

With regard to Shakespeare's knowledge of Italian, Mr. Lee says:—"He doubtless possessed just sufficient acquaintance with Italian to enable him to discuss the drift of an Italian poem or novel," referring, as his authority, to Spencer Baynes' "What Shakespeare Learnt at School." He then acknowledges that the plot of the *Merchant of Venice* was taken from "Il Pecorone," and states that "the story followed by Shakespeare was not accessible in his day in any language but the original Italian," and again, "Several of the books in French and Italian, whence Shakespeare derived the plots of his dramas, were not accessible to him in any English translation," while on p. 236 we are informed that "Cinthio's painful story of Othello is not known to have been translated into English before Shakespeare dramatised. *He followed its main drift with fidelity.*" That the writer of the Plays had more than this smattering of Italian is proved by the fact that he must have read Vasari's *Lives of the Painters* in the original Italian. This is a fact of which Mr. Lee appears to be unaware.

In *A Winter's Tale* the statue of Hermione is called "a piece . . . now newly-performed by that rare Italian master, Julio Romano." Now this same Romano was known as a painter, not a sculptor. In the *first edition* of Vasari's *Lives of the Painters*, published in 1550, and never translated from its original Italian, we are informed that Romano did work in sculpture. In the *second edition*, published in 1568, and translated into several languages, this information is not given. Romano is there described as a painter. Either then the author of *A Winter's Tale* must have read the first edition of Vasari in the original Italian, or else he must have travelled in Italy and gazed upon statues by Romano. Of course, Mr. Lee will answer: Shakespeare owed his information to "the verbal reports of travelled friends," to which is also to be ascribed the knowledge of Venice, Padua, Verona, Mantua, and Milan, displayed in the dramas. What a host of convenient tutors William Shakespeare must have employed, providing his "intuitive power" with all its working material!

Then we are informed that "Shakespeare's accurate reference in *Macbeth* to the 'nimble' but 'sweet' climate of Inverness, and the vivid impression he conveys of the aspects of wild Highland heaths . . . can be satisfactorily accounted

for by his inevitable intercourse with Scotsmen in London and the theatres." Obliging Scotsmen! We wonder how many London Scotsmen of the period had ever been so far north as Inverness?

Again: "It was doubtless to Shakespeare's personal relations with men and women of the Court that his Sonnets owed their existence." From this we learn that Shakespeare, the actor and playwright, was the intimate friend of the nobility at the Court of Elizabeth and James. Yet Mr. Halliwell Phillips, "the soundest scholar among Shakespeare's biographers," according to Mr. Lee, tells us that "actors occupied an inferior position in society, and that even the vocation of a dramatic writer was considered scarcely respectable," and Dr. Ingleby has it that "at this day we can scarcely realise the scorn which was thrown on all sides upon those who made acting a means of livelihood. Let their lives be as clearly and their dealings as upright as they might, they were deemed to be *sans aveu*, runaways and vagrants." But, according to Mr. Lee, they were welcome guests at Court. Perhaps, it was also due to these same "personal relations with men and women of the Court" that we are to ascribe the aristocratic leanings of the author of the plays, who, we are told, fled from Stratford for killing an aristocrat's deer, and was first employed in holding aristocrats' horses at the door of the theatre! This strong aristocratic spirit is treated in an able fashion by Mr. Frank Harris, in a recent number of the *Saturday Review*, where he says: "Nor had the political philosophy then come into being which leads able men of our time to distrust all the ideas and beliefs which are current in the day and hour. No one in the sixteenth century sought for this reason to sever himself from the opinions and customs that obtained about him, and if a Bacon regarded the social peculiarities of his time as immutable and necessary laws, Shakespeare may be forgiven for not having followed this special science further than the famous lawyer and law-maker. Besides, Shakespeare's aristocratic leanings and his dislike of the vulgar must have been intensified by the every day incidents of his trade. . . . Naturally enough, Shakespeare came to detest the middle classes, even more than he detested the commons. . . . It is no wonder that Shakespeare makes his 'citizens' contemptible. But nothing in his time and in his calling, nothing, in fact, but imperious bent of nature, can explain that love of aristocracy which betrays itself in all his works. . . . There can be no denying that the bias of Shake-

speare in favour of the aristocrat narrowed his vision of life." How did Shakespeare come to despise the class to which he himself belonged? Bacon's "aristocratic leanings" are well known. In fact, Dean Church, says:—"Bacon had no sympathy with popular wants and claims; of popularity and all that was called popular, he had the deepest suspicion and dislike." This is the spirit everywhere displayed in the Shakespearean dramas, where we are ever meeting with such expressions as the "mob," the "unmasked rabble," the "swinish rabble," &c.

It is also worthy of note that in his appendix Mr. Lee acknowledges that "of the sixteen plays of his (Shakespeare's) that were published in his life-time, not one was printed with his sanction. He made no audible protest when seven contemptible dramas in which he had no hand were published with his name or initials on the title-page, while his fame was at its height." How does Mr. Lee explain what he calls this "utter indifference to all questions touching the publication of his works?" May I suggest the natural answer—Because, though he produced the plays, he was not their author, and was therefore unable to inhibit their publication? Well may the Right Hon. D. H. Madden, in his "Diary of Master William Silence" ("his entertaining and scholarly *Diary*," according to Mr. Lee), launch out on this point to the following effect:—"That notwithstanding the publication and rapid sale of pirated and inaccurate copies, he was never moved, during the years of retirement at Stratford, to take even the initial step of collecting and revising for publication the manuscripts of his Plays; and that, so far as their author was concerned, they might be stolen, travestied, or perish altogether, are surely among the strangest facts in the history of literature," and this is the confession of as ardent a Shakespearean as Mr. Sidney Lee. The appearance, therefore, of Shakespeare's name or initials on the title-pages of the quartos is no proof that Shakespeare was their author. The laxity in the claiming of the authorship of Plays in the Elizabethan age is well described by Mr. Greenstreet in an article read to the Browning Society in 1888, entitled, "The Whitefriars Theatre in the time of Shakespeare," where it is stated:—"At a date when Plays were seldom if ever printed at the outset, the authorship of a large majority of them belonged to well nigh any one who chose to make the claim. For, when stage plays were first introduced, few of the performers themselves possessed the needed qualifications for the

production of dramatic works. And we may safely infer, I think, that most of the early Plays were the outcome of the industry of men of learning and travel, and the best read and more worldly experienced of the nobility. What were their names, Mr. Greenstreet? Did they write anonymously or under pseudonyms?" Perhaps Mr. Lee can inform me.

In his Appendix Mr. Lee starts the section dealing with "the sources of biographical knowledge" with the statement that "the scantiness of contemporary records of Shakespeare's career has been much exaggerated," while in his Preface he says, "I have endeavoured to set before my readers a plain and practical narrative of the great dramatist's *personal history*." Well, the first Appendix, to which we allude, excepting so far as parish registers and such impersonal documents are concerned, does not refer to a *single contemporaneous authority* about William Shakespeare himself. Such a keen critic as Mr. Lee might be expected to know that such writers as Collier, Halliwell-Phillipps, Fleay, Wheeler, Wise, Farmer, &c., are not in any true sense "sources of biographical knowledge." They are only privates in the vast army of guessers, or at best, Shakespearean critics. How little of the personal history of William Shakespeare is related by his contemporaries is shown by Mr. Lee's acknowledgment on page 265 that "*the sole anecdote of Shakespeare that is positively known to have been recorded in his lifetime* relates that Burbage, when playing Richard III., agreed with a lady in the audience to visit her after the performance; Shakespeare, overhearing the conversation, anticipated the actor's visit, and met Burbage on his arrival with the quip that 'William the Conqueror was before Richard the Third.'" This, it must be acknowledged, is a slightly different piece of *personal history* from that which Mr. Lee records of William Shakespeare in his book on *Stratford-on-Avon*, where it is writ:—"Shakespeare, it should also be remembered, must have been a regular attendant at the Parish Church, and may at times have enjoyed a sermon." It is history such as this that forms the larger part of every *Life* of Shakespeare.

In regard to the latest—that of Mr. Sidney Lee—there is scarcely a page which is not more or less unsound, because of the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, or *petitio principii*, of the Shakespeare myth, besides that the buttresses in support of this huge phantom encumber the whole subject, necessitating the introduction of an infinite quantity of absolutely useless stuff.

A ROSICRUCIAN DOCUMENT CONNECTED WITH SIR FRANCIS BACON.

TRAJANO BOCCALINI was the son of an *architect* (mason), an Italian by birth, and flourished in the latter part of the 16th century. He is known chiefly as a satirist, and the Author of "*Ragguagli di Parnasso.*" The exact date of the publication of this work is unknown, but it was certainly published before his death, which occurred in 1613. The book is divided into 123 "Advertisements," the 78th of which appears as one of the manifestoes of the Rosicrucian fraternity. In 1704 it appeared newly done into English, and adapted to the present times, by N. N., Esqre. (Nicolas Nicolai), with a recommendation on the title-page, by Roger L'Estrange, "This revised version being curious, I reproduce it."

The argument of the 78th Advertisement is briefly this: "By order from Apollo a general Reformation of the world is to be published by the Seven Wise Men of Greece, and some other Literati." Apollo finding hardly any, even of the Virtuosi in Parnassus, fit to reform their companions, he at last fixes upon the Seven Wise Men of Greece; in addition to these he selects Marcus Cato and Annæus Seneca, and in honour of the English philosophers he makes Sir Francis Bacon Secretary of the Society, and honours him with a vote in the assembly.

Thales, of Miletus, first speaks, assuring the rest that he has found an antidote against the corruptions which he believes to be nothing else than dissembled hatred, feigned love, double dealing, &c. The cure is to be making a little window in men's breasts,* whereby all this hypocrisy and secret contrivance being openly exposed to the rest of mankind, they must necessarily learn, not only to *seem*, but to *be* honest and virtuous. The opinion of Thales was much applauded, but it had to be, nevertheless, discarded for anatomical reasons.

Solon then proceeded to charge the inequality of Wealth in the age as the cause of corruption, and his proposed remedy was to divide the world anew, giving every man an equal share in it. And to the end that this equality should endure, all sorts of traffic should be for ever prohibited. This suggestion was, after a long debate, disposed of, as it was thought that too much fortune would fall to fools.† Chilo,

* "Behold the window of my heart," &c.—*L. L. L.* v. 2.

† "Call me not fool till Heaven hath sent me fortune."—*As You Like It* v. 7.

therefore, stood up and argued that the greed of gold and silver was the root of all evil, and that if these metals were banished corruption would disappear.

Cleobulus refuted these opinions, and hotly maintained that the metal most prejudicial to the world is iron, which being designed by Nature for the making of plough-shares, spades, and mattocks, had, by men's malice, been forged into instruments for the destruction of mankind. But though the opinion of Cleobulus was thought to be good, yet the assembly found it impossible that iron should be expelled except by iron, which would be but to multiply mischiefs, and to cure one wound by making many more.

Pittachus declared that all would be well if men could be forced to walk by the way of vertue, and that by this way only they should be allowed to follow the laboursome journey which leads to supreme dignities. This opinion was admired by the assembly until Periander changed their minds by saying that undue advancement, and the favour of kings, was attributable to the fact that deserving men instead of courting the goodwill of the prince waited to be courted, and that if the men advanced were learned and faithful as well as deserving corruptions would cease. Now, "undeserving dwarfs became great giants in a month's time, ignorance is seated in the chair of knowledge and partiality in the tribunal of justice."

Bias then gave as his opinion that the present disorder arose from the want of due observance of the laws of Nature, avarice and ambition having caused men to break down the natural boundaries between countries and seas, men boring through mountains, passing the most rapid rivers, and crossing the seas in ships. In order to prevent the confusion arising from such rash boldness, Bias recommends the breaking down of all bridges, the destruction of mountain roads and passes, and the absolute prohibition of all kinds of navigation. This proposition was also carefully examined, but discarded as impracticable; and further discussion by Cleobulus, Thales, and Periander followed with no better results.

Cato then alarmed and displeased the assembly by desiring them to pray for a second Deluge to destroy all males over twelve years of age; and that all females, both young and old, should be exterminated, for "as long as there shall be any women in the world, men will be wicked." For when a man's house is so crazy, the walls so gape that it cannot

stand long, were it not better to pluck it down and build a new one than perpetually be patching up an old one. On the rejection of this last suggestion the assembly had only one more string to their bow, their Secretary, Sir Francis Bacon, who, not discouraged by the ill success of his seniors, spoke to the following effect :—

"You seem to me, gentlemen, to throw away your time in consultations, like foolish physicians ere you have seen the sick party or heard an account of her illness from herself. . . . 'Tis therefore my advice that the present age be immediately brought before us, that we may feel her pulse, and ask her what questions we shall think convenient about her illness, &c. Then I dare undertake we shall find the cure easy, which you now think desperate." *

"The whole assembly were so well pleased with Sir Francis Bacon's opinions" that they carried out his suggestion. The age was brought before them, but her horrible sores and corruptions were found to be so deeply sunk into her blood and marrow that there was not one sound part about her. They therefore dismissed her as being past hope of cure.

There are some points of notice in this edition, "done into English by N. N., Esq.," and published in 1704, probably about 100 years after the publication of the Italian version (called the original) by Boccalini, and 90 years after the anonymous German edition of 1614. This English "translation" (attributed, like the English version of "Montaigne's Essays" to an Italian) contains, for the first time, the name of *Sir Francis Bacon*. "Mazzoni, a novice," is the Secretary to the assembly of learned men in Boccalini's version. So here, as in many other cases, we find apparently two versions —one intended for the general public, the other for the initiated few, or "for the future ages, when some time shall have gone over." In the first Bacon is concealed, in the second (when interest in or excitement concerning the Rosicrucian fraternity had passed away with all, excepting the traditional Sons of Science, the Invisible Brotherhood, or the Literary and Religious High Freemasons), then the fictitious name is exchanged for the true, and Francis Bacon himself steps forth. Can we doubt that this "translation" is the original? It is full of Baconisms, *Promus* Notes of 1593, "Fixed Ideas," and modes of expression of Francis Bacon.

* "Diseases desperate grown
By desperate appliance are relieved."—*Ham.* iv. 3.

Note that here the age is *she*. Boccalini also speaks of "the foul infirmities under which *she* labours," but then "it" is sent for, "that we may interrogate *it* of *its* sickness," and the age being brought in a chair, "*he* was a man of full years, . . . *he* seemed likely to live yet many ages, only *he* was short-breathed, his voice very weak," &c., and so the age continues *he* to the end of the chapter.

It would be well if the various editions of this notable Rosicrucian document were collated and published; at least the oft-reiterated assertion, that there is no connection between *Bacon* and the *Rosicrucian* fraternity would be laid to rest.

L. BIDDULPH.

A BRIEF CONTROVERSY.

FEW members of the Bacon Society are likely to have heard of a little controversy on the Bacon-Shakespeare question which has been going on in *The Stratford-on-Avon Herald.* The correspondence began on Oct. 7th, 1898, and was continued until March 24th, 1899. At this date, when (as Baconians will think) Mr. Stronach and Mr. Henry Dryerre were manifestly gaining the upper hand in every argument, and many fresh champions armed cap-a-pie had entered the lists, they were met with the editorial notice at the end of Mr. Stronach's letter, "This closes the correspondence." Many of us regretted this circumstance, whilst still highly applauding the moral courage and public spirit of a newspaper editor who could at this day, and from such a locality admit an answer to a "Shakesperean" article. Anyone curious in the matter can see the whole correspondence, by applying (with satisfactory references to some Member or Associate) to the Hon. Sec. of this Society, who will forward a mounted collection of the cuttings. We would gladly reprint some of the letters in which, point by point, the *Shakespearean* objections have been met, and erroneous statements corrected, but want of space does not admit of return to arguments and fallacies as often disproved as stated.

It may, however, be of some interest to beginners, if we attempt to recapitulate the chief heads under which the assumptions and conclusions (we dare not say the *arguments* or *chain of reasoning*) of our opponents seem to range themselves; for these are seen to be typical, and fair examples of

the style and manner in which all similar discussions upon the Bacon-Shakespeare question are conducted by the defendants.

1. There is first the assumption that because certain students are deeply read in "*Bacon*," therefore they must be ignorant of "*Shakespeare*." This ignorance is supposed to increase in direct proportion to the study of Baconian works.

2. That any writer should arrive at conclusions based upon this equal study of both groups of works, is held to be a sign of ignorance, absurdity, incapacity for taking common-sense views of any question, sufficient to justify those who have not thus thought or studied, in terming the Bacon-Shakespeare scholars, fools, impostors, cranks, and other names familiar to modern Shakespearean literature.

3. On the other hand it is found (by some process of reasoning which we have not mastered) to be unnecessary for a "Shakespearean" critic to have more than the most superficial acquaintance with the works of "*Bacon*," in order to be qualified to pronounce decided opinions upon all matters connected with the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy.

4. Where any argument cuts both ways, or where evidence tells as well on the one side as on the other, it is to be held good only when in favour of "*Shakespeare*."

5. Should some anonymous journalist or professional writer have criticised adversely, imperfectly, or unfairly some Baconian book or article, such book or article is to be considered as "demolished," even though replies on the Baconian side are refused, and "the correspondence closed."

6 (and this is important). Shakespearean champions, as a rule, practically wave away, or beg the whole question :—"Did the man whom we know as "Francis Bacon" write the works now known as "*Shakespeare*," together with "a mass of other unacknowledged works, published under other names?" To put it more briefly :—Was "*Shakespeare*"* a mere pseudonym adopted under stress of circumstances?

7. No observant reader can overlook the tendency of thorough-paced "Shakespereans" to confuse *assumptions* with *facts*—to write perpetually of the supposed poet, in the conjunctive mood. According to them, "Shakespeare" the

* This spelling of the family name Shakspur, Shakspurre, Shaxper, &c., show that the ordinary pronunciation was not adopted by any member of the family, on tombs, or in deeds, &c., until about 20 years after the supposed poet's death. In the six volumes of Registers, Annals, Accounts, &c., of the Theatrical Managers' and the Stationers' Company, published by the *first* Shakespeare Society are only two marginal notes in which this name is in any way introduced; in both cases it is spelt "Shaxberd."

man "may," "might," "could," "would," have done, or "possibly" or "probably" did an infinite number of interesting things. Yet there is no iota of proof that Will Shakspere, of Stratford-on-Avon, ever did, could do, or wished to have a hand in any such matters. We know a good deal about him, and cannot find any single good, noble, generous or worthy record of the Stratford hero.

8. We ask thoughtful readers to take a "*Shakespearean*" life, biography, or personal history from the careful records of Halliwell Phillips to the equally painstaking and more readable work of Mr. Sidney Lee, recently published. Let the reader underline in red ink every phrase or paragraph which argues by assumptions and totally unproved suppositions. Let him similarly underline all the "proofs" from internal evidence (usually found far more applicable to "Bacon" than to Shakspere). Now let it be seen how much remains of the fancied proofs as to authorship. The supposed poet and his imaginary history will fade, and leave scarce a wrack behind.

Such slight encounters in the field of argument, trivial as they may appear to some of us, might still be turned to good use, for much still remains to be known. We Baconians readily admit our lack of information upon many perplexing matters, and, in so far as these concern "*Shakespeare*" only, we might both give and receive help by a more frequent interchange of questions and answers. One of the Stratford correspondents, "a late Librarian of the Shakespeare Memorial," says: "I am heartily tired of the folly and ignorance displayed by the Baconians." This is crushing; but since this gentleman is so conscious of our shortcomings and want of proper teaching, would it not be a kindly act if he would help our infirmities and supply our needs? We do not ask for help beyond the pale of matters purely "Shakespearean," but we should be grateful for direct information upon several points, of which the following are a few:—

(1) Where is the *proof* (not mere presumptive evidence) that William Shakspere could write without copying, tracing, or having his hand guided?

(2) Where is any proof that Shakspere possessed a book, even a Bible, or that he could read?

(3) What proof is there that he ever went to school?

(4) What proof as to who were the designers, makers, and erectors of the monumental tablet to Shakspere in the church at Stratford-on-Avon? They must have been strangely ill-

acquainted with their business when they affirmed upon that monument that within it was "plast" the body of the poet, knowing, as we are all supposed to know, that William Shakspere was buried deep down in a grave some feet from the wall to which the monumental tablet is affixed.

(5) Why did the Registers of the Stationers' Company, the Accounts of the Revels at Court, the Theatrical Accounts of Edward Alleyne, the Memoirs of Edward Alleyne, and Henslowe's Diary (all published by the first *Shakespeare Society*) utterly ignore the man or the name Shakespeare. Two entries of the performance on Shrove Sunday and Shrove Tuesday of the *Merchant of Venice* have in the margin (as name of the poet) "Shaxberd" (see account of the "*Revels at Court*," pp. 204-5). So far as William Shakspere is concerned, "the rest is silence." How comes it that no records of money paid to the author or his representatives are extant—at least, *before the public?*

(6) We would also be grateful for explicit information about the history of the oil-painting of *Shakespeare* preserved as "the most precious gem of the collection" at the Shakespeare Cottage. Very different tales have been told concerning this modern-looking picture to different inquiring visitors. The story that it was found in the house of Dr. Hall, disguised by a dark beard which was removed by a picture-cleaner, seems too strange to be true. Still stranger is the explanation of this disguise. Susanna, the eldest daughter of Shakspere, married Dr. Hall, and as this marriage raised her in the social scale, she was ashamed to exhibit in her own home the clean-shaven portrait of her father, *the actor*.

(7) The question of this portrait raises another with which, for the present, we will conclude. Ignorant Baconians are most anxious to know why the "Kesselstadt" mask has of late years been made in photographic pictures sold at Stratford-on-Avon, to do duty and be foisted upon the public as the "*Death Mask of Shakespeare?*" The whole story of that "Darmstadt" or "Kesselstadt" mask has been so often told that we do not repeat it here.* The main point which at present concerns us is that the cast of the *Shakespeare* effigy on the monument, which was formerly considered as authentic, and perhaps modelled from a death-mask, has now been superseded by a mask which belongs to an artist's family in Germany, and which bears no resemblance to the effigy, but a

* See a Paper read before the Bacon Society, BACONIANA, May, 1893, pp. 19-20.

very strong resemblance to portraits, busts, and medallions of Francis "Bacon." The Kesselstadt mask was in 1860 offered as "*Shakespeare*" to the authorities at the British Museum. After one and a-half years' deliberation, that mask was rejected as "Shakespeare," and returned to Germany. Now Stratford-on-Avon has adopted this rejected cast. We ask, On what grounds have Shakespeareans adopted it?

If Shakespeareans will take in good part these queries, and will answer them, we shall be happy to supply answers to any questions or difficulties which they in turn may raise, and which, in the opinion of Baconians, may be capable of satisfactory and straightforward explanation.

NOTES.

DR. APPLETON MORGAN has noted the fact that a small type called *nonpareil* was introduced in English printing-houses from Holland about the year 1560, and became preferred beyond the others in common use. He adds:—"It seems to have become a favourite with Shakespeare, who calls many of his lady characters *nonpareils*."

Mr. Wigston has pointed out that "in the Play of *The Tempest* we have a magical, superhuman presentation of the poet."

Now, the poet's *works* also appear to be hinted at in the character of Miranda, as follows:—

Tempest iii. 3:—

Caliban: "And that most deeply to consider is
The beauty of his daughter; he himself
Calls her a *nonpareil*."

* * *

In Sonnet No. 38 (which, as Mr. Wigston has clearly shown, is addressed to the Sun or Light) we have:—

"Be thou the *tenth Muse*, ten times more in worth,
Than those old nine which rhymers invocate."

It is curious to note that in the "Manes Verulamini" Bacon himself is apostrophised as the *tenth Muse*.

* * *

A PARALLEL.

Two Gentlemen of Verona, Act 1, Scene i. (line 66):—

Proteus. . . . "Thou hast *metamorphosed* me."

Bacon's "Natural History," Experiment 99. . . . "This *Proteus* of matter being held by the sleeves, will turn and change into many *metamorphoses*."

Qy. Is not the figure on the top of the symbolic design of the Bacon Medal (see BACONIANA, Vol. i., p. 173) identical with the upper part of the figure described in Mr. Wigston's "Bacon, Shakespeare, and the Rosicrucians" as "Hermes Mercurius Trismegistus, Nature, Virgin of the World, or Rosalind?"

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIRS,—One of the first questions which arises in the mind of an inquirer when considering the claims made on behalf of Francis Bacon for the authorship of the "Shake-speare" Plays is:—Why, if he wrote them, did he neglect to acknowledge them? Many reasons have been suggested to account for his omission to do so, which, though they be plausible enough and may or may not have influenced him in his resolve, appear to me to be far from the mark as regards the principal motive which actuated him.

I submit that his chief reason was purely an *artistic* one. He felt that in order to preserve at all costs an absolute distinction between the types of character of his various *dramatis personæ*, who should stand forth as if (so to speak) self-created, it was in the highest degree necessary that no connection (such as an acknowledgment of authorship would bring about) should be felt between the minds of the characters and the mind of their creator, otherwise (however marvellously portrayed) they could not but suffer by being divested of a certain indefinable essence of reality and become, in some measure, invested with the individuality of the author.

It is difficult to conceive at the first blush that any man, however much he might love the children of his brain, would, for the greater glory of the works themselves, forego indefinitely, and perhaps for ever, all the personal honour and fame to be derived from an acknowledgment of their authorship; and yet in this sacrifice we see the broad mind of the great master, whilst we feel that his recognition of the *artistic necessity* for the sacrifice evidences the force of his unique genius. E. V. TANNER.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIRS,—In 1598, John Marston published a thin volume, entitled, "The Metamorphosis of Pigmalions Imago and certaine Satyres." The first Satyre is evidently meant for Shakespeare, and is important to Baconians, for it contains hints that the reputed author was not the writer of the works ascribed to him, but someone else. A few quotations will be of interest:—

> "I cannot show in strange proportion,
> Changing my hew like a camelion;
> But you all-canning wits, hold water out,
> Yee vizarded-bifronted-Janian rout.

Tell mee, browne Ruscus, hast thou Gyges ring,
That thou presum'st as if thou wert unseene?"

. . . .

"For shame! unmaske; leave for to cloke intent,
And show thou art vaine-glorious impudent."

. . . .

"He, who on his glorious scutchion,
Can quaintly show wits newe invention."

. . . .

"Tut, he is famous for his reveling,
For fine sette speeches, and for sonetting;
He scornes the violl, and the scraping sticke,
And yet's but broker of another's wit.
Certes, if all things were well-known and view'd,
He doth but champe that which another chew'd."

It will be noted that Robert Greene's somewhat similar attack was written in 1592 (six years earlier). Addressing his fellow dramatists he bids them beware of puppets "that speak from our mouths" and of "antics garnished in our colours." . . . "Never more acquaint [these pretenders] with your admired inventions, for it is pity men of such rare wits should be subject to the pleasures of such rude groomes."

The heading of Satyre I. is also curious. It is "Quedam videntur, et non sunt,"—those who are seen and are not. The heading of Satyre II. is "Quedam sunt et non videntur,"—those who are, and are not seen.

F. J. Burgoyne.

Erratas in article in January number of Baconiana entitled "*The Quarterly Review*:"—

Page 1, 6th line from foot, for "confirmation" *read* "confutation."
Page 3, 3rd line from foot, for ΘΕΛΕΝΗ read 'ΕΛΕΝΗ.
Page 4, the paragraph beginning "The reviewer" should appear on page 4, after the paragraph ending "accordingly."
Page 11, 15th line from top, for "fits" read "*pity*."
Page 11, 9th line from foot, for "Waverly" read "Waverley."

Baconiana.

Vol. VI—*New Series.* JULY, 1899. No. 27.

THE BACON-SHAKESPEARE PROBLEM.*

"Palmam qui meruit ferat."

IN suggesting, as I do by my title, that there *is* a problem regarding the true authorship of the "Shakespeare" Poems, calling for investigation, I am quite aware what results I may expect for myself. The supporters of the traditional belief on this subject have a pleasant habit of cutting all enquiry short by polite assertions of the lunacy of their opponents.

A recent example of this favourite style of argument may be found in an article in the *Quarterly Review*, for July, 1898. It is a short article, and yet I was able to count in it more than a dozen expressions of such unmitigated contempt for the advocates of the Baconian theory as the following:—

The whole theory is dubbed "Baconomania," or the "Baconian delirium." It "can only be entertained by levity and ignorance." The writers on that side have "the credulity of the less than half-educated;" they are "ignorant of the classics;" they are "extremely stupid people," who write nothing but "puerilities," unless when they become "impudent;" they continually exhibit "their matchless ignorance," and only prove themselves "incapable of believing in genius."

Undeterred by the fear of such criticism, I frankly confess that the "Baconians" seem to me have a very strong case. They may not have absolutely proved it, but they have at least shewn its great probability.

I lay no stress in the argument on Mr. Ignatius Donnelly's alleged "Cryptogram," said to be hidden in certain of the Plays. Not having studied his arithmetical investigations, I venture no opinion of their value.

The evidence that Francis Bacon was closely connected with the authorship of the Shakespeare Plays, which has

* A Paper read to the Uddingston Literary Society, 13 Feb., 1899, by M. W. Strang, of Uddingston, Glasgow.

weighed with me, is altogether of a different kind. I know of no fuller or better statement of it than Mr. Donnelly has given in the first volume of his "Great Cryptogram," which is preliminary to, and quite independent of anything he has to say about the alleged cypher itself.

With regard to the possibility, however, of such a secret cypher underlying certain of the Plays, as Mr. Donnelly professes to have discovered, it may be well to bear in mind

1. That Bacon at the early age of 18 or 19, had already invented a secret system of writing.

2. That even in his old age he continued interested in such studies, and in his great work, *The Advancement of Learning*, advocated a certain secrecy of writing among initiated persons, as one way of leavening society with new teaching.

3. That in the dangerous times of Elizabeth, and James I., when Society was honeycombed with intrigue, and counter-intrigue, it was no uncommon thing for prominent men to cover up their opinions under false names, private pass words, and other like cryptic devices.

4. That the 1623 Folio edition of the Shakespeare Plays, in which Mr. Donnelly claims to find the secret writing, certainly looks as if it were intended to conceal some such thing—what with its many *interpolations* on the older editions, its strange sprinkling of apparently meaningless *italics*, and *hyphenated words*, its *false paging*, and other suspicious features.

But, as already said, I do not dwell on this line of argument. Only this I would like to say to those who may be inclined to reject with scorn the whole suggestion of a secret cypher embodied in the Plays: "Better keep a back-door of retreat open in your denials, lest further investigation should elicit facts too strong to be set aside."

The starting-point of this whole controversy is found in the impossibility of wedding the known facts of Shakspere's education, life and character, to the literary features of the Poems and Plays that go by his name.

I say advisedly "*the known facts*," because the whole realm of Shaksperian apologetic literature is pervaded by *fancies*, having no real foundation in his history as it has been preserved to us. For example, the writer of the Plays was undoubtedly conversant with the *law*—a point to which we shall return later on—and in order to account for this feature in the supposed writings of the man of Stratford, many of his partisans circulate a theory that he must at one time have been articled in a lawyer's office. But impartial

biographers, such as Sidney Lee, Richard Grant White, and others, set the theory aside. There is absolutely no evidence that Shakspere ever even swept out a lawyer's office.

In the same way the meagre details of his life that have come down to us have been eked out by deliberate forgeries, of which an instructive list will be found in Sidney Lee's new "Life of Wm. Shakespeare," or by fancy pictures, such as Mrs. Stopes so plentifully supplies in her book,* prefaced by "It may be supposed," "we cannot but think," and similar phrases, all indicating that the lady is "drawing on her imagination for her facts."

Sticking to admitted facts, we learn that Wm. Shakspere was brought up in a country town, amid country clowns. His father was a tradesman, butcher and general dealer, in Stratford, whose first appearance in the town records is suggestive. He is found "paying a fine of twelve pence for having a dirt-heap in front of his house."† It is claimed that Shakspere's father could write; but if so, strange to say, he frequently preferred to "make his mark" instead of signing his name. Of his mother, it is certain she could not write even her own name.‡

Wm. Shakspere was never known to be studious. Indeed, the most reliable traditions about his career before he went to London are that he was of loose habits, and given to bad company; that he was more than once punished as a poacher; that, at a very early age, he married, in haste, and apparently under compulsion, a woman eight years his senior; and that he went off to London at the age of 22, very much because his ill-deeds and ill-luck combined had made Stratford an undesirable place of abode.§

Had Shakspere been as keen a student as the above facts seem to indicate he was *not*, he would, in the surroundings of his Stratford home, have found great difficulty in following the bent of his desires. Schooling there was next to none; while books were, like sanitary arrangements, cleanliness, and sobriety—conspicuous by their absence. Moreover, on the authority of Sidney Lee, his latest biographer, he had to "leave school at an unusually early age," ‖ owing to his father's growing financial difficulties.

Here is what the late Richard Grant White, a most thorough upholder of the traditional belief as to the authorship of the plays, has to say on the subject :—

* "The Bacon-Shakspere Question," Chap. I. † Sidney Lee's "Life," pp. 4, 5. ‡ *Ibid* pp. 5, 7. § *Ibid* pp. 19—26. ‖ *Ibid*, pp. 17, 18.

"When, at 22 years of age, he fled from Stratford to London, we may be sure he had never seen half-a-dozen books other than his horn-book, his Latin accidence, and a Bible. Probably there were not half-a-dozen others in all Stratford" (*Atlantic Monthly*).

In 1593, six or seven years after Shakspere left Stratford, was first published the poem "Venus and Adonis." In its dedication, it is called "the first heir" of the poet's "invention." As it was not the first of his poems to be printed, this can only mean that it was the first *written*. Hence, critics generally believe that Shakspere wrote it immediately after arrival in London, if, indeed, he did not take it with him in his pocket when he fled from Stratford. This piece was based on a poem of the Latin poet Ovid ("Amores") not, even in our day, accessible to the general reader. Shakespeare's poem was, however, admittedly based on a study of the original, and bore an introductory Latin motto taken from Ovid's work.

Now, that an untutored rustic could have penned this long, classic poem, which for literary finish and polish of diction, is not surpassed by anything in our language, is an extreme demand on our faith. There happens to be extant a specimen of Shakspere's versifying powers about this time, in the shape of a fragment of a lampoon said to have been penned by him against Sir Thomas Lucy, of Stratford, whose game he had interfered with, and whose vengeance he had suffered. A sorry bit of lame, coarse, doggerel it is, of which Shakspere-worshippers are so ashamed that some of them deny its authenticity, and it is carefully excluded from his "whole works."

If internal evidence counts for anything in this question, the youth who wrote the Lucy lampoon and the author of the "Venus and Adonis" could not be the same.

The *incongruity* which thus meets us with the "first heir of the poet's invention," continues to face us all through the subsequent appearances of works from his pen. If it be a "fad" or a "symptom of lunacy" to be struck with it, and count it *a problem requiring investigation*, then it is a weakness shared by some of the keenest intellects of our century, such as Emerson, who declared that he could not "marry" the facts of Shakspere's life "to his verse." *

Thedates of the first appearance of the "Shakespeare" Dramas are not at all certain, and authorities differ widely. Sidney

* "Representative Men."

Lee, the latest authority, whose "Life" is reckoned one of the principal literary successes of 1898, says :—

"There is no external evidence to prove that any piece in which Shakspere had a hand was produced before the spring of 1592. No play by him was *published* before 1597, and none bore his name on title page till 1598." *

During the first few years of this period Shakspere was still occupying a very sordid position (if tradition may be trusted), first as a holder of horses at the theatre-doors, then as a call-boy, and next as a supernumerary and inferior actor. These were not positions likely to put him much in the way of "improving his mind" by the study of literature.

Yet it is of the utmost importance to note that the earliest Plays attributed to him are singled out by critics (without any bias towards Baconian views) as samples of an *academic style.* Some of these critics go the length of describing this early style as *pedantic*, as if the author were a young man fresh from college, wishful to air all his acquirements. This criticism is specially applicable to *Love's Labour Lost*, with its legal jargon, its frequent doses of Latin, its Italian, and other such features which render this Drama unfit for popular representation.

Coleridge says of the author of these early plays :—

"His habits had been *scholastic* and those of a *student.* A young author's first work almost always bespeaks his recent pursuits."

Prof. Baynes also remarks :—

"The immaturity of his mind in these early plays is seen in the extent to which *the smell of the lamp* mingles with the freshness and vigour of poetic feeling. The wide circle of references to Greek fable and Roman story suggests that the writer *had come recently from his books.*" †

Now, it is just here that the advocates of Bacon's authorship have an initial and decided advantage. Granted that Bacon could have been a writer of Dramas—on which point an important word or two anon—then everything in these early Plays which points to the author's being a student and scholar, or, as we might say, a "university man," while it fits with no known fact about Wm. Shakspere, will admirably agree with the well-ascertained facts as to young FRANCIS BACON.

A most precocious youth, his wit and power of courteous

* "Life," p. 50. † "Fraser's Magazine," 1880.

repartee, at the age of 10, attracted the notice of Queen Elizabeth herself. Born of aristocratic lineage, he had from the first all the educational advantages open, in those days, only to the select few. His father was Lord Treasurer to the Queen, and a man of brilliant and original talents. His mother was one of the most accomplished women of her time, able to *write* idiomatic Greek and Latin, and familiar with French and Italian. At the age of *twelve*, Francis' tutors could teach him nothing more; and so he was sent to join his elder brother Anthony at Trinity College, Cambridge.

He studied there for three years, and then left Cambridge, having learned all it could teach him, and, moreover, having, at this early age of 15, discovered that the whole *method* of teaching then in vogue was radically vicious, and could lead to no real, useful increase of knowledge. Already to him, the boy of 15, there had occurred the germs of those *new principles of enquiry* which he afterwards more fully expounded, and which still make his name revered as the true father of all that is best in our modern philosophy and scientific research.

In the next few years he studied Law; resided a good while in France, as an *attaché* of the English Ambassador to the French Court; learned French, Italian and Spanish; was called to the bar at the early age of 21; and continued absorbed in studies, the exact nature of which his biographers have not been able to ascertain.

The supposition that this witty and brilliant young student and scholar—linguist, lawyer, and courtier combined—was the writer of these "academic" Plays, and of the polished "Venus and Adonis," does violence to none of the probabilities. But to believe that a rustic plebeian, whose father and mother made a mark for their signature, suddenly shewed such signs of college culture, without ever being near a college, is rather "a large order" on our faith. In plain English, it is, on the first blush, *quite incredible.*

Wm. Shakspere was undoubtedly a man of talent in his way. He could not otherwise have risen so rapidly, as he did, to be manager of a theatre, to part-proprietorship, and to opulence. This advance bespeaks for him at least a good business capacity and a genial temperament—neither of which we wish to deny him. But such qualifications would never enable any man to exhibit literary gifts or a *scholarly culture* which has been the wonder of the world ever since.

It is open to the gravest doubt whether the Plays ever were really claimed to be by William Shakspere, of Stratford. As

we have seen, they were anonymous till 1598. When, in that year, a name was given on the title page, it was not the Stratford family name, but only ***a colourable resemblance of it,*** possibly the better to act as a disguise for the real author. The name was printed SHAKESPEARE, sometimes with a hyphen between the syllables, as if indicating a *nom de plume.*

Now, some fifty different ways of spelling the Stratford name in those times have been unearthed, and not one corresponds with this title-page. Wm. Shakspere himself never seems to have signed his name this way. Moreover, the pronunciation of the Stratford name seems to have been *Skaxper* or *Shagsper,* never *Shake-speare.*

We are doing no great violence to literary probability, therefore, in thinking that the name was originally an assumed one.

Our doubts as to Wm. Shakspere's authorship are strengthened by one or two other facts connected with his personal history.

In 1610 he retired from London, a wealthy man, and spent the remaining six years of his life in his native town, in such sordid pursuits as wool-stapling, brewing, and money-lending. But of any further connection of his with literature there is not a trace—which is the more remarkable when we remember that many of the Plays now attributed to him had not yet seen the light.

In 1616, certain further Shakspere records are found, which fill us with fresh scepticism. Judith, the younger daughter of this prince of poets, philosophers, and literary men, was married, and had to sign her marriage bond ***with a mark!*** Think of it! This man, who, as tradition goes, was familiar with literature of all lands and times, who "knew everything," and made a new era in the English language, adding to its vocabulary some 5,000 new words—this man's daughter was allowed to grow up to womanhood an utter "illiterate," unable to write her own name! Surely the father could not be the lover of books that tradition paints him. It could not be he who penned those frequent condemnations in the Plays of "ignorance, the curse of God,"* "barbarous ignorance," † "dull, unfeeling ignorance," ‡ "gross and miserable ignorance." § Clearly, there is a problem here, wanting fearless investigation.

But this is not all we have to say about the year 1616. In it Wm. Shakspere, of Stratford, died—the result, according to

* 2 *H. VI.* iv. 7; † *K. John IV.* 2; ‡ *Rich. II.* i. 3; § 2 *H. IV.* iv. 2.

the testimony of the local Vicar, of a drinking bout. Be that as it may, what surprises us is this, that this literary prodigy, who had in his day, if tradition is correct, amassed wisdom from books of every sort, *died and left not a book nor manuscript behind him.*

His will is extant. Its details are "minutely particular in the disposition of his goods and chattels, even to his second-best bed, his clothes, his household utensils," but "there is no mention of a book of any kind, no allusion to any papers, works, or manuscripts, or of his interest in any." As an American writer has exclaimed :

"He had $20,000 a year, and not a volume! The man who wrote *Love's Labour Lost*, so learned, so academic, so scholastic in expression and allusion . . . ; the man whose ample page is rich with the transfigured spoils of ages—that man lived without a library!"*

Our scepticism is surely by this time well justified ; and it is further strengthened by the fact, just mentioned, that at the time of his death, there were still unpublished some 18 or 19 of the Plays that now go by his name, including such masterpieces as *Macbeth* and *The Tempest.*

Seven years later, in 1623, a large and revised edition of the Dramas appears, containing these 19, of which, it is further to be remarked, *eight or nine had not even been heard of till then ;* and among them such works as *Julius Cæsar, Cymbeline,* and *Timon of Athens.*

Where had these works been if Shakspere wrote them before his death? Why did he, who knew so well—none better—the pecuniary value of such things, say never a word of them in his will?

Moreover, of the old Plays, republished in 1623, many were greatly altered, amended, and in some cases enlarged. By whom, seeing the supposed author was seven years in his grave? One Play, *Othello,* was first published in 1622, and a greatly altered edition next year following.

The Preface to this 1623 Edition professes to explain matters, but really leaves us more mystified than ever. It alleges that these are the true original works got from the dead author, and that all previous editions had been pirated—a story which will scarcely bear examination.

It would require us, for example, to believe that some of the finest passages in *Hamlet,* which appeared in these "pirated" quarto editions, but were left out of the 1623 folio edition,

* "Hamlet's Note Book," by W. D. O'Connor.

were not by the Dramatist himself.* Yet critics are now pretty well agreed that they are characteristically his.

I commend Mr. Donnelly's Chap. IV. on the "Lost MSS. and Library" to the study of any one interested in the question.

The fact is, that on the Shaksperian theory, this posthumous publication of the greatest of the Dramas, without any reference in Shakspere's will to their existence, and with the extensive revision which the others had undergone, is *inexplicable*. The only theory, which will give a key to the mystery, is that which maintains that in 1623 the true author was still alive, able to revise, enlarge, and amend his old Plays, and to publish others never before seen; and that this true author was the great *Francis Bacon*, Lord Verulam, who in that same year of 1623, was setting his whole literary house in order by publication of revised editions of all his works.

I am quite aware that, if we disregard everything else, and pin our faith on tradition, there is a certain amount of external testimony to be adduced in its support. There is the aforesaid preface to the 1623 Edition, which attributes the Plays to the dead author. There are the lines (supposed to be by Ben Jonson) affixed to the wooden-looking portrait at the beginning of that volume—lines attributing the works to "gentle Shakspere." There are tributes by Jonson and others of the time, paid to the transcendent genius of the author of the Plays. But there are reasons for not leaning too much on these supports.

1. The statements of the 1623 Preface, as already said, seem to require to be taken "with a grain of salt." If it was the intention of the still-living author to throw dust in the eyes of the public, and continue his *incognito*, that preface would very well serve his purpose.

2. The testimonies of other writers of plays are also open to suspicion. While Shakespere was connected with the Theatre in London, he was not always received with cordiality by his fellows. Indeed he was looked on with great jealousy, not because of his transcendent skill, but, as far as we can make out from the tortuous allusions of the time, because his rivals looked on him as more or less of a *pretender*. Some of them described him as an "upstart crow" in borrowed "feathers;" as a man who "supposed he could bombast out a blank verse as well as any," and managed to enrich himself by "mouthing words that *better wits* had framed."

* See Intro. to "Cambridge" Shakespeare, XXVI.

No one held him up to keener ridicule than Ben Jonson, who nicknamed him "Poet Ape." (*Epig.* 51). When, therefore, we read Ben Jonson's statement, after Shakspere's death, "I loved the man and do honour his memory on this side idolatry as much as any," we are inclined to doubt his sincerity very much. For, during a great part of Shakspere's career, Jonson, if he did not *hate* him, certainly "dissembled his love" for him very thoroughly indeed.

Jonson acted for several years, after Shakspere's death, as private secretary to Bacon. He was likely, therefore, to be a party, in these later years, to any secret that there might be in Bacon's life about this matter; and it is quite possible to understand a great deal of what he wrote in these latter years, in praise of "*Shakespeare*" as intended for the real author of the works that went by that name, without proving anything as to the *personality* behind the name.

Indeed Jonson is one of the leading witnesses called on the Baconian side. For, strange to say, one of the strongest testimonies he has borne to the achievements of the great Dramatist of his time, he has repeated, and *applied to the undoubted person of Sir Francis Bacon.*

He compared "*Shakespeare*," the Dramatist, with the most famous Playwriters of antiquity, and said:—

> "When thy socks were on,
> *Leave thee alone, for the comparison*
> *Of all that insolent Greece or haughty Rome*
> *Sent forth*, or since did from their ashes come."

Writing, after *Bacon's* death, he says of him that this is "he that hath *filled up all numbers* and performed that in our tongue which may be compared or *preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome.*"

This tribute is of the utmost importance to our enquiry. In it, Ben Jonson, who shared Bacon's literary labours, declares that *Bacon was a poet*, and a poet of such high standing as to eclipse all antiquity.

I know some Shaksperians kick at this conclusion from his words, and try to make out that when he said Bacon had "*filled up all numbers*," he was referring to him as an orator. He had been speaking undoubtedly of oratory in others, but Jonson, who was a good Latin scholar, was not at all likely to use the word "numbers" in any other sense than the well-known sense in which Cicero, Virgil, Horace, and Ovid, all

use its Latin original, of *musical measure, verse,* or *poetry.** Pope and Milton, after Bacon's day, continued its use in that sense. Pope tells us "he lisped in *numbers,* for *the numbers* came;" meaning, he made verses from his earliest years. And the Shakespearian poems themselves thus fix its sense. For example—

> "But now my gracious *numbers* are decayed,
> And my sick *muse* doth give another place."
>
> *Sonnet* 79.

> "If I could write the beauty of your eyes,
> And in fresh *numbers* number all your graces,
> The age to come would say, 'This *poet* lies.'"
>
> *Sonnet* 17.

> "I fear these stubborn *lines* lack power to move;
> O sweet Maria, empress of my love,
> These *numbers* I will tear, and write in *prose.*"
>
> *Love's Lab. Lost,* iv. 3.

That Bacon should be ranked among the *Poets* is probably as great a surprise to most people as it was to the Unicorn in Lewis Carroll's quaint story to find that children were not the "fabulous monsters" he had always thought them.†

If this controversy should serve no other purpose, it will do much if it help to remove very prevalent misconception as to Bacon's true place in English literature. Apart from the question whether he wrote the "Shakespeare" Plays, there is abundant evidence that he had a highly poetical imagination, and that his *prose* is sparkling with gems of poetic expression, apt similes, pithy and most musically expressed sentiments.

Macaulay has one or two remarkable tributes to his faculties in this respect, *e.g.*, he says he had "the most exquisitely constructed intellect that has ever been bestowed on any of the children of men." Again: "The *poetical faculty* was powerful in Bacon's mind." And again: "No *imagination* was ever at once so strong and so thoroughly subjugated."

Campbell says: "Few *poets deal in finer imagery* than is to be found in Bacon. . . . *His prose is poetry,*"

I might multiply such testimonies, from men who have made a special study of his works. But a few words from the

* Thus Tibullus iv. i. 36:—

> "*Numeris* illo, hic *pede libero,* scribit."
> "One writes in *verse,* another in *prose.*"

† "Through the Looking-glass."

estimate of that acute French literary critic, *M. Taine*, are perhaps worth quoting.

"Among this band of scholars, philosophers, and dreamers, is Francis Bacon, a great and luminous intellect, *one of the finest of this poetic progeny*, who was naturally disposed to clothe his ideas in the most splendid garb." . . . "He has thought in the manner of *artists* and *poets*, and he speaks after the manner of *prophets and seers*." *

Bacon a dry prosaic writer! Never was more mistaken notion held of any great author. Let any one read his account of the Spanish Armada, and say whether anything more lively or interesting is to be found among historical records. Or take the brief description † of Sir Richard Grenville's mad, yet heroic, fight with his little "Revenge" against overwhelming Spanish odds. Of this, the late Professor Nichol, of Glasgow, declared that it was "not less stirring than" Tennyson's poetic version of the same incident.

One might cull endless instances, from Bacon's most serious writings, of sparkling gems of thought, shewing all the felicity of expression of the poet. For example :—

"Men must learn that, in this theatre of man's life, it is reserved only for God and the angels to be lookers-on" (*Adv. of L.*)

Again, he describes "Antiquities" as

"Remnants of history which have casually escaped the shipwreck of time."

Or what is there finer than his remark, in the Essay on "Friendship ?"

"A crowd is not company, and faces are but a gallery of pictures, and talk but a tinkling cymbal, where there is no love."

Again, the writer who in a sober philosophical treatise on "The Nature of Things," describes the ocean as "the solitary handmaid of eternity," had surely in him something capable of the Poet's higher achievements.

In this connection, Baconians have remarked a curious resemblance of style between Bacon's prose, and "Shakespeare," in one respect—*viz*,, a habit of putting pithy sayings into *triple form*. The quotation from the Essay of "Friendship" gave one instance. Here are other six, three from Shakespeare :—

* "History of English Literature." † "Of a war with Spain."

B.—"Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested."

Sh.—"Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them.—*Tw. Night, ii.* 5."

B.—"Reading maketh a full man, conference a ready man, and writing an exact man."

Sh.—"It would be argument for a week, laughter for a month, and a good jest for ever."—1 *Hen. IV. ii.* 2.

B.—"Nature is often hidden, sometimes overcome, seldom extinguished."

Sh..—"To be now a sensible man, by-and-bye a fool, and presently a beast."—*Oth. ii.* 3.

Will candid criticism tell us, apart from any previous knowledge of the respective sources, and *from the style alone,* which are from Bacon and which are from Shakespeare? Might not one man have written them all?

To return to Ben Jonson's evidence. He says Bacon was a *skilled master of verse* or *numbers.* Now, that he *did* write verse requires no proof. Some of his verses are still extant and acknowledged to be his. Opinions differ as to their merits. Some Shaksperians fasten on them with every expression of contempt, as clearly proving that Bacon could not have written the finished lines of "Skakespeare." They judge, however, mostly from a few translations of the Psalms, which he wrote in his old age, and on a sickbed. These, in the nature of things, are not a fair criterion.

Let any of the budding poets of this Society try their hands at turning the Psalms into verse, and they will soon find all the natural buoyancy of their Muse's wings cramped and fettered, and their Pegasus-flights soon brought to earth. Truth to tell, even John Milton, when he took to that kind of exercise, could only write something very poor, just a shade less "wooden" than Tate and Brady. Yet Bacon's few versions of the Psalms will compare favourably with Milton's, and contain some really noble lines. Spedding, his loving biographer (who did not for a moment believe in his identity with "Shakespeare") opines, from these very specimens of his poetic powers, that if he had cultivated his Muse, he could have produced something really great.

There are other fragments of verse attributed to Bacon. One is deserving of notice—a short piece called "The Retired Courtier." I quote only the first verse :—

"His golden locks hath Time to silver turned;
O time too swift! O swiftness never ceasing!

His youth 'gainst time and age hath ever spurn'd,
But spurned in vain; youth waneth by increasing.
Beauty, strength, youth, are flowers, but fading seen;
Duty, faith, love, are roots, and ever green."

This has a decided Shakespearian ring, and seems worthy of any poet. So also a paraphrase of an Epicurean epigram, *undoubtedly by Bacon*, of which I give only one couplet :—

"Who then to frail mortality shall trust,
But limns the water, or but writes in dust."

Bacon, then, *was a Poet*, but there is evidence that he practised his poetic art mostly *in secret*. On the accession of James I., in 1603, Bacon wrote to Sir John Davis, a poet attached to the Court, asking him to render him all possible good offices with the new Sovereign, and he concludes his letter with the strange remark: "So, desiring you *to be good to all* CONCEALED POETS, I continue, &c." This, in the circumstances, could only mean that the writer of the letter was one of that fraternity, and a *concealed Poet.*

Where then, are the works which he thus secretly produced?

Bacon was in the habit of sending to Sir Tobie Matthew, his life-long bosom-friend, for his criticism and approval, all kinds of his literary productions. In his correspondence with Sir Tobie, which survives, his acknowledged serious and philosophical works are openly named. But these same letters have frequent allusions to literary work of a different kind. In one letter Bacon refers to the "works of his *recreation*." In another, his other works are alluded to under the veiled title of the "Alphabet"—a term which there is reason for believing to have been a private password meaning "Tragedies and Comedies" (See Bacon's *Promus*, Entry, 516).

In acknowledging one such budget of literature from Bacon, about the year 1623 (the date is not certain) Sir Tobie Matthew makes the following significant remark :—

"The *most prodigious wit* that ever I knew of my nation, and of this side of the sea, is *of your Lordship's name*, THOUGH HE BE KNOWN BY ANOTHER."

Sir Tobie wrote this from the Continent of Europe, and it is hard to see what else he could mean (though Shaksperians try hard to put another meaning on his words) than this: that his friend, Lord Verulam, Francis Bacon, was the greatest wit whom he knew on either side the English Channel; but that

the works displaying this surpassing wit were circulating under another's name.

This certainly could not apply to his philosophical writings; and goes to confirm all other evidence up to this point, which proves that Bacon was a *Poet* of high skill, but that this fact was unknown to all save a few initiated persons who were in his secret.

On general grounds, it is open to us to believe that these secret productions of his witty Muse may have been connected with the Stage. But there are not wanting direct testimonies that this was so. Dr. Rawley, the chaplain and biographer of Bacon, collected a number of Elegies written of him in Latin after his death. Strange to say—strange, that is, in view of the usual idea of Bacon's literary powers—many of these Elegies praise him in no stinted terms AS A POET. One speaks of him as "Literature's Star . . . who breathed forth *the breath of poetry.*" Others say that "the *Muses* mourn the death of *him who taught them their art,*" and who was himself the "*Tenth Muse.*" Another says that to rightly understand him, we must know him as "a *composer of fiction.*" While yet another describes him as "with a serious purpose *drawing on the socks of comedy*, and the *high-heeled boots of the Athenian tragedian.*" *

These Elegiac tributes are conveniently ignored by the other side; but their evidence is very significant, and they probably convey a fresh surprise to those who thought they knew all about Bacon. *They connect him with the Dramatic Art.*

Now, some Shaksperians have laid great stress on the familiarity with the *technicalities of the Stage* evinced by the writer of the Shakespeare Plays. "Who," they ask, "but an actor could have penned these Stage allusions? Who so likely to have done so as the Actor-Manager to whom they have been so long attributed?"

But it so happens that even here Bacon's claims are strong. If he had one "hobby" above another, it was a fondness for the Stage. From his youth up, he was continually taking part in the getting up of theatrical Masques and Plays among his fellows in Grays Inn and elsewhere. His mother (a bit of a Puritan) was sorely vexed about this *penchant* of his; and possibly his respect for her may have been one reason why originally he did not confess his connection with the theatre.

One fact speaks volumes as to Bacon's familiarity with the

* "The Manes of Francis Bacon," BACONIANA, April, 1898.

technique of the Stage. In 1602 the Grays Inn Benchers and Inner Templars combined to get up a theatrical masque to entertain King James. A contemporary record tells us that Sir Francis Bacon "was the chief contriver" of this masque. Now, at the time, he held the office of Solicitor-General! As Mrs. Pott very well points out, this was in "days when Shakspere and Ben Jonson were at the height of their fame; yet it was neither the one or the other of them, but the Solicitor-General, who was employed to 'contrive,' and ultimately to manage, the first Masque presented to the King. Under similar circumstances, we should expect that Mr. Beerbohm Tree or Sir Henry Irving would be invited to undertake such a management. It would not have occurred to us to apply for help to Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., M.P."*

The possibility that Bacon could have written the "Shakespeare" Plays having been, I venture to think, so far established, it remains to indicate a few arguments sustaining the probability that he did.

I shall not attempt to set forth these proofs at any length. It would be folly to do so. They form a literature by themselves. All I can do is, indicate a few of the heads under which these proofs are grouped, in the hope that my preliminary argument may have aroused sufficient interest to lead to their being studied for themselves. Their force lies not so much in any one of them singly, as in the *cumulative power* of a thousand and one, all pointing to the same conclusion.

The education, training, and experience of the author of the Plays, as exhibited in their contents and style; his bent of mind, his tastes, his views of human nature, of things material and immaterial, and of a host of general subjects; his choice of words, his invention of new terms—all these points, carefully studied, produce strange and innumerable parallels between his Dramas and Bacon's Prose. So much is this the case, that the best commentary on "Shakespeare" is always found in Bacon on almost any conceivable subject.

Even, in some cases, the stories embodied in the Plays, and the times and circumstances of their publication, are found to fit into the personal history of Bacon, while they have nothing in common with the facts of Shakspere's life.

The Scenes of 1 *Henry VI.* (one of the earliest Plays, although not published till 1623) are laid in those very parts of France where Bacon resided as a youth. The Scene of

* "Francis Bacon and His Secret Society," p. 143.

2 *Henry VI.*, on the other hand, is St. Albans, near which he resided on his return to England, and from which in later years he took his title of Viscount St. Alban.

The great tragedies of *Hamlet* and *Lear** turn much on questions of *madness*. They are usually spoken of as the products of the poet's "dark period." But the man of Stratford, at the time of their appearance, was at the height of financial success, and is not known to have been under a cloud of any kind. It was far otherwise with Bacon. About this very time, his beloved brother Anthony died; his friend Essex was convicted of treason and executed; and—saddest and most significant of all—his mother's mind began to give way, growing worse and worse in the very manner described of Ophelia, until her death some years later.

Such are a few of the curious coincidences which may be traced when we try to fit the Plays and the life of Bacon together. Of themselves they may prove little; but as part of a series of coincidences they have their value.

Much more striking are the points of resemblance—not occasional, but to be reckoned by hundreds—in *thought* and *expression* between the Poems and the Prose works of Bacon. After allowing for some far-fetched and doubtful instances which the eagerness of Baconian advocates has pressed into the service, there still remain a sufficient number of such a kind as can only be explained by getting, as Mr. Donnelly has it, the heads of Bacon and Shakespeare "under one hat."

It need not be counted "flat blasphemy" on the part of Baconians thus to judge of the question of the authorship of the Plays. For the principle is acted on to some extent by Shakesperian critics also. There were some 15 Plays attributed to "Shakespeare" during his life-time, and even published with his name, which these critics almost unanimously reject *on grounds of internal evidence*. Even the latest writer on the subject, Sidney Lee, maintains that in the earlier and the later Plays the author used "collaboration," and composed dramas "*with another's aid*." † It must never be forgotten that the whole question of the origin, dates of publication, and revisal, &c., of the "Shakespeare" Plays is not one that can be settled off-hand with the ease with which we can trace, for example, the literary history of Tennyson's works.

* First produced, according to Sidney Lee, in 1602 and 1606, respectively.
† S. Lee, "Life," p. 242.

Mr. Wigston has devoted a good part of a bulky volume* to a comparison of the opinions given in Bacon's "Essays" on such topics as Ambition, Envy, Deformity, Suspicion, Malice, Vainglory, Revenge, Usury, &c., &c., with the pictures of such things set forth in leading characters of the Plays. I commend the study as an interesting one, no matter what bearing it may have on the question before us.

Even the *verbal* parallels between the Essays and the Plays are sometimes striking. Here are two examples :—

BACON.	SHAKESPEARE.
"Be so true to thyself as thou be not false to others."—*Ess.* 23.	"To thine own self be true, And it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man."—*Ham.* i. 3.
"A man that is *young in years* may be *old in hours*, if he have lost no time."—*Ess.* 42.	"Yet hath Sir Proteus . . . Made use and fair advantage of his days, His *years but young*, but *his experience old.*"—*Two Gent. Ver.* ii. 4.

A friend lately sent me a Johannesburg paper, containing a report of a lecture by a clergyman of Pretoria on "The Baconian Theory." Needless to say, he dubbed its supporters "cranks and faddists." We would scarcely recognize ourselves unless these pet names were applied to us. But this lecturer, who was neither a "crank" nor a "faddist," went on to say that Bacon's "knowledge of human nature, and of the passions, hopes, and fears by which it is swayed, was most superficial, and entirely inadequate to the production of such works as Shakespeare had given to the world."

One cannot help smiling at off-hand criticism of this sort; for if there be one point of resemblance between the two classes of writings under discussion, more distinct than another, it is this very *knowledge* of *human character* and *conduct.*

Did this critic, one wonders, ever read as much as one of Bacon's famous "Essays?" of which a powerful intellect, such as Archbishop Whateley's, declared :

"Rarely, if ever, do we find any [such] failures in Bacon's speculations on *human character and conduct. It was there that his strength lay;* and *in that department of philosophy* it may safely be said that *he had few to equal*, and *none to excel him.*"†

"* Francis Bacon, Poet, Prophet, Philosopher," 1891.
† "Introd. to Bacon's Essays."

The *Erudition* displayed in the Plays has already been referred to. This also is capable of ample illustration as an argument for the Baconian authorship.

The author was undoubtedly a *Lawyer*, not a mere dabbler in law, or amateur, but trained to it. Campbell made a special study of this feature of the Plays, and his verdict is that "the writer had a *deep technical knowledge of the law*," and was familiar with "*some of the most abstruse proceedings* in *English jurisprudence*."

This knowledge appears also in a curious preference for legal expressions, metaphors, and other allusions, in some of the most unlikely places; as, *e.g.*, in *Love's Lab. Lost*, in a lover's dialogue over the right of taking a kiss! Evidently, as Mr. Donnelly remarks, "The author was brimming full of legal phraseology." It is idle to pretend that Shakspere, or any other man, however heaven-born his genius, could have acquired this legal tone by mending quills in a lawyer's office for a few months, or gossiping with lawyers in the Courts or in taverns!

Again, the knowledge of other languages shewn in the Plays, while it puts Shakspere's claims in great doubt, agrees in every way with Bacon's. Bacon knew French and Italian well. And there is no doubt the writer of the Plays was also able to use these languages for himself. Some whole scenes are written in French. And as for Italian, Iago's famous speech to Othello:

"Who steals my purse steals trash, &c."

is taken, with little variation, from a stanza of Berni's *Orlando Innamorato*, of which poem, *to this day, there is no English version.* I would not venture to quote any Baconian in support of this last fact; for are they not all "half-educated" persons? My authority is Richard Grant White, a leading critic on the Shaksperian side.

Then as regards the *classical* flavor of the Plays, it is not so much a question of allusion to Roman or Greek legend or history. The plays abound in these, but it is conceivable that many of them might have been derived from a diligent use of translations, without any familiarity with the originals. But in the Plays we are often struck with the author's use of *Latin derivatives* (many of them of his own coining), with a nicety of meaning in strict conformity to the original, only possible to a classical scholar, and indeed sometimes scarcely understandable to an ordinary reader.

Burns, with all his genius, could never have written in Milton's style; for Milton was a scholar, and used a scholar's vocabulary. John Bright, with all his eloquence, never got far away from his terse Anglo-Saxon; and therein his oratory differed from that of Mr. Gladstone, whose bookish training and habits appeared in the more ornate and cumbrous style of his speech.

Thus, too, when we find in the Plays such scholastic words (many of them quite new) as "rondure, vastidity, exsufflicate, incarnadine, procreant, deracinate, conflux, tortive," &c., we conclude the writer was a bookish man, and must have spent much time in his library—an apartment, which, as we have seen, Shakspere did not possess.

Here everything consorts with the Baconian theory; for Bacon's prose writings present just the same features of what some would call *pedantry* as this aspect of the Plays.

There are also many odd and uncommon words and expressions common to both. Many instances will be found collected in Mr. Donnelly's book. Let me mention one by way of illustration :—

> "A beast that wants *discourse of reason.*"
>
> *Hamlet* i. 2.

This singular phrase, "discourse of reason," has seemed to some critics to want emendation. But it is a favorite phrase of Bacon's, occurring several times in his writings.

Such features of this enquiry might be dwelt on indefinitely; but I must hasten to conclude this already too lengthy paper, by referring to two bits of evidence that seem to go beyond anything so far advanced, and to prove conclusively that Bacon had something to do with the production of "Shakespeare's" Plays.

I. In 1867 a curious *M.S.,* once belonging to Bacon, was found in *Northumberland House.* It was an unbound volume of manuscript pieces, some of which have disappeared from the volume. But the Table of Contents remains, and is very instructive. It includes some undoubted works of Bacon, such as some of his speeches, and a quasi-dramatic piece entitled "A Conference of Pleasure." But among the rest are two pieces entitled *Richard II.* and *Richard III.* These pieces themselves have been removed.

But more significant still are the scribblings on the cover. The names of *Francis Bacon* and *William Shakespeare* are scribbled several times. There is also a line from *Lucrece,* and

a jaw-breaking Latin word *honoraficabilitudino*—a word which, strange to say, occurs with a slightly altered termination (the *ablative plural* instead of *nom. sing.*) in *Love's Labour Lost*—dragged in there, as if by the hair of the head.

What does all this bringing together of Bacon and Shakespeare's names, and of such Shaksperian titles and clues, in a Baconian MS., mean? As Mr. R. M. Theobald says:—

"The only place in the world where we can be sure that the MSS. of two of Shakespeare's Plays once existed is *Bacon's Portfolio.*"*

This significant fact suits the Baconian theory admirably: it is hard to see what the other side can do with it, except pooh-pooh it, after their manner.

II. Still more significant is the evidence of Bacon's "Promus"—an undoubted MS. in Bacon's own handwriting, which lay neglected in the British Museum till 1883, when it was edited and published, with illustrations from "Shakespeare," by Mrs. Henry Pott.

Promus means a *store-house, larder*, or collection of what we may call "raw material" to be worked up. Bacon's MS. so described, was a miscellaneous collection of literary jottings, a "commonplace book." It contains 1655 entries, sometimes single words, mostly short phrases, quotations, or proverbs, in English, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, or Greek. Many of the jottings are forms of salutation, or conversational turns of speech. The collection was evidently "made by Bacon with a view of enriching his vocabulary, and helping his literary invention." It bears the date 1594, and is allowed to have been made in the earlier part of his life.

It is not too much to say that the publication of this book has altered the whole aspect of this controversy. For what purpose did Bacon make these notes and how did he afterwards use them? Many of them are quite out of keeping with anything of a sober, or philosophical kind which he ever wrote. So much so, that Spedding, in editing Bacon's Prose Works, left this MS. unpublished, because he could make nothing of it in their connection.

But Mrs. Pott has shewn that, though the jottings have little to do with Bacon's prose works, they reappear many times in "Shakespeare"—about 3,000 times, she claims, but we are willing to allow a very liberal discount to objectors, off that number, for those that are not perhaps unquestionable.

Now, Shaksperians fight shy of this book, and for a very

* "Dethroning Shakspere," p. 160.

good reason. Mrs. Stopes, for example, in her "Bacon-Shakspere Question Answered," which was greeted by an omniscient press as having ended the Baconian claims finally—dismisses it in a line: "I do not think it proves much. The quotations were evidently not original"; * as if "quotations" were usually original! Other critics, like the *Quarterly Reviewer*, † select a few of the most doubtful of Mrs. Pott's parallels, and hold these up to cheap ridicule as a sample of the whole—a great saving of trouble, certainly, to those too prejudiced or too lazy to examine the work for themselves.

But let us take a half-dozen samples for ourselves, and judge:—

BACON'S *PROMUS.*	SHAKESPEARE.
No. 889.—Clavum clavo pellere = with one nail to drive out another.	"One nail by strength drives out another."—*Two Gent. of V.* ii. 4. "One fire drives out one fire, One nail one nail."—*Cor.* iv. 6.
No. 72.—"He who dissembles is not free."	"The dissembler is a slave."—*Per.* i. 1.
No. 477.—"All is not gold that glisters."	"All that glisters is not gold."—*M. of V.* ii. 7.
No. 106.—"A fool's bolt is soon shot."	"A fool's bolt is soon shot."—*Hen. V.* iii. 7.
No. 472.—"Seldom cometh the better."	"Seldome cometh the better."—*Rich. III.* ii. 2.
No. 1455.—Παθηματα μαθηματα = Our sufferings are our teachers (*lit.* Afflictions (are) a schooling)."	"Give *sorrow* leave a while to *tutor* me."—*Rich. II.* iv. 1. "To sinful men, the injuries that they themselves procure, must be their schoolmasters."—*Lear* ii. 4.
No. 391.—"Tantaene animis celestibus irae?"—*Virg. Aen.* i. 15.	"What, Cardinal, is your priesthood grown peremptory? Tantaene animis, &c."—2 *Hen. VI.* 1.
No. 872.—"Haile of pearle."	"I'll set thee in a shower of gold, And *hail* rich *pearls* upon thee." —*Ant. Cl.* iii. 5.

There is surely no dubiety about these parallels. They are striking enough to whet the appetite for more. But I refrain. Only this has to be noted. The *Promus* was written before the Plays above quoted, and long before many of them were printed. It had prior existence. Therefore, if there was borrowing, it was the writer of the Plays who borrowed. But where did he get *Bacon's private note-book* to borrow from?

There are two entries in *Promus* specially pointing to a con-

* "Bacon-Shakspere Question," p. 191. † July, 1898

nection with the Plays:—No. 1165. "The law at Twickenham for ye Merry Tales."

Now, what had a grave lawyer, or dry philosopher, in view with such a jotting? But if Bacon wrote those bright Comedies whose legal knowledge has startled the critics, then all is clear.

Again, No. 1200 is the name *Romeo* in a contracted form. What had Bacon to do jotting down that lover's name? A good deal, if he wrote *Romeo and Juliet*. And this brings me to the final point of proof with which I shall at present try your patience.

Mrs. Pott some years ago published proof, collected with her usual patience and industry, that the Play of *Romeo and Juliet* had been at least revised with the help of the *Promus* notes. She took the editions of 1597 and that of 1599, and gave about 80 examples where the earlier edition had been altered or enlarged in the later, every one of which alterations in some way or other used up some note found in Bacon's *Promus*. As that note-book was, as already said, his private property, it is clear from this that he had a hand in revising this one at least of Shakespeare's Plays. And if it be proved that he had even that connection, it is not difficult to go a step further, and believe he revised it, because he had the best of rights to do so, being the true author.

Here I must leave the subject, feeling that after all I have but touched its fringe. May I at least venture to believe that I have shewn that the Baconian view is not such a "ridiculous craze" as it is so usually deemed, but a sober theory based on a good few facts, and deserving of candid consideration?

If I should be asked—as most likely I may—what does it matter who wrote the works we know by the name of Shakespeare? I reply: in one sense, nothing; but in another very much. *All* purely literary questions, if judged by a certain standard dear to this mercenary age, are valueless. But if any question should interest literary minds, this surely should.

Historical truth is valuable for its own sake. Moreover, if it be true that *Bacon* was the true author of the Shakespeare Poems, let critics and commentators cease wandering fruitlessly about Stratford for elucidation of these writings, and find a fuller and clearer light on their depths and beauties in Bacon's life and works.

If Bacon be the author of these Poems, they remain not one whit less the "acme" of our English tongue. But we shall be placing the laurels on the rightful brow—on his who, dying,

bequeathed his name and fame, with strange foresight, "*to the next ages.*" In Francis Bacon we shall acknowledge not only an eminent Lawyer, Statesman, and Philosopher, not only the father of modern Science; but also the greatest Dramatic Poet the world has seen, and in this combination of glories find a proof that he had, indeed, as Macaulay said, "the most exquisite intellect ever bestowed on any of the sons of men."

THE CHRONICLE PLAYS.—II

(*Continued.*)

THE following finds reflection in the Plays,—the coupling of the best soldiers, with the plough, and rural life, by Bacon:—"Certainly Virgil coupled Arms and the Plough together well in the constitution of ancient Italy:

"'*Terra potens armis atque ubere glebæ.*

"'*For it is the plough that yieldeth the best soldier;* but how?—'Maintained in plenty and in the hand of owners, and not of mere labourers.'"

—"The Greatness of Kingdoms" Essays, 1612.

This is somewhat varied in the Essay of 1625 (British Museum Copy), as follows:—"In regard, the middle people of England (*Coloni, et inferioris Ordines Homines*—farmers and men of the lower orders), make good soldiers, which the peasants of France do not. And herein, the device of King Henry the Seventh, was profound, and admirable, in making farms, and houses of husbandry of a standard; that is, maintained with such a proportion of land unto them, as may breed a subject, to live in convenient plenty, and no servile condition; and to keep the plough in the hand of the owners, and not mere hirelings. And thus indeed, you shall attain to Virgil's character, which he gives to ancient Italy—*Terra potens armis atque ubere glebæ* (a land powerful in arms and fruitful of soil.—Æneid i., 531). Neither is that state (which for anything I know, is almost peculiar to England), to be passed over; I mean the state of Free Servants, and Attendants upon noblemen and gentlemen, which are no ways inferior to the *Yeomanry* for arms."—*Ib.* 1625.

Now directly we turn to the Plays, we find English soldiers, called *Yeomen, as by Bacon, and also coupled with the soil.*

Henry the Fifth, before Harfleur (urging his soldiers to the breach), exclaims :—

> On, on, you noblest English,
> Whose blood is fet from fathers of war proof !
>
> . . . . .
>
> And you, good *yeomen*,
> Whose limbs were made in England, show us here
> *The mettle of your pasture*, let us swear
> That you are worth your *breeding*.
> —*K. Henry V.*, Act III., i. 25.

The reader will observe this connotation of arms with pasture and plough.

Bacon writes :—" Neither is the authority of Machiavel to be despised, who scorneth the proverb of estate, taken first from a speech of Mucianus—' That moneys are the sinews of war.' And saith : '*There are no true sinews of war, but the very sinews of the arms of valiant men.*' "—" Naturalization of the Scottish Nation," p. 22 ; " Resuscitatio," 1661.

This coupling of *arms with sinews*, finds repeated reflection in the Plays. Talbot, upon surprising the Countess of Auvergne, with his soldiers, exclaims of them :—

> These are his substance, *sinews*, *arms*, and strength,
> With which he yoketh your rebellious necks,
> Razeth your cities and subverts your towns,
> And in a moment makes them desolate.
> —1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II., iii.

Bacon says :—" Crœsus boasted of his gold, but Solon said to him, contrary to his expectations : *Why, sir, if another come, that hath better iron than you, he will be lord of all your gold.*"—" Resuscitatio," 1661, p. 22.

Writing of England, Bacon remarks :—" This island of Britanny, seated and manned as it is, and that hath (I make no question) *the best iron in the world—that is, the best soldiers in the world.*"—*Ib. p.* 23 ; " Resuscitatio," 1661.

Henry the Fifth, who may stand as the typical English soldier of the Plays, thus describes himself, to Katharine of France :—

> " Now, beshrew my father's ambition ! He was thinking of civil wars when he got me ;— therefore was I created with a stubborn outside, *with an aspect of iron*, that when I come to woo ladies, I fright them."—*K. Henry V.*, Act V., ii. 245.

So Richmond in his prayer, just before the battle of Bosworth, exclaims :—

> Look on my forces with a gracious eye,
> Put in their hands thy *bruising irons* of wrath.
> —*Richard III.*, Act V., iii. 110.

Compare:—

> Than now to see you here *an iron man*,
> Cheering a rout of rebels with your drum,
> Turning the word to sword, and life to death.
> —2 *K. Henry IV.*, Act IV., ii.

But the most direct convincing illustration of the Baconian identification of the British soldier *with iron* is still to come. It is to be found in the conversation of the Constable of France, with Rambures, in the Play of *King Henry the Fifth*:—

> *Rambures.*—The island of England breeds very valiant creatures; their mastiffs are of unmatchable courage. . . .
> *Constable.*—Just, just; and the men do sympathize with the mastiffs in robustious and rough coming on, leaving their wits with their wives. *And then give them great meals of beef, and iron and steel, they will eat like wolves, and fight like devils.*—*Henry V.*, iii. 7.

So (in keeping with this idea), we read in the Plays, of "*tales of iron wars.*"—1 *Henry IV.*, ii. 3.

> With harsh resounding trumpets dreadful bray,
> And grating shock of wrathful *iron arms*.
> —*K. Richard II.*, Act I., iii.

. . . . .

> Spin to the rescue of the noble Talbot,
> Who now is girdled with a waist of *iron*.
> —1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act IV., iii. 21.

In his Essay of the "True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates," Bacon writes:—"*To be master of the sea, is an abridgement of a Monarchy.* Cicero writing to Atticus, of Pompey his preparation against Cæsar, saith: *Consilium Pompeii planè Themistocleum est; putat enim, qui mari potitur, eum Rerum potiri* (*i.e.*, 'The counsel of Pompey is evidently that of Themistocles: for he thinks that he who is *master of the sea will rule all things*'). And without doubt, Pompey had tired out Cæsar, if upon vain confidence, *he had not left that way.*"—Essay "Greatness of Kingdoms," Etc., 1625. (British Museum Copy.)

This passage is to be discovered, perfectly paralleled in action, in the Play of *Antony and Cleopatra.* We find Pompey described as *master of the sea*:—

> *Lepidus.*—Of us must Pompey presently be sought,
> Or else he seeks out us.
> *Antony.*—Where lies he?
> *Cæsar.*—About the mount Misenum.
> *Ant.*—What is his strength by land?
> *Cæsar.*—Great and increasing: *but by sea*
> *He is an absolute master.*—Act II., ii. 162.

. . . . .

Pompey.—I shall do well.
The people love me, *and the sea is mine.*—Act II., i.

. . . . .

Antony exclaims:—Sextus Pompeius
Hath given the dare to Cæsar, *and commands*
The Empire of the sea.—Act I., ii. 190.

It was Pompey's vain confidence, that caused him to enter into a treaty, or alliance with Cæsar and Antony, depicted in the sixth and seventh scenes, of the second act, of the Play. One of the articles of the treaty was :—

Pompey.—You have made me offer
Of Sicily Sardinia ; and I must
Rid all the sea of pirates ; then to send
Measures of wheat to Rome ; this 'greed upon,
To part with unhack'd edges, and bear back
Our targes undinted.—Act II., vi.

Pompey accepted this offer, and lost with it his fortunes, for in exchange for what was a trifle, he relinquished his sovereignty of power by sea, and his advantage over Cæsar. Menas, who thoroughly realized the folly of Pompey's act, exclaims of the meeting or treaty :—

For my part, I am sorry it has turned to a drinking.
Pompey doth this day laugh away his fortune.—Act II., vi. 109.

In the seventh scene Menas proposes to cut the cable of Pompey's galley, in which Cæsar, Antony, and Lepidus, are seated at a banquet :—

Menas.—Thou art, if thou darest be, the earthly Jove :
Whate'er the ocean pales, or sky inclips,
Is thine, if thou wilt ha't.
Pompey.—Show me the way.
Menas.—These three world-sharers, these competitors,
Are in thy vessel : let me cut the cable ;
And, when we are put off, fall to their throats :
All there is thine.
Pompey.—Ah, this thou should'st have done,
And not have spoken on't ! In me 'tis villainy;
In thee 't had been good service. Thou must know,
'Tis not my profit that does lead mine honour ;
Mine honour, it. Repent that e'er thy tongue
Hath so betray'd thine act : *being done unknown,*
I should have found it afterwards well done ;
But must condemn it now.
Menas.—For this,
I'll never follow thy pall'd fortune more.
Who seeks, and will not take when once 'tis offered,
Shall never find it more.—*Ant. and Cleo.*, Act. II., vii.

Bacon throws a light upon the character of Pompey, in a passage, which seems written, with an eye to the above

quotation, in which he describes him:—"Pompey, who tended to the same ends, but by more umbraginous and obscure ways (as Tacitus saith of him, *Occultor non melior;* a censure wherein Sallust concurs, *Ore probo, animo inverecundo*), made it his design, and endeavoured by infinite engines, that deeply hiding his boundless desires and ambition, he might in the meanspace, cast the state into an anarchy and confusion, whereby the state must necessarily cast itself into his arms for protection, and so the sovereign power be put upon him, *and he never seen in it.*"—Page 414, "Liber" viii.; "Advt. of Learning," 1640.

These acts of deep dissimulation are reflected in the Play, for we see that Pompey was quite willing Menas should have assassinated Cæsar, and Antony, so long that he (Pompey) was "*never seen in it.*"

Bacon writes, in his Essay of "The Greatness of Kingdoms":—"Walled towns, stored arsenals, and armouries, goodly races of horses, chariots of war, elephants, ordnance, artillery, and the like, all this is *but a sheep in a lion's skin, except the breed and disposition be stout and warlike.*"—British Museum Copy, 1625.

Talbot, rallying his soldiers before Orleans, exclaims to them:—

> Hark countrymen! Either renew the fight,
> *Or tear the lions out of England's coat;*
> *Renounce your soil, give sheep in lions stead.*
> Sheep run not half so treacherous from the wolf,
> Or horse, or oxen from the leopard,
> As you fly from your oft-subdued slaves.
> —1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act I., v. 28.

The reader will observe, what stress is laid, upon the *breeding* of the English soldier or yeomen, by Henry the Fifth, which is echo of Bacon's words!

In his Essay upon "Vain-Glory," we find Bacon saying: "In military commanders and soldiers, *Vain-Glory* is an essential point, *for as iron sharpens iron, so by glory one courage sharpeneth another.*"—"Vain-Glory" Essay, 1625. (British Museum Copy.)

The death of Percy is described by Morton (a retainer of the Northumberland's) thus:—

> *For from his metal was his party steel'd;*
> Which once in him abated, all the rest
> Turn'd on themselves, like dull and heavy lead.
> And as the thing that's heavy in itself,
> Upon enforcement flies with greatest speed,
> So did our men, heavy in Hotspur's loss.
> —2 *K. Henry IV.*, Act I., i. 115.

Bacon observes: "That the principal part of a country's greatness, *is a race of military men.*"—Page 473, Essays, "Arber."

Also of the Navy: "The might of the Navy, and augmentation of the shipping of the realm, is so advanced, as this Island is become (as the natural site thereof deserveth) *the Lady of the Sea.*"—Page 114, "Resus.," 1661.

Bacon writes:—"But the son of an *attainted person,* born before the *attainder,* shall not inherit, as the after-born shall, notwithstanding *charter of pardon.*"—"Speech on the Union of Laws, and Naturalization of Scotland," p. 29, "Resus.," 1661.

This very point in all its issues, finds its complete illustration, in the case of Richard Plantagenet, son of the Earl of Cambridge, the latter having been attainted of high treason, and executed, in King Henry the Fifth's reign, together with Lord Scroop, and Sir Thomas Grey, at Southampton, depicted in the second scene, of Act II., *King Henry V.* We find, in the celebrated scene, of the plucking, of the white and red roses, in the Temple Gardens, Somerset calling Richard Plantagenet a yeoman, on the plea, that he, *by his father's attainder, had forfeited his title, and ancient gentry.*

> *Somerset.*—Was not thy father Richard Earl of Cambridge,
> For treason executed in our late King's days?
> *And, by his treason, stand'st not thou attainted,*
> *Corrupted, and exempt from ancient gentry?*
> *His trespass yet lives guilty in thy blood;*
> *And, till thou be restored, thou art a yeoman.*
> —1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II., iv.

In the first scene, of the next act, we find this *charter of pardon,* extended by King Henry the Sixth, to Richard Plantagenet:—

> *King.*—Therefore, my loving lords, our pleasure is
> That Richard be restored to his blood.
> *Warwick.*—Let Richard be restored to his blood;
> So shall his father's wrongs be recompensed.
> —1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act III., i. 158.

Bacon writes:—"Your lordships see what monstrous opinions these are; and how both these beasts, the beast with seven heads, *and the beast with many heads,* * *Pope and the people,* are at once let in, and set upon the sacred persons of kings."—Page 57, "Resuscitatio," 1661.

Compare:—

* This expression is borrowed from the Latin, "Bellua multorum capitum."

> *Coriolanus.*—Come, leave your tears. A brief farewell: *the beast*
> *With many heads butts me away.*
> —*Coriol.*, Act IV., i. 1.

Coriolanus is alluding to his banishment, or ostracism, at the hands of the people of Rome, whom he calls, "the beast with many heads," as Bacon does.

Bacon writes:—"But, Scotland was ever rather used by France, *as a diversion of an English invasion upon France*, than as a commodity of a French invasion upon England."—"Observations of a Libel," 1592; p. 120, "Resuscitatio," 1661.

Compare:—

> *K. Henry.*—For you shall read that my great-grandfather
> Never went with his forces into France,
> But that the Scot on his unfurnished kingdom
> Came pouring, like the tide into a breach,
> With ample and brimfulness of his force
> Galling the gleaned land with hot essays,
> Girding with grievous siege castles and towns;
> That England, being empty of defence
> Hath shook and trembled at the ill neighbourhood.
>
> . . . .
>
> *Westmoreland.*—But there's a saying very old and true,
> "If that you will France win
> Then with Scotland first begin:"
> For once the eagle England being in prey,
> To her unguarded nest the weasel Scot
> Comes sneaking and so sucks her princely eggs,
> Playing the mouse in absence of the cat,
> To tear and havoc more than she can eat.
> —*K. Henry V.*, Act I., ii. 147.

Of King Henry the Fifth's reign, Bacon observes:—"And for King Kenry the Fifth, as his success was wonderful, so he wanted continuance, being extinguished after ten years in the prime of his fortune. Now for her Majesty (Queen Elizabeth), we will first speak of the blessing of continuance. For that sentence of the Scripture, '*Misera natio, cum multi sunt principes ejus,*' is interpreted not only to extend to divisions and distractions in government, but also to frequent changes in succession."—Page 110, "Resuscitatio," 1661.

The "*want of continuance*," or shortness of Henry the Fifth's reign is twice noted in the Plays.

> Small time, but in that small most greatly lived
> This star of England.—Epilogue to *K. Henry V.*, Act V., ii.
> King Henry the Fifth too famous to live long.
> —1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act I., i.

Bacon quotes the Bible to the effect that:—"That nation

is miserable, which has '*too many princes.*'" This was exactly the case with England in the succeeding reign, of which Bacon was probably thinking. For owing to the long minority of King Henry the Sixth, all the troubles of the Wars of the Roses, may be attributed to the many princes of the houses of Lancaster and York, with their rivalries for the protectorship, and their private ambitions for the throne.

> Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crown'd King
> Of France and England, did this King succeed
> *Whose state so many had the managing*
> That they lost France, and made his England bleed.
> —Epilogue to *K. Henry V.*, Act V., ii.

These princes were, Cardinal Beaufort, great-uncle to the King; the Duke of Gloucester, uncle to Henry the Sixth (and protector); Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York; and it is the factions of the former two, which are presented to us quarrelling in the third scene of Act. I. (1 *King Henry VI.*).

> *Messenger.*—Amongst the soldiers this is muttered
> That here you maintain several factions,
> And whilst a field should be despatch'd and fought
> You are disputing of your generals.
> —1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act I., i.

Exactly the same may be observed of the succeeding, reign and troubles depicted in the Play of *K. Richard III.* Owing to the youth of the two unhappy sons of Edward the Fifth, they gave occasion to become the victims of the ambition of Richard, Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard the Third. In this Play we find a citizen exclaiming:—

> *Third Citizen.*—Woe to that land that's governed by a child!
> *Second Citizen.*—In him there is a hope of government,
> That in his nonage council under him,
> And, in his full and ripened years himself,
> No doubt, shall then, and till then, govern well.
> *First Citizen.*—So stood the state when Henry the Sixth
> Was crown'd in Paris but at nine months old.
> *Third Citizen.*—Stood the state so? No, no, good friends, God wot;
> For then this land was famously enriched
> With politic grave counsel; then the King
> *Had virtuous uncles to protect his grace.*
> *First Citizen.*—Why so hath this, both by the father and mother.
> *Third Citizen.*—Better it were they all came by the father,
> Or by the father there were none at all;
> For emulation now who shall be nearest,
> Will touch us all too near, if God prevent not.
> O, full of danger is the Duke of Gloucester!
> And the Queen's sons and brothers haught and proud;
> And were they to be ruled, and not to rule
> This sickly land might solace as before.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act II., iii.

In these uncles of the Royal house, we have the real causes of the Wars of the Roses, and the realisation of Bacon's text: "Misera natio, cum multi sunt principes ejus."

In Bacon's "*Beginning of the History of Great Britain,*" we read:—"That after Queen Elizabeth's decease, there must follow in England, *nothing but confusions, interregnums, and perturbations of estate, likely to exceed the ancient calamities of the civil wars between the Houses of Lancaster and York.*"—Page 221, "Resuscitatio," 1661.

It is exactly after this excellent comparison, that the Plays embracing the Wars of the Roses are written—and indeed all these confusions, and calamities of estate, are thus summed up by Richmond, after the defeat of Richard the Third at Bosworth Field—

> England hath long been mad, and scarr'd herself.

Among the many wonders of Bacon's pen, nothing is perhaps more remarkable, than the following prophecy of England's future colonial empire:—"Thirdly this kingdom, now first, in his majesties' times, hath gotten a lot, or portion, in the new world, by the plantation of *Virginia,* and the *Summer Islands,* and certainly it is with the kingdoms on earth, as it is, in the kingdom of heaven. *Sometimes a mustard seed, proves a great tree. Who can tell?*"—A Speech in Parliament, p. 96, "Resuscitatio," 1661.

Of Ireland he writes: describing its "*kierns and swordsmen*" (p. 263, "Resus.") and its "race and generation of men valiant, hard and active" (on Irishmen, p. 258, *Ib.*).

Compare:—

> The uncivil *kierns* of Ireland are in arms
> And temper clay with blood of Englishmen.
> 2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act III., i. 310.

In the Play of *K. Henry VI.*, there is to be found the celebrated episode, laid at St. Albans, of the detection of the impostor Saunder, Simcox, by the good Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. A man, who declares he was born blind, suddenly recovers his sight, and attributes it to a miracle just performed at the shrine of St. Alban.

> [*Enter a townsman of St. Albans, crying, "A miracle!"*]
>
> *Gloucester.*—What means this noise?
> Fellow, what miracle dost thou proclaim?
> *Towns.*—A miracle! A miracle!
> *Suffolk.*—Come to the King and tell him what miracle.
> *Towns.*—Forsooth, a blind man at St. Alban's shrine,

Within this half-hour hath received his sight.
A man that ne'er saw in his life before.
—2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II., i. 59.

The blind man is brought before the King, and the Protector, Duke Humphrey. The latter questions him, as to his lameness, and the cause of it, which he is told, was caused by a fall from a plum-tree, which he climbed in order to pick damsons. This reply naturally awakens the suspicions of the Duke, who forthwith proceeds to question Simcox, *as to the colours of certain objects*, such as cloaks and gowns, which they are wearing. The impostor, not perceiving the subtlety of these test proofs of his veracity, falls at once into the trap, and glibly enough gives the correct answers, showing *a too perfect distinction of colours*, or *their right names*, for a man who was blind from his birth up to within half-an-hour of his interrogation-

Glouc.—What colour is this cloak of?
Simp.—Red, master; red as blood;
Glouc.—Why, that's well said. What colour is my gown of?
Simp.—Black, forsooth: coal black as jet.
King.—Why, then, thou know'st what colour jet is of.
Suffolk.—And yet I think, jet did he never see.
Glouc.—But cloaks and gowns, before this day, a many.
Wife.—Never, before this day, in all his life.
Glouc.—Tell me, sirrah, what's my name?
Simp.—Alas, master, I know not.
Glouc.—What's his name?
Simp.—I know not.
Glouc.—Nor his?
Simp.—No, indeed, master.
Glouc.—What's thine own name?
Simp.—Saunder Simcox, an if it please you, master.
Glouc.—Then, Saunder, sit there, the lyingest knave in Christendom. If thou had'st been born blind, thou might'st as well have known all our names as thus to name the several colours we do wear. Sight may distinguish of colours, *but suddenly to nominate them all it is impossible.*
2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II., i. 109.

Bacon writes:—"But reason teacheth us, that in ignorance, and implied belief, it is easy to agree *as colours agree in the dark.*"—Page 118, "Resuscitatio," 1661. (Observations on a libel).

Inasmuch as ignorance is a species of mental blindness, or darkness, this parable might be applied with profit, to the problem of the authorship of the Plays, particularly by those who cannot distinguish, or *nominate, the Baconian colours, or mind in the Plays!* The fact this episode is laid at St. Albans (Bacon's native town, and home so to speak), and turns upon *impostorship* must excite speculation, and questioning in every profound mind. There is a sort of dumb sermon, in the

episode full of eloquent significance, if we only choose to see it. It seems to say—"Impostorship is always to be detected, so be it, there is subtlety enough in the process of detection, and in the interrogation. How could Shakespeare, *nominate so many things in his supposed writings, which we are sure he could not have known ; one of them being this historical episode which really occurred at St. Albans, and was of course a familiar story to Lord Bacon?*" To my mind, it seems pretty certain, that Bacon was thinking of Simcox, of his detection, by Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, when he entered this remark, that, "*Colours agree in the dark,*"—that is to say, it is impossible to nominate the differences of colours, if one has only just recovered from a life-long blindness, half-an-hour ago.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

NOTES ON THE PROŒMIUM TO THE GREAT INSTAURATION.

IT may not be amiss now and again to turn from consideration of what has been thought, said, or written about Francis of Verulam, to the more important examination and consideration of his own statements concerning himself, his aims, and his work. For indeed there is a strong ground for believing that amongst the many who are interested in hearing or reading what is said by others upon our wonderful but mysterious subject, there are comparatively few who have *read,* much less *studied and examined,* his work as a whole.

We desire on the present occasion to direct attention to the *Proœmium* or Introductory Pages which precede the Dedication and the Preface to the "Great Instauration." The piece is very short, only two pages ; but it is very full of suggestion as well as information. Three points especially demand notice from the reader, and tend to confirm the growing opinion as to the universal as well as the unique authorship which some of us claim for our Concealed Poet.

(I.) *Francis of Verulam was solitary in his work,* and well aware how solitary an enterprise was his, "the total reconstruction," namely, of all human knowledge. He knew that this project would seem to others to be infinite and beyond the powers of man ; he had "found no man hitherto who had applied his mind to the like, and he knew not how long it

might be before these things might occur to anyone else, therefore he was resolved to publish what he had completed.

In the Dedicatory Epistle he repeats that, "Certainly these things are *quite new; totally new in their very kind*, yet they are copies from a very ancient model, even the world itself, and the nature of things and of the mind."

Such utterances as these, frequently though in various ways reiterated, should be sufficient to put an end to the kind of argument by which it has often been endeavoured to silence our claims for "Francis" by saying that his knowledge, his theories, his imagery, his diction, his words, were "in the air" or "public property." In the air they were not, until he, the Great Orpheus had "charmed the air to give a sound." Public property they were not, until he, the Great Benefactor of the Human Race, having subjected and mastered all the Provinces of learning, having supplied all Particulars which he had found deficient, having filled up all Numbers,—made a free gift of his treasures to the world in all future ages.

(2.) *Francis of Verulam restored the Arts.* We are accustomed to think of him as the Man of Science, and as the Philosopher, Natural, Experimental or Contemplative. We have also been taught to regard him before all, as the Statesman, and the distinguished, though unwilling, Lawyer—Politics and the Law being those matters for which he declares himself to be the "least fit."

But what about the *Arts* which he would reconstruct? We know that they were not *Mechanical* Arts, whether Sculpture or Painting, Gardening or Building, Printing, or any kind of handicraft. At the end of the Catalogue of Histories which he required to be written, he says:—"*I care little about the Mechanical Arts themselves; only about those things which they contribute to the equipment of Philosophy.*"

What then were *the* "*Arts*" which he ranks between Sciences and General Knowledge? We maintain that they were the Arts of Poetry in all her many forms, the Poesy, Narrative, Dramatic, and Parabolical, which he himself describes.

(3.) Francis of Verulam presents his acknowledged Philosophical works to the present and future generations as an "Outline" merely, of the project which he had conceived. This is important; it teaches us that these works, the *Advancement of Learning* (and its enlargement in Latin, the *De Augmentis*), the *Novum Organum, Instauration*, &c., are not to be regarded as ordinary scientific works—they are not

subjects for the kind of criticism which is suitable for works of complete and exhaustive research, or of exact and perfected knowledge in any branch of Natural Philosophy. On the contrary, as we have often insisted, these works are *not* works of exact science, they are Maps or Charts intended to guide us to the discovery of those coasts of new-found Lands round which he sailed his solitary ship; of those Provinces of Learning which, alone, he invaded and mastered; those vast tracts which he had found waste and barren, those wildernesses impenetratable and unprofitable, where he as "a true pioneer" had cleared the ground, had dug and fertilized the soil, and sown his seed broadcast.

(4.) Francis of Verulam alludes, as usual, to his great scheme as a rebuilding of *Solomon's House.* If we study the history of the English Renaissance, and the simultaneous springing up in all parts of Europe of the great secret societies, we must see that these were nearly all manifestations of the same effort for the Advancement of Learning. Whether or no they recognised each other, they all emanated from one and the same centre, "Our Francis"—sole Architect and Master Builder of the New Solomon's House, the stupendous fabric devised and raised upon sound foundations *by himself.*

Some imagination is needed to realise the magnitude of this self-imposed task—"*A total reconstruction of Sciences, Arts, and all Human Knowledge.*" Let us pause, and allow our minds to draw a deep breath before passing this sentence. That the "Great Master" should have needed assistants, goes without saying; secretaries, amanuenses, cryptographers, shorthand writers, translators, collators; not to mention printers, designers, and experts in those "mechanical arts which contribute to the equipment of philosophy." At the present hour it seems almost superfluous to add that such persons were bound by oaths of secrecy, and by rules and methods as strict and imperative as those of the ancient mysteries, or of any other archaic Fraternity from which our Francis derived and adapted his own codes and ceremonies.

(5.) It was no ambition for himself, but solicitude for "*the Work,*" which urged Francis of Verulam to put forward this "Outline." All other ambition whatsoever seemed poor in his eyes compared with this great work of his, for which, nevertheless, he knew how hard it would be to win faith or credit.

Neither in his own strength did he undertake "that which may seem a thing infinite, and beyond the powers of man,"

but, as he says, in the Dedicatory Epistle, that he wished "if there be any good in what I have to offer, it may be ascribed to the infinite mercy and goodness of God." In the Preface he adds—"wherefore, seeing that these things do not depend upon myself, at the outset of the work I most humbly and fervently pray to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, that, remembering the sorrows of mankind, and the pilgrimage of this our life, wherein we wear out days few and evil, they will vouchsafe through my hands to endow the human family with new mercies."

FRANCIS OF VERULAM,

reasoned thus with himself,

AND JUDGED IT TO BE FOR THE INTEREST OF THE PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS THAT THEY SHOULD BE MADE ACQUAINTED WITH HIS THOUGHTS.

Being convinced that the human intellect makes its own difficulties, not using the true helps which are at man's disposal, soberly and judiciously; whence follows manifold ignorance of things, and by reason of that ignorance mischiefs innumerable; he thought all trial should be made, whether that commerce between the mind of man and the nature of things, which is more precious than anything on earth, or at least than anything that is of the earth, might be by any means restored to its perfect and original condition, or, if that may not be, yet reduced to a better condition than that in which it now is. Now that the errors which have hitherto prevailed, and which will prevail for ever should (if the mind be left to go its own way), either by the natural force of the understanding or by help of the aids and instruments of Logic, one by one correct themselves, was a thing not to be hoped for; because the primary notions of things which the mind readily and passively imbibes, stores up and accumulates (and it is from them that all the rest flow) are false, confused, and overhastily abstracted from the facts; nor are the secondary and subsequent notions less arbitrary and inconstant; whence it follows that the entire fabric of human reason which we employ in the inquisition of nature, is badly put together and built up, and like some magnificent structure without any

foundation. For while men are occupied in admiring and applauding the false powers of the mind, they pass by and throw away those true powers, which if it be supplied with the proper aids and can itself be content to wait upon nature instead of vainly attempting to overrule her, are within its reach.

There was but one course left therefore, to try the whole thing anew upon a better plan, and to commence a total reconstruction of Sciences, Arts, and all Human Knowledge, raised upon the proper foundations. And this, though in the project and undertaking it may seem a thing infinite, and beyond the powers of man, yet when it comes to be dealt with, it will be found sound and sober, much more so than what has been done hitherto. For of this there is some issue; whereas in what is now done in the matter of science there is only a whirling round about, and perpetual agitation, ending where it began.

And although he was well aware how solitary an enterprise it is, and how hard a thing to win faith and credit for, nevertheless he was resolved not to abandon either it or himself; nor to be deterred from trying and entering upon that one path which is alone open to the human mind. For better it is to make a beginning of that which may lead to something, than to engage in a perpetual struggle and pursuit in courses which have no exit. And certainly the two ways of contemplation are much like those two ways of action so much celebrated, in this—that the one, arduous and difficult in the beginning, leads out at last into the open country; while the other, seeming at first sight easy and free from obstruction, leads to pathless and precipitous places.

Moreover, because he knew not how long it might be before these things would occur to anyone else, judging especially from this, that he has found no man hitherto who has applied his mind to the like, he resolved to publish at once so much as he has been able to complete. The cause of which haste was not ambition for himself, but solicitude for the work; that in case of his death there might remain some outline and project of that which he had conceived, and some evidence likewise of his honest mind and inclination towards the benefit of the Human Race. Certain it is that all other ambition whatsoever, seemed poor in his eyes compared with the work which he had in hand; seeing that the matter at issue is either nothing, or a thing so great that it may well be content with its own merit, without seeking other recompense.

BEN JONSON'S "POET-APE."

MR. SIDNEY LEE, in his article on Shakespeare in the "Dictionary of National Biography," after quoting Chettle and Jonson, says, "No other contemporary left on record any impression of Shakespeare's personal character." The passage he quotes from Chettle's "Kind Heart's Dream" has been shown not to apply to Shakespeare, so that the only contemporary writer who seems to have known anything personally of Shakespeare is Ben Jonson, all the other allusions of the time are references to the works published as Shakespeare's by writers who learned from the title-page that they were written by him, much in the same way as the reviewers of the sixties supposed the author of "Adam Bede" to be a man named George Eliot.

What Ben Jonson's real opinion of Shakespeare was we can only judge from such allusions in his plays as can be shown to point to him, the passage Mr. Lee quotes from his "Discoveries" and the panegyric prefixed to the folio of 1623 having been written after Jonson came under Bacon's influence. I think such an allusion can be traced in the prologue to Jonson's "Poetaster" taken in conjunction with his sonnet on Poet-Ape. The prologue is spoken by Envy, who utters the following lines:—

> Are there no players here? no poet-apes
> That come with basilisk's eyes, whose forked tongues
> Are steeped in venom, as their hearts in gall?

Jonson would appear to have had in his mind Act iii., Scene II of *Henry VI*. (part II) (a play he is supposed previously to have ridiculed in the prologue to "Every Man in his Humour"), for at line 321 we read:—

> *Poison* be their drink
> *Gall* worse than *gall*, the daintiest that they taste
> Their sweetest shade a grove of cypress trees
> Their chiefest prospect murdering *basilisks*.

At line 259 we find:—

> Were there a serpent seen with *forked tongue*

Let us now turn to Jonson's Epigram on "Poet-Ape":—

> Poor Poet-Ape that would be thought our chief
> Whose works are e'en the grippery of wit
> For brokage is become so bold a thief
> As we, the robbed, leave rags and pity it.

At first he made low shifts, would pick and glean
Buy the reversion of old plays: now grown
To a little wealth and credit in the scene
He takes up all, makes each man's wit his own,
And told of this he slights it. Tut such crimes
The sluggish gaping auditor devours;
He marks not whose 'twas first, and after times
May judge it to be his as well as ours
Fool! as if half eyes will not know a fleece
From locks of wool, or shreds from the whole piece.

Who except Shakespeare could possibly have any claim to be considered the chief of the dramatists?

"Poet-Ape" was a player who had attained "a little wealth and credit" and who tinkered up old plays for the stage, and wished to parade in his borrowed plumes as foremost in the ranks of the dramatists.

Jonson in the "Poetaster" ridiculed Marston and Dekker in the characters of Crispinus and Demetrius. If Shakespeare had not been alluded to why should he have administered a "purge" to Jonson, as he is said to have done in The Return from Parnasus? "O that Ben Jonson is a pestilent fellow. He brought up Horace giving the poets a pill; but our fellow Shakespeare hath given him a purge that made him bewray his credit."

Can it be believed that the wisest, wittiest, kindliest, most human of all the human race should have lived for fifty-three years and died without leaving any vestige or trace of his personality upon his age, beyond the faint praise of Jonson. "He was indeed honest, and of an open and free nature?" That versed, as he was, in the ways and converse of kings, princes, philosophers, divines, he should have been content to spend the last seven or more years of his life at Stratford without society, and as far as we know without books, without correspondence, intent only on exhorting small debts from his neighbours and inclosing the common lands? To believe that a man who lived the life of Shakespeare, as shown from our meagre records, could have written the plays, requires far more credulity than to suppose that the plays were for personal reasons published (as Puttenham tells us "notable gentlemen in the court" were in the habit of publishing their works) "without their owne names to it, as if it were a discredit for a gentleman to seeme learned or show himself amorous of any good art."

E. S. ALDERSON.

"FROM THE DUST OF OLD OBLIVION RAKED."

SUBJECTS FOR RESEARCH.

IT is very necessary for a due understanding of the life and times of "Francis Bacon," and for just appreciation of recent discoveries, that we study diligently the *older* histories and the *private* papers of the reign of Elizabeth, now easily accessible through the printed reports or calendars of the Government Historical Commission. Many particulars divulged by these important documents have been utilised by careful historians, like Agnes Strickland in her "*Queens of England.*" But some main points which pierce to the heart of our subject have been curiously glossed or glided over, glanced at, but not arrested, faced, and publicly cross-examined.

May we urge those who desire to get to the bottom of things, to find truth, though she be hid in the centre, to join hands with us in tracing out, by true and painstaking research, the *private and hidden* life, aims, and achievements of that miracle of men, Francis, Viscount St. Alban? Recent discoveries, which we hope soon to make public, render it the more needful that our knowledge of ascertained facts should be accurate, and the facts themselves demonstrable. It is because experience daily proves the shallowness of popular knowledge, showing how much is the mere echo, the incorrect reiteration of incorrect and often disproved traditions, that we venture to suggest to the few who love laborious research that they should undertake this particular investigation, and pursue it to the end with method and persistency. Some, at least, of our fraternity should be armed and well prepared for the coming controversy.

We recommend such readers to con again the familiar pages of Strickland's "*Queens,*" vol. vi. *Elizabeth* (especially pp. 21—39); also the articles "*Elizabeth,*" "*Dudley,*" and "*Essex*" in *Chalmers' Dictionary,* and in the *Dictionary of National Biography.*

The three distinguished persons specified are those whom, at present, it most concerns us to track and follow into their most secret recesses, spying out all their doings. This, in the case of Elizabeth *when Queen,* it is not easy to do; for assuredly that clever, crafty, iron-willed Sovereign would take good care that matters which she desired to have concealed should be peremptorily suppressed, tell-tale documents destroyed, tongues which ran too roundly in men's heads

silenced, and their owners "put to the perpetual wink for aye." But murder will out, and truth cannot be hid. Letters, and the memoranda, affidavits, confessions, and other documents continually brought to light, force thoughtful minds to reconsider old-established traditions. Modern research must in the end materially affect unprejudiced judgment regarding the lion-hearted Elizabeth, or, as she desired to be called, "The Virgin Queen." Read, then, the following books:—

Haynes' "State Papers," 1548 (specially pp. 94—108, 361, 364).
The Throckmorton MSS.
Wood's Annals.
Ballard's Memoirs.
Andrew's "Continuation."
Herbert's "Henry VII."
Ellis's "Specimens."
Birch's Memorials of Queen Elizabeth.
Strype's Annals.
Seward's Biographiana.
Lord Orford's Royal and Noble Authors (edited by Park).
Hayward's "Edward VI."
Leti's Life of Queen Elizabeth.

Of ROBERT DUDLEY, EARL OF LEICESTER, see "*Leicester's Commonwealth*" and "*Leicester's Ghost,*" 1641 (*Brit. Mus.*, 599, a. 30). This curious book, although put forward and abused as the work of Robt. Parsons, Jesuit, is evidently full of genuine matter. Its statements were never confuted, though a list is given (pp. 14, and 23—28) of the deaths which he compassed of Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, the Earl of Sheffield, Cardinal Chatillon, Lady Lennox, Mistress Draycott, Robin Honnies, and Gates (50), of his intended murder of the Earl of Ormonde (38), his treacheries to the Earl of Sussex, and his devices for the overthrow of Sir Christopher Hatton and the Earl of Shrewsburie (36, 149, 150). "By his art of poisoning, Leicester holdeth all his foes, as well as many of his friends in fear. . . . The cruellest, wickedest, most perilous and perfidious man under heaven."

"*The Perfect Picture of a Favourite: A Secret Memoir of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*" (1708, *3rd Edit.*, *Brit. Mus.* 10816, *b.b.* 22). This describes "his rise and fall; his excessive power and wealth; his cruel oppressions; exorbitant grants made to him; his ambitious aim at the Crown; his lusts, hypocrasie, and irreligion," &c. A collation of the editions of 1708 and 1721 gives the attractive side of his character: "A man of very comely person, a noble and graceful aspect, engaging behaviour, and courtly address: a wit capable at once of entertaining agreeably, designing deeply . . . a presence which commanded attention and respect.

'*Inerat vultui, sermonque amæna quædum majestas.*'" The suggestive words in Latin were said of Robert Dudley by Grotius.

"*The History of Reynard the Fox*" is another tract in which "the violence and rapaciousness, the craft and dissimulation of the Earl of Leicester, is excellently set forth."

See also Pettigrew's "*Inquiry into the Death of Amy Robsart*" and Dr. Drake's History, where Strada is quoted.

To the foregoing should be added a careful inspection of the "Political Tracts" (16th century). The following references may be useful :—

Cotton, F. vi. 211, 2086; B. vii. 11; C. vii., xvi.; E. 12.
Harleian, 180, 252, 253, 847, 1130, 1582, 4149, 4228, 4243, 4808, 6403.
Lansdowne, 94. 1197. "Home Friend" advocates the Queen's marriage with an English nobleman.
Sloane, 303, 223—240.
Hatfield, or *Cecil* (Part VI.).
" " Vol. i., 252—257. Arthur Gunter's "Submission" concerning the death of Amy Robsart.
" " " 792. Thos. Lever to Sir Francis Knollys and Sir William Cecil (1560). Speaks of a "suspicion and muttering" regarding the death of Amy Robsart.
" " " 795. Arthur Gunter's "Information" concerning the same.
" " " 796. Lord Robert Dudley to Sir R. Cecil concerning the same.
" " " 797, 801, and 255, 810, 811. A. Gunter's "Declaration" concerning the report that the Queen will marry Lord Robert Dudley.
" " Vol. ii. 165—170. Baptista di Trento tells the Queen that the Earl of Leicester had resolved to make himself King of England by a marriage with her; this letter is written in Italian.

The death of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, in 1588, is shrouded in some mystery. It appears probable that he received measure for measure, and that he died by the poison which he had so often administered to those who stood in his way (see Lodge ii. 379, and the *Hatfield Papers*, vol. iii. 356-7, 359-360).

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of "Baconiana."

SIRS,—In the last number of BACONIANA the frequent question, "Why, if Bacon wrote the 'Shakespeare Plays' did he neglect to acknowledge them?" was alluded to and answered with appreciation and ingenuity by E. V. Tanner. May I point out that the same question was, not asked, but most satisfactorily answered by Dr. Stubbs, Dean of Ely, while preaching the Shakespeare sermon in the Collegiate Church of the Holy Trinity, Stratford-on-Avon, a month or two ago. I quote his words as reported in the *Daily News* of the following day.

"He (Shakespeare) taught the most gracious and gentle precepts, too good almost to have been listened to if men had quite known what they were receiving. There were some things in Shakespeare he (the Dean) almost fancied that he might have been burnt for had he been a theologian; just as certainly there were things about politics, about civil liberty, which, had he been a politician or a statesman, would have brought him to the block. But God made him a player," this pathetic little touch suggests very plainly that if by any chance the author was not a player, he could not act more wisely than by putting on the garb of one, and to a Baconian recalls Bacon's plea to his Maker: "I have, though in a despised weed, sought the good of all men." "God made him a player, so," continues the Dean, "he could teach a message to his age which it much needed; lessons of peace, gentleness, mercy, patience, long-suffering."

If Dean Stubbs, standing in that pulpit, were not altogether above suspicion, one might almost imagine that, in uttering these last words, he had in his mind the man to whom Peter Boener says a monument should be erected "as a memorable example to all of virtue, kindness, peacefulness and patience," rather than the litigious, and not very moral William Shakespeare, of Stratford-on-Avon. Leaving this out of the question, however, Dr. Stubbs distinctly proves to his own satisfaction and that doubtless of his audience, that, if Francis Bacon, statesman, politician, and, in a sense, theologian, had acknowledged the authorship of the "Shakespeare Plays," not only would his body have suffered at the stake or on the block, but the "prophetic" voice would have been silenced, and the much needed lesson to the world left unuttered. Surely if Shakepearians are agreed in this, no further argument on that point from Baconians is necessary.

HELEN HINTON STEWART.

Coodham, Kilmarnock, Ayrshire, 5th June, 1899.

Baconiana.

VOL. VII—*New Series.* OCTOBER, 1899. No. 28.

III.—THE CHRONICLE PLAYS.

(*Continued from page* 130.)

IN Bacon's collection of Apophthegms, published in his *Resuscitatio*, the twenty-second is as follows:—

"The book of *Deposing King Richard* the Second, and the coming in of *Henry the Fourth*, supposed to be written, by Doctor Hayward, who was committed to the Tower for it, had much incensed Queen Elizabeth; and she asked Mr. Bacon, being then of her counsel learned, whether there were any treason contained in it? Who intending to do him a pleasure, and to take off the Queen's bitterness, with a merry conceit answered, '*No, Madame, for treason I cannot deliver opinion, that there is any, but very much felony.*' The Queen apprehending it gladly, asked, '*How? And wherein?*' Mr. Bacon answered, '*Because he had stolen many of his sentences and conceits, out of Cornelius Tacitus*'" (Page 296, *Resuscitatio*, 1661).

In Bacon's Essay upon *Praise*, we find him writing:—"*Praises proceed merely of flattery;* and if he be an ordinary flatterer, he will have certain common attributes, which may serve every man. If he be a cunning flatterer, he will follow the arch-flatterer, which is a man's self; and wherein a man thinketh best of himself, therein the flatterer will uphold him most. But if he be an impudent flatterer, look wherein a man is conscious to himself, that he is most defective, and is most out of countenance in himself, that will the flatterer entitle him to perforce, *Spreta conscientia.* Some praises come of good wishes, and respects, which is a form due in civility to Kings, and great persons, *Laudando præcipere* (to teach in praising); *when by telling men, what they are, they represent to them, what they should be. Some men are praised maliciously to their hurt, thereby to stir envy and jealousy towards them*—'*Pessimum genus inimicorum laudantium*' (The worst kind of enemies are flatterers, or eulogists."—*Tacitus Agricola*, 41).

It is our object to call attention to this last sentence, and quotation made by Bacon, from *Cornelius Tacitus,* and to inquire whether *this is not one of the sentences, or conceits, which we may re-find as a text, upon which the character of King Richard the Second, has been drawn in the Play of his name, attributed to Shakespeare?*

The ruin of Richard the Second, is mainly attributed, in the Play, *to his fondness for praise, or flattery.* We find the Duke of York, telling John of Gaunt, how vain, his good counsel will be in the ears of the King:—

> *Gaunt.*—Though Richard my life's counsel would not hear,
> My death's sad tale may yet undeaf his ear.
> *York.—No; it is stopp'd with other flattering sounds,*
> *As praises,** of whose taste the wise are fond.—Act II. i.

And Gaunt exclaims to the King:—

> And thou, too careless patient as thou art,
> Committ'st thy anointed body to the cure
> Of those physicians that first wounded thee:
> *A thousand flatterers sit within thy crown,*
> Whose compass is no bigger than thy head.—Act II. i. 99.

The character of Richard the Second is described, as a mixture, of lightness, vanity, and weakness for praise, or flattery, and to this was added a morbid inclination to self analysis, and self-torture. The Earl of Northumberland echoes the same note as Gaunt, when he replies to Ross:—

> The King is not himself, *but basely led*
> *By flatterers;* † and what they will inform
> Merely in hate, 'gainst any of us all,
> That will the King severely prosecute
> 'Gainst us, our lives, our children, and our heirs.
> —Act II. i. 241.

When the Duke of York hears of the invasion of England by Bolingbroke, he exclaims of the King:—

* *Proteus.*—I will not *flatter* her.
Val.—O *flatter* me; for love delights in *praise.*
—*Two Gent.*, Act II. iv. 147.

† These flatterers of the King were Bushy, Bagot, and Green, whose rise was one of the direct causes of King Richard's overthrow. When they hear of the approach and landing of Bolingbroke, and the flight of Northumberland, Percy, and Ross to the invader's assistance, Bushy and Bagot endeavour to allay the Queen's despair with flattering hopes. She replies:—

> I will despair, and be at enmity
> With cozening hope: he is a flatterer,
> A parasite, a keeper back of death,
> Who gently would dissolve the bands of life,
> Which false hopes lingers in extremity.
> —*K. Rich. II.*, Act II. ii. 68.

> Now comes the sick hour that his surfeit made;
> *Now shall he try, his friends that flatter'd him.*
> —*K. Rich. II.*, Act II. ii. 84.

This sermon upon the dangers of too much praise, or flattery, is writ large in Bacon's prose, and in his poetry likewise. For example, Bacon, amid the collection of Solomon's Proverbs, which he has thought fit to comment upon, and introduce, into his *Advancement of Learning*, has chosen the one that runs, "*He who rises early, praising his friend, shall find it no better than a curse to him.*" That is to say, immoderate praise possesses two dangers—it fosters self-ignorance and vanity in the person flattered, and it raises envy in others, which may bring the curse home to him. Timon of Athens is a complete sermon upon this text:—

> *Alcib.*—I never did thee harm.
> *Timon.*—*Yes, thou spokest well of me.*
> *Alcib.*—*Call'st thou that harm?*
> *Timon.*—*Men daily find it.*—*Timon*, Act IV. iii.

Bacon observes: "He that is too much in anything, *so that he giveth another occasion of satiety, maketh himself cheap*" (*Essays, Ceremonies and Respects*).

King Henry the Fourth, in describing the character of King Richard the Second, dwells particularly upon this point, how the King made himself too cheap:—

> Grew a companion to the common streets,
> Enfeoff'd himself to popularity;
> That, being daily swallowed by men's eyes,
> They surfeited with honey, and began
> To loathe the taste of sweetness, whereof a little
> More than a little is by much too much.
> —1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act III. ii. 68.

The twenty-third apophthegm, of Bacon's collection, printed in his *Resuscitatio*, and following upon the heels of the one already quoted, is as follows:—"Queen Elizabeth, being to resolve upon a great officer, and being by some, that canvassed for others, put in some doubt of that person, whom she meant to advance, called for Mr. Bacon; and told him *she was like one, with a lantern, seeking a man;* and seemed unsatisfied in the choice she had of a man for that place. Mr. Bacon answered her: '*That he had heard that in old time, there was usually painted, in the Church walls, the Day of Doom, and God sitting in Judgment, and Saint Michael by Him, with a pair of balances; and the Soul, and the good deeds, in the one balance; and the faults, and the evil deeds in the other; and the souls balance went up far too light. Then was our Lady painted with*

a great pair of beads; who cast them into the light balance, and brought down the scale.' So he said, *place and authority, which were in her Majesty's hand to give, were like our Lady's beads which though men, through any imperfections, were too light before, yet when they were cast in, made weight competent*" (Twenty-third Apophthegm, Page 296, *Resuscitatio*, 1661).

This apophthegm finds a striking reflection in the Play we are discussing, when the gardener, dwells upon the *lightness and vanity*, of King Richard the Second's character:—

> King Richard, he is in the mighty hold
> Of Bolingbroke: their fortunes both are *weigh'd*,
> In your lord's *scale*, is nothing but himself,
> And some few vanities that make him light;
> But in the *balance* of great Bolingbroke,
> Besides himself are all the English peers,
> *And with that odds he weighs King Richard down.*
> —*K. Rich. II.*, Act III. iv. 83.

It may be observed that this metaphor, is evidently borrowed from the Psalms:—"Surely men of low degree are vanity, and men of high degree are a lie—*to be laid in the balance, they are altogether lighter than vanity*" (Psalm lxii. ver. 9).

Richard the Second had been *weighed in the balance, against Bolingbroke, and found wanting*. This deficiency of *weight* in the King's character, is attributed to his vanity, which early in the Play is alluded to thus:—

> Where doth the world thrust forth a *vanity*—
> So be it new, there's no respect how vile—
> That is not quickly buzzed into his ears?
> Then all too late comes *counsel* to be heard.—Act II. i.

Bacon writes in his Essay upon *Counsel*: "The wisest princes need not think it any diminution to their greatness, or derogation to their sufficiency, to rely upon Counsel" [Consilio virorum selectorum—Counsel of chosen men] (*Essays*, 1625).

If the reader will turn to the second Act of Richard the Second, John of Gaunt, who is dying, is presented, earnestly endeavouring to instil "*wholesome counsel*" into the deaf ears of the wilful King:—

> *Gaunt.*—Will the King come, that I may breathe my last
> In wholesome *counsel* to his unstaid youth?
> *York.*—Vex not yourself, nor strive not with your breath;
> For all in vain comes counsel to his ear.—Act II. i.

Bacon says, "*Optimi consiliarii mortui*—the best counsel-

lors are the dead" (*Counsel*, 1625), and it is certainly in this sense, that John of Gaunt alludes to his own dying counsel :—

> O, but they say the tongues of dying men
> Enforce attention like deep harmony.
> Where words are scarce, they are seldom spent in vain,
> For they breathe truth that breathe their words in pain.
> He that no more must say is listen'd more
> Than they whom youth and ease have taught to glose;
> More are men's ends mark'd than their lives before.
> The setting sun and music at the close,
> As the last taste of sweets, is sweetest last,
> Writ in remembrance more than things long past
> Though Richard my life's counsel would not hear,
> *My death's sad tale may yet undeaf his ear.*—Act II. i.

In the fifth scene, of the second act, of the first part, of *King Henry VI.*, Edmund Mortimer is introduced, giving *his dying counsel*, to his nephew Richard Plantagenet, who was afterwards Duke of York.

> *Mortimer.*—With *silence*,* nephew be thou politic:
> Strong fixed is the house of Lancaster
> And like a mountain not to be removed.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> And so farewell, and fair be all thy hopes
> And prosperous be thy life in peace and war! [*Dies.*]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> *Plantagenet.*—Well, I will lock his *counsel* in my breast;
> And what I do imagine let that rest.
> —1 *K. Henry VI.*, Act II. v. 101.

In like manner the dying King Henry the Fourth gives *counsel* to his son Prince Henry, afterwards King Henry the Fifth.

> *King.*—Come hither, Harry, sit thou by my bed;
> *And hear, I think, the very latest counsel*
> *That ever I shall breathe.*
> —2 *K. Henry IV.*, Act IV. v. 182.

In a letter to the Earl of Essex, Bacon writes: "I pray God her Majesties *weighing* be not like the weight of a balance, *Gravia deorsum, levia sursum*" (*Letters. Resuscitatio*, p. 111: 1661).

This weighing of character against character, as presented in the comparison of Richard the Second, with Bolingbroke, of *lightness with weight*, is thus introduced by Octavius Cæsar :—

* Of *silence* Bacon writes, "Silence like night is fit for treacheries" *Loquacity*. *Antitheta* xxxi.).

Yet must Antony
No way excuse his soils *when we do bear*
So great weight in his lightness.
—*Ant. Cl.*, Act I. iv. 23.

In Bacon's collection of *Antitheta*, under the heading of *Nobility*, we find this :—"The industry of *new rising men* is oftentimes such, as *Nobles* compared with them are but *Statues*" (Liber VI., p. 300, *Advt. of Learning*).

There can be very little doubt this was penned as a point for Cardinal Wolsey, who was a *newly-risen man*, in direct rivalry with the nobility, as we find at the opening of *King Henry VIII.*, where the Duke of Norfolk, the Duke of Buckingham, and Lord Abergavenny complain of the Cardinals' ambitious fingers. When Wolsey is charged by the King, with imposing exactions and taxations upon the people, he replies that he is "traduced by ignorant tongues," "malicious censurers," and "sick interpreters," who are his enemies, and whom he indicates as "*State statues only*," with an evident stab at the nobility.

If we shall stand still,
In fear our *motion* will be mock'd, or carp'd at,
We should take root here where we sit, *or sit*
State statues only.—*K. Henry VIII.*, Act I. ii. 85.

Wolsey's expression—"*motion*," is but another word, for what Bacon calls, "*the industry of new rising men!*" In Bacon's Essay of *Nobility*, he writes :—"Nobility of birth commonly abateth industry: and he that is not industrious, *envieth him that is.* Besides noble persons cannot go much higher. And he that standeth at a stay when others rise, can hardly avoid *motions of envy*" (*Nobility. Essays*, 1612).

This envy of the Nobility against Cardinal Wolsey is the main theme of the first scene, of the first act of the play:—

Buckingham.—The devil speed him! No man's pie is freed
From his ambitious finger.* What had he
To do in these fierce vanities? I wonder
That such a keech can with his very bulk
Take up the rays of the beneficial sun
And keep it from the earth.
Norfolk.—Surely, sir,
There's in him stuff that puts him to these ends;
† *For, being not propp'd by ancestry, whose grace*

* Bacon: "Envy is as the *sunbeams, that heat more upon a rising ground,* than upon a level. *Nobility*: *Essay*, 1612.

† Bacon observes: "Men of *noble birth* are noted to be envious *towards new men when they rise.* For the distance is altered; and it is like a deceit of the eye, that when others come on, they think themselves go back."—*Essays*, *Envy*.

Chalks successors their way, nor call'd upon
For high feats done to the crown; neither allied
To eminent assistants; but spider-like,
Out of his self-drawing web, he gives us note,
The force of his own merit makes his way;
A gift that Heaven gives for him, which buys
A place next to the King.

Abergavenny.—I cannot tell
What Heaven hath given him—let some graver eye
Pierce into that; but I can see his pride
Peep through each part of him. Whence has he that?
If not from hell? The devil is a niggard,
Or has given all before, and he begins
A new hell in himself.
—*K. Henry VIII.*, Act I. i.

The comparison of Nobility to Statues is a very happy image, and implies, a little irony, which may, or may not be allied to the Latin:—Statuæ erectæ stultitiæ.

In Bacon's Essay of *Great Place*, he observes, "*Merit is the end of man's motion*," which illustrates the point, that the word *motion* is employed by him to signify advancement. Again: "For honour is, or should be, the place of virtue. And as in nature, *things move violently to their place*, and calmly in their place, so virtue in ambition is violent, in authority, settled and calm" (*Essay, Great Place*, 1625).

Bacon writes: "Certainly men in great fortunes *are strangers to themselves*, and while they are in the push of business, they have no time to tend their health either of body, or mind, *Illi mors gravis incubat, qui notus nimis omnibus, ignotus moritur sibi, i.e.*, Death lies heavily on the man who is too well known to all, dies a stranger to himself" (Seneca, Thyestes, Act II., Chorus. *Great Place, Essays*, 1625).

After his fall, Cardinal Wolsey exclaims in answer to Cromwell:—

Cromwell.—How does your Grace?
Wolsey.—Why, well;
Never so truly happy, my good Cromwell.
I know myself now; * and I feel within me
A peace above all earthly dignities,
A still and quiet conscience. The King has cured me,

* Bacon writes: "After the knowledge of others follows *the knowledge of ourselves*. for no less diligence, rather more is to be taken in a true and exact understanding of our own persons; than of the persons of others; for the oracle NOSCE TEIPSUM is not only a rule of universal prudence, but a special place in politics, for as St. James excellently puts us in mind, *that he that views his face in a glass, yet instantly forgets what a one he was;* so that there is need of a very frequent inspection."—Liber VIII., p. 407, *Advancement of Learning* (1640).

> I humbly thank his grace; and from these shoulders,
> These ruin'd *pillars*, out of pity, taken
> A load would sink a navy, too much honour
> O 'tis a burden.—Act III. ii. 374.

So likewise Mark Antony exclaims:—

> And then when poisoned hours had bound me up
> *From mine own knowledge.*
> —*Ant. Cl.*, Act II. ii. 90.

We find the Duke of Norfolk exclaiming of Cardinal Wolsey:—

> *Norfolk.*—The King will know him one day.
> *Suffolk.*—Pray God he do! *He'll never know himself else.*
> —*K. Henry VIII.*, Act II. ii.

Thales, the Milesian, is said to have been the first author of the precept—γνῶθί σεαυτον—"Know thyself." He is supposed to have said, that, "*for a man to know himself, is the hardest thing in the world*" (see Stanley's *Life of Thales*). It was one of those three precepts which Pliny affirms to have been consecrated at Delphos in golden letters. It was so frequently quoted, that at length it acquired the authority of a divine oracle, and was supposed to have been given originally by Apollo himself. Cicero remarks upon this point:—"*Hæc enim (i.e. Philosophia) nos cum cæteras res omnes tum quod est difficilimum docuit; ut* [*nosmet ipsos*] *nosceremus, Cujus præcepti tanta vis, tanta sententia est, ut ea non Homini cuipiam, sed Delphico Deo tribueretur*" (*Cicero de Legib.*, lib. i.).

This opinion of its coming originally from Apollo himself, was probably the reason that it was written in golden capitals over the door of his temple at Delphos: "*Quod præceptum quia majus erat quam ut ab Homini videretur, idcirco assignatum est Deo: Jubet igitur nos Pythius Apollo noscere* [*nosmet ipsos*]" (*Idem de Finibus*, lib. v., cap. xvi.).

"Self-knowledge is that acquaintance with ourselves, which shows us what we are, and do, and ought to be, in order to our living comfortably and usefully here and happily hereafter. The means of it is self-examination; the end of it is self-government and self-fruition. It principally consists in the knowledge of our souls; which is attained by a particular attention to their various powers, capacities, passions, inclinations, operations, state, happiness, and temper. *For a man's soul is properly himself.* The body is but the house; the soul is the tenant that inhabits it: the body is the instrument; the soul the artist that directs it. Cicero observes, "Præceptum Apollinis, quo monet ut se quisque noscat, non enim, credo, id

præcipit, ut membra nostra aut staturam, figuram noscamus: neque nos corpora sumus: neque ego, tibi dicens hoc, corpori tuo dico: cum igitur NOSCE TE dicit, hoc dicit, *Nosce animum tuum.* Nam corpus quidem quasi vas est, aut aliquod animi receptaculum; ab animo tuo quicquid agitur, id agitur a te." (*Cicero, Tuscul. Quæst.*, lib. i.). See 2 Cor. v. 1; Rom. vi. 13: ἡ δύναμις ψυχῆς, τὸ δὲ ὄργανον σώματος. (Mason on *Self-Knowledge*, page 10.)

It is very certain that *self-knowledge* is impossible to the unregenerated, or for those living in sin. Because just as when within a wood, "*we cannot see the wood for the trees*," so one condition of mind, can only be surveyed by means of another condition, in the same way, as we can only contemplate a city, or village as a whole, by climbing a heighth, *giving us an advantage above it.* Antony exclaims:—

> *Antony.*—But when we in our viciousness grow hard—
> O misery on't! The wise gods seel our eyes; *
> In our own filth drop our clear judgments;
> Make us
> Adore our errors; laugh at's, while we strut
> To our confusion.—*Ant. Cl.*, Act III. xiii.

Cassius asks Brutus, whether he can see, or understand himself?

> *Cassius.*—Tell me, good Brutus, can you see your face?
> *Brutus.*—No, Cassius, for the eye sees not itself
> But by reflection, *by some other things.*
> *Cassius.*—'Tis just
> And it is very much lamented Brutus
> That you have no such *mirrors as will turn*
> *Your hidden worthiness into your eye.*
> —*Julius Cæsar*, I. ii.

Bacon's thirty-fourth parable (concerning dispersed occasions), has for its text (borrowed from the Proverbs of Solomon), this:—"As faces shine in waters, so men's hearts are manifest to the wise." Bacon's explication:—"The parable distinguisheth between the hearts of wise men and of other men; comparing those to waters or glasses, which receive and represent the forms and images of things; whereas the other are like to earth, or rude stone, wherein nothing is reflected. And the more aptly is the mind of a wise man compared *to a glass or mirror, because in a glass his own image may be seen, together with the images of others, which the eyes cannot do of themselves without a glass.* Now if the mind of a wise man be so capable, as to observe and comprehend, such

* Seneca observes: "It is a good argument of a reformed mind, that it sees those vices in itself, which it was before ignorant of" (Epistle VI.).

an infinite diversity of natures and customs, it remains to be endeavoured, that it may become no less various in the application, than it is in the representation."

Qui sapit, in numeris Moribus aptus erit.
—*Liber.* VIII. p. 397, *Advancement of Learning*, 1640.

In Bacon's Essay upon "*Praise*," he writes, "Praise is the reflection of virtue. *But it is as the glass or body, which giveth the reflection.*" Now, *praise is another name for flattery.* Bacon tells us:—"There be so many false points of *praise*, that a man may justly hold it a suspect. *Some praises proceed merely of flattery;* and if he be an ordinary flatterer, he will have certain common attributes, which may serve every man. If he be a cunning man, he will follow the arch-flatterer, which is a man's self; and wherein a man thinketh best of himself, therein the flatterer will uphold him most" (*Praise*, 1625).

Now all this is very perfectly illustrated in the following soliloquy delivered by King Richard the Second, in which the King takes up a looking-glass, or mirror, and exclaims, whilst contemplating himself:—

O, flattering glass,
Like to my followers in prosperity;
Thou dost beguile me. Was this face the face?
That every day under his household roof,
Did keep ten thousand men? Was this the face?
That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?
Was this the face, that faced so many follies,
And was at last outfaced by Bolingbroke?
A brittle glory shineth in this face;
As brittle as the glory is the face.
[*Dashes the glass against the ground.*]
—*K. Richard II.*, Act IV. i.

. . . .

In this passage, Bacon's text upon praise or flattery is clearly reflected, viz., that the praise, or flattery, of his followers in prosperity, *had broken and undone the King, in the same way the glass was broken and shattered upon the ground!* And there is little doubt, that in this episode, we have a silent, but eloquent commentary, upon the vanity of beauty, and of worldly fortune, reflected in this sonnet from the Passionate Pilgrim:—

Beauty is but a vain and doubtful good,
A shining glass that fadeth suddenly;
A flower that dies when first it gives to bud,
A brittle glass that's broken presently;
A doubtful good, a gloss, a glass, a flower,
Lost, faded, *broken*, dead, within an hour.
—*Passionate Pilgrim Sonnet, XIII.*

A Latin proverb says that, "*Fortune is like glass, soon broken,*" and Bacon intends to point the moral, that flattery is like a looking-glass full of beguilement, and as brittle. King Richard the Second, had arrived at self knowledge, but too late—*he had lived for the shadow, and not for the substance, and the shadow destroyed him!*

Bolingbroke.—The shadow of your sorrow hath destroy'd
The shadow of your face.
K. Richard.—Say that again,
The shadow of my sorrow! ha! let's see;
'Tis very true, my grief lies all within,
And these external manners of laments;
Are merely shadows* to the unseen grief,
That swells with silence in the tortur'd soul;
There lies the substance.—*K. Richard II.*, Act IV. i. 292.

But there is something more to be said. When Bacon says of praise, or flattery, that it is, "*the glass or body that giveth the reflection,*" he is ironically pointing at those passions which *belong to the body, and which reflect the earthly, or worldly life, and the external man, or shadow, rather than the soul, or substance!* The substance, Richard the Second tells us, *lies with the soul, but he had not lived for the soul*, only for light vanity, and the flattering praise of his followers, who like the mirror had beguiled him! Bacon writes, "It is a strange thing to behold, what gross errors, and extreme absurdities, many (especially of the greater sort) do commit, for want of a friend, to tell them of them, to the great damage, both of their fame of fortune. For, as St. James saith, *they are as men, that look sometimes into a glass, and presently forget their own shape and favour*" (*Friendship, Essay*, 1625).

John of Gaunt gave Richard the Second, good counsel, but he would not hearken to it, on account of his vanity, and his flatterers. Bacon says:—"So as, there is as much difference, between the counsel that a friend giveth, and that a man giveth himself, as there is between the counsel of a friend *and of a flatterer*" (*Friendship*, 1625). Thus in *Timon of Athens*, we find the Poet speaking of "*the glass-faced flatterer*" (Act I. i. 58).

"Praise proceeds more out of a bravery than out of merit, and happens rather to vain and windy persons, *than to persons substantial and solid*" (*Praise, Reputation, Antitheta* IX., p. 304, *Liber.* VI., *Advancement of Learning*, 1640).

* The glories of our blood and state,
Are shadows, not substantial things.

In the play of *King Henry the Eighth* we find the Duke of Buckingham, speaking of Wolsey :—

> *Buck.*—But this top proud fellow,
> Who from the flow of gall, I name not, but
> From sincere motions, by intelligence,
> And proofs as clear as founts in July when
> We see each grain of gravel, I do know,
> *To be corrupt and treasonous.*
> *Norfolk.*—Say not treasonous.
> *Buck.*—To the King, I'll say't, and make my vouch as strong,
> As shore of rock. Attend. This holy *fox*, *
> *Or wolf, or both*, for he is equal ravenous,
> As he is subtle, and as prone to mischief;
> As able to perform it—*K. Henry VIII.*, Act I. i. 151.

Bacon taking the Parables of Solomon, as texts, quotes :—"A just man falling before the wicked *is a troubled fountain and a corrupt spring.* The Parable gives it in precept, that States and Republics must above all things *beware of an unjust and infamous sentence*, in any cause of grave importance, and exemplar in the face of the world; *specially where the guilty is not quitted, but the innocent is condemned.* For injuries ravaging among private persons do indeed trouble, and pollute the waters of justice, yet as in the smaller streams, *but unjust judgments* such as we have spoken of, from which examples are derived, *infect and distain the very Fountains of Justice.* For when the courts of justice side with injustice, the state of things is turned into a public robbery, and it manifestly comes to pass, *ut Homo homini sit lupus*" (*Liber* VIII., *Advancement of Learning. Parables of Solomon*, 34).

Now Buckingham, an innocent man, became a prey to the wolf, Cardinal Wolsey, and he might have said with Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester :—

> The purest spring is not so free from mud,
> As I am clear from treason to my sovereign.
> —2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act III. i. 101.

Indeed, Cardinal Wolsey, was one of those who like, the Duke of Suffolk remorselessly hunted down his enemies, and of Suffolk the Captain says :—

> Ay, Kennel, puddle, sink, whose filth and dirt,
> *Troubles the silver spring where England drinks.*
> —2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act IV. i. 71.

Bacon makes use of the expression :—"*Projected to trouble*

* "Wisdom for a man's self is in many branches thereof a depraved thing. It is the wisdom of the fox that thrusts out the lodger who digged and made room for him."—*Wisdom for a man's self, Essay*, 1625.

the waters," said of the King of Spain. (A true report of the Treason of Dr. Lopez, p. 152, *Resuscitatio*, 1661). Again:—"And, therefore, I do wonder, how Mr. I. S. *could foul, or trouble so clear a fountain.*"* (A charge against I. S. for scandalizing the benevolence, p. 62, *Resuscitatio*, 1661).

Buckingham is an example, like Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, of a just man falling before the wicked, before the corrupt fountain of an unjust court. But it is in the thirty-fourth parable of Bacon's collection, out of the Wisdom of Solomon, we find a clue to our text, "As faces shine in waters, so men's hearts are manifest to the wise." Again, in his Essay upon *Judicature*, Bacon observes:—"One foul sentence, doth more hurt, than many foul examples. For these do, but corrupt the stream, the other *corrupteth the fountain*, so saith Solomon, *Fons turbatus, et vena corrupta, est justus cadens in causâ sua coram adversario*" (*Judicature, Essays*, 1625).

Bacon writes:—"By the madness and fury of Catiline, and the conspirators, unto which action *he secretly blew the coal*" (Character of *Julius Cæsar*, p. 285, *Resuscitatio*, 1661).

Queen Katharine exclaims to Cardinal Wolsey:—

> *Katharine.*—For it is you,
> Have *blown this coal* betwixt my lord and me
>
> . . . . .
>
> *Wolsey.*—You charge me,
> That I have *blown this coal.*† I do deny it.
> *K. Henry VIII*, Act II. iv. 78.

Bacon observes: "There are also (no doubt) Counsellors and Governors, which may be held sufficient (*negotii pares*), able to manage affairs, and to keep them from *precipices*" (*Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates*, 1625).

King Henry the Eighth exclaims to Cranmer:—

> *King*—Go to! Go to!
> You take a *precipice* for no leap of danger,
> And woo your own destruction.
> —*K. Henry VIII.*, Act V. i. 137.

This subject is closely allied to Bacon's Essay upon *Great Place*. Great Place is *lubrica statio, et proxima præcipitis*,

* *Achilles.*—My mind is troubled like a fountain stirred,
And I myself see not the bottom of it.
—*Troilus and Cressida.* Act III. iii.

† What reward shall be given or done thee, thou *false tongue?*
Even mighty and sharp arrows,
With hot burning coals.—Psalm cxx. 3.

that is to say, in Bacon's own words, "The standing is *slippery*, and the regress, is either a downfall, or at least an eclipse, which is a melancholy thing" (*Great Place*, 1625).

> Cousin of Buckingham, though Humphroy's pride,
> And *greatness of his place* be grief to us.
> —2 *K. Henry VI.*, Act I. i.

Bacon writes: "As on the other side, there is a natural malignity. For there be, that in their nature, do not affect the good of others. The lighter sort of malignity, turneth but to crossness or frowardness, or aptness to oppose, or difficilness, or the like; *but the deeper sort to envy and mere mischief. Such men in other men's calamities, are, as it were, in season, and are ever on the loading part*" (*Of Goodness and Goodness of Nature, Essays*, 1625).

This is excellently pointed at Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, against whom we have just found Henry the Eighth warning Cranmer. It was against the latter that Gardiner cherished the deepest envy and malice. Gardiner replies to Cranmer :—

> *Gardiner*—My lord, my lord, you are a sectary,
> That's the plain truth. Your painted gloss discovers,
> To men that understand you, words and weakness.
> *Cromwell*—My Lord of Winchester, you are a little,
> By your good favour, too sharp; men so noble,
> However faulty, yet should find respect
> For what they have been: *'tis a cruelty*
> *To load a falling man.*—*K. Henry VIII.*, Act V. iii. 70.

This "*natural malignity*" of Gardiner's is everywhere writ large in the Play.

In Bacon's collection of Apophthegms, is the following, touching the Salique Law :—

"There was a French gentleman, speaking with an English of the law Salique, '*That women were excluded, from inheriting the crown of France.*' The English said, '*Yes, but that was meant of the women themselves, not of such males as claimed by women.*' The French gentleman said, '*Where do you find that gloss?*' The English answered, '*I'll tell you, sir; look on the backside of the Record of the Law Salique, there you shall find it indorsed.*' Implying there was no such thing, as the *Law Salique*, but that it is a mere fiction" (Thirty-second Apophthegm, Page 298, *Resuscitatio*, 1671).

Now, directly we turn to the Play of *King Henry the Fifth*, we find the Archbishop of Canterbury, urging the claims of

King Henry the Fifth, to the throne of France, on the same plea, *indorsed by the Record of History :—*

> *K. Henry*—My learned lord, we pray you to proceed,
> And justly and religiously unfold
> Why the law Salique, that they have in France,
> Or should, or should not, bar us in our claim.
>
> . . . . .
>
> —Act I. ii. 9.

> *Canterbury*—There is no bar
> To make against your highness' claim to France
> But this, which they produce from Pharamond,
> "'*In terram Salicam mulieres ne succedant*:'
> *No woman shall succeed in Salique land.*"
> Which Salique land the French *unjustly gloze*
> To be the realm of France, and Pharamond,—
> The founder of this law and female bar.
> Yet their own authors faithfully affirm
> That the land Salique is in Germany,
> Between the floods of Sala and of Elbe.—Act I. ii. 35.

In fact, the Archbishop of Canterbury proceeds to do *exactly what the Englishman* (in the apophthegm cited above) *tells the Frenchman to do, i.e.*, to look upon the backside, or *Record of the Law Salique—that is,* to trace its historical origin, and to point out how the "*French unjustly gloze*" the Salique land "*to be the realm of France,*" when originally it was "*in Germany called Meisen.*" Note especially how the same expression is used by the Frenchman (in the apophthegm), and by Canterbury in the Play? The Frenchman *said,* "*Where do you find that gloze?*" The Archbishop, in the Play, accuses the French of this *unjust gloze.* Now, the Englishman's point (in the apophthegm cited) is, *that though the Salique law excluded the females from the throne, it did not exclude the male issue of these women from succession.* The Frenchman inquires where this *gloze*, is to be found, and is referred to the record of history. In exactly like manner, we find the Archbishop in the Play, *citing instances of successors to the throne who were issues of females :—*

> *Canterbury*—Besides, their writers say,
> King Pepin, which deposed Childeric,
> Did, as heir general, *being descended*
> *Of Blithild, which was daughter to King Clothair,*
> *Make claim and title to the crown of France.*

In the same way Hugh Capet :—

> Convey'd himself *as heir to the Lady Lingare,*
> *Daughter to Charlemagne*—
> Also King Lewis the Tenth,
> Who was sole heir to the usurper Capet,
> Could not keep quiet in his conscience,

> Wearing the crown of France, till satisfied
> That fair Queen Isabel, his grandmother,
> Was lineal of the Lady Ermongare.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> So that, as clear as is the summer's sun,
> King Pepin's title, and Hugh Capet's claim,
> King Lewis, his satisfaction, all appear
> *To hold in right and title of the female.*
>
> —*K. Henry V.*, Act I. ii.

King Henry the Fifth based his claim to the throne of France, as a male who "*claimed by women.*" Canterbury shows that the Law Salique was a fiction, first as to its French origin, secondly in its working.

In a letter to the Earl of Essex, Bacon writes: "For as for appetite, *the waters of Parnassus*, are not like the waters of the Spa, that give a stomach; but rather they quench appetite and desire" (*Letters*, page 85, Part II. *Resuscitatio*, 1661). This is proof positive Bacon had been following his poetic proclivities, for the expression "*waters of Parnassus*," allow no other interpretation, but as an allusion to the fountain of the Muses, or, in other words, to the *waters of Castalia, sacred to Apollo, the God of Poetry.*

Now, directly we open the title (first) page, of the poem of *Venus and Adonis* (the first heir of the poet's invention), what is our astonishment to find the Latin motto, introducing the poem, to declare that the author, "leaves common things to the vulgar, but that his intention is *to drink 'the waters of Parnassus*,' at the fount of the Golden Apollo, *i.e.*, at Castalia." This motto is borrowed from *Ovid*, and consists of two lines only:—

> "Vilia miretur vulgus; mihi flavus Apollo
> Pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua."

Bacon's allusion and this one are really identical, for the waters of Parnassus are the waters of Castalia, whose fountain or source was situated at the foot or base of Mount Parnassus. The latter, properly, is a mountain in Phocis, *sacred to Apollo and the Muses*, hence called the region of poetry. It was situated near Delphi, which had two summits, one of which was sacred to Apollo and the Muses, the other to Bacchus. It was accidently called Larnassus, from Larnax, an Ark, because Deucalion's ark stranded there after the Deluge. After the oracle of Delphi was built at its foot, it received the name of Parnassus, which Peucerus says, is a corruption of Har Nahas, or *Hill of Divination.* It is not amiss to observe,

that one of the pieces of Bacon's collection, entitled, "*The Wisdom of the Ancients,*" is called Deucalion. Polixenes exclaims to Florizel:—

> We'll bar thee from succession:
> Not hold thee of our blood, no, not our kin:
> Far than Deucalion off.—*Winter's Tale*, IV. iv. 439.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

BACON'S "ESSAY OF ENVY."

I WISH to preface the following remarks on Bacon's "Essay of Envy," by acknowledging my indebtedness to Mr. W. F. C. Wigston, who has treated of this subject in his very interesting work, "Francis Bacon, Poet, Prophet, and Philosopher." I have followed the line taken by Mr. Wigston, but have endeavoured to push the parallels something further and to show how closely connected in thought, sentiment, and studies, the writer of the Plays was with the author of the Essays. A passage from the *Advancement of Learning* as expanded in *Troilus and Cressida* will afford some idea of how the "seeds and weak beginnings" to be found in some of Bacon's earlier works grew and developed into glorious flowers of poesy and wisdom in the Plays. "Nothing doth derogate from the dignity of a state more than confusion of degrees."—*Advancement of Learning*, Book II. ii. 10.

In *Troilus and Cressida*, I. iii. we find a wonderful passage of over fifty lines on the confusion of degrees, beginning at line 83.

> "Degree being vizarded,
> The unworthiest shows as fairly in the mask,
> The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre,
> Observe, degree, priority and place. . . .
> O when degree is shaked,
> Which is the ladder to all high designs,
> The enterprise is sick . . .
> Take but degree away, untime that string,
> And hark what discord follows!"

The political wisdom and insight displayed in *Troilus and Cressida* have been a standing puzzle to all writers on Shakespeare. How came he so well versed in State mysteries and policies? This is a difficult question to answer. Take a passage which occurs in Act III., Scene iii.

"The providence that's in a watchful State,
Knows almost every grain of Plutus' gold,
Finds bottom in the uncomprehensive deeps;
Keeps place with thought, and almost, like the gods
Does thoughts unveil in their dumb cradles.
There is a mystery, with whom relation,
Durst never meddle, in the soul of State;
Which hath an operation more divine,
Than breath or pen can give expressure to"(line 196, &c.).

Turning now to the *Advancement of Learning*, Book II. xxiii. 48, we read:—"So unto princes and states, and specially towards wise senates and councils, the natures and dispositions of the people, their conditions and necessities, their factions and combinations, their animosities and discontents, ought to be, in regard to the variety of their intelligences, the wisdom of their observations, and the height of their station where they keep sentinel, in great part clear and transparent."

Bacon had been brought up among statesmen. At the age of seventeen he formed one of the suite of Sir Amyas Paulet, the Ambassador to the French Court, and before he was nineteen had begun the study of European politics, so that by the time the Plays were written the ways and policies of Kings and States were quite familiar to him, how they became so to Shakespeare or whether he studied them while holding horses at the theatre doors, we can find no clue, even in that "player's hide," so ingeniously stuffed out by Mr. Sydney Lee with suppositions, conjectures, and possibilities, and offered to the public with Promethean audacity as a "Life of Shakespeare." Turning now to Bacon's *Essay of Envy*, we read:—

"Deformed persons, and eunuchs, and old men, and bastards are envious; for he that cannot possibly mend his own case, will do what he can to impair another's; except these defects light upon a very brave and heroical nature, which thinketh to make his natural wants part of his honour."—*Essay of Envy*.

Only three deformed persons are found in Shakespeare's Plays: Richard, Duke of Gloster, afterwards Richard III., Caliban "a savage and deformed slave" and Thersites "a deformed and scurrilous Grecian." Of Richard we shall find something to say under "boldness," suffice it at present to note that he is * envious, a man to whom

* Dr. Johnson says, "Shakespeare diligently inculcates that the wicked-

"This earth affords no joy,
But to command, to check, to o'erbear such
As are of better person than myself.—3 *Henry VI.* iii. 2, 165.

Caliban's envy is sufficiently patent, while Thersites, of whom also more anon, is the very impersonation of envy.

Only one eunuch is mentioned by Shakespeare, Mardian in *Anthony and Cleopatra*, whose part is so small that we learn nothing of his character.

Five bastards are introduced into the Plays, Edmund in *Lear*, Faulconbridge in *King John*, Don John in *Much Ado*, and Margarelon and Thersites in *Troilus and Cressida*. Now while Edmund, Don John, and Thersites are perhaps the most envious persons in the Plays, Faulconbridge and Margarelon are entirely free from this vice. On looking for some explanation of this we find that in each of them "these defects light upon a very brave and heroical nature." Faulconbridge is the natural son of Richard Coeur de Lion, Margarelon of King Priam. Of the latter we know very little, but he appears to have been of a brave and heroical nature, he is represented as standing,

"Colossus-wise waving his beam,
Upon the pashed corses of the kings,
Epistrophus and Cedius,"

and striking terror unto the hearts of the Greeks.

Faulconbridge, too, is of heroic metal. "The Bastard bounds light of heart into the wider sphere that opens before him, and advances steadily in seriousness and strength even to a tragic greatness" (Gervinus). The envy of Don John is that of malicious, sour, and discontented nature which delights in doing evil to others from sheer envy of their good fortune, personally careless what the result may be so his own malice is gratified.

"Only to despite them I will endeavour anything." On first hearing of Claudio's intended marriage he determines to thwart it if possible :—

"If I can cross him any way, I bless myself every way."

"Any bar, any cross, any impediment will be medicinable to me : I am sick in displeasure to him ; and whatsoever comes athwart his affection ranges evenly with mine."

ness of Richard proceeded from his deformity, from the envy that arose at the comparison of his own person with others, and which incited him to disturb the pleasures that he could not partake."

This kind of envy is touched on by Bacon :—

"A man that hath no virtue in himself ever envieth virtue in others. For men's minds will either feed upon their own good, or upon others' evil ; and who wanteth the one will prey upon the other ; and whoso is out of hope to attain another's virtue, will seek to come at even hand, by depressing another's fortune."—*Essay of Envy.*

The case of Edmund is slightly different. In the first scene in *King Lear* he is introduced by his father as an offspring to be ashamed of and apologised for :—

"This knave came somewhat saucily into the world, before he was sent for."

He envies his brother not only his legitimacy, but also his land :—

"Let me, if not by birth, have lands by wit."

But he, too, is working out Bacon's ideas :

"Lastly, near kinsfolk and fellows in office, and those that are bred together, are more apt to envy their equals when they are raised. For it doth upbraid unto them their own fortunes, and pointeth at them and cometh oftener into their remembrance, and incurreth likewise more into the note of others ; and envy ever redoubleth from speech and fame."—*Essay.*

"Again envy is ever found with the comparing of a man's self."—*Essay.*

Thus we find Edmund, whose envy has been aroused by his father's slighting speech of him, railing against fortune for the accident of his birth, and comparing himself with his brother ; his envy, unlike that of Don John, has a practical object in view besides the gratification of malice, that of obtaining his brother's inheritance :—

"Wherefore should I
Stand in the plague of custom, and permit
The curiosity of nations to deprive me,
For that I am some twelve or fourteen moonshines
Lag of a brother ? Why bastard ? Wherefore base ?
When my dimensions are as well compact,
My mind as generous, and my shape as true,
As honest madam's issue ? Why brand they us
With base ? with baseness ? bastardy ? base, base ?
Who, in the lusty stealth of nature, take

More composition and fierce quality,
Than doth, within a dull, stale, tired bed,
Go to the creating a whole tribe of fops,
Got 'tween asleep and awake? Well, then,
Legitimate Edgar, I must have your land."

Edmund here curiously re-echoes some remarks of Bacon in his "Historia Vitæ et Mortis":—

"Some are begotten by old men, some by young men, . . . some after sleep, and in the morning hours, . . . some in the fervency of the father's love (as frequently in bastards), some when it has cooled, as in ordinary married life."

Coming to Thersites, who is both deformed and a bastard, we find that he is the very incarnation of envy; indeed, in all literature it would be difficult to find envy so distinctly personified. He is addressed as:—

"Thou core of envy." "Thou damnable box of envy." After invoking "Vengeance on the whole camp," he prays his patron saint, "Devil Envy," to say Amen.

Bacon says, "It is also the vilest affection, and the most depraved; for the which cause it is the proper attribute of the Devil."

It can scarcely be denied that Thersites is the "vilest and most depraved" character in the Plays; indeed, the writer of the Plays seems to have taken pains to show how despicable envy could be made to appear. The Thersites of Homer and of the mediæval romances, from which the character is taken, are comparatively respectable citizens beside the Thersites of *Troilus and Cressida.* "A slave by tenure of his own baseness, made to bray and to be brayed at, to despise and to be despicable" (Coleridge).

The connection between old age and envy is not quite so clearly worked out in the Plays. The observation seems to have been based on a passage from Ovid's Metamorphoses quoted by Bacon in *The Promus* (entry 121): "*Tuque invidiosa vetustas*" [And thou envious old age] (Met. xv. 234). We find age coupled with envy in the person of Sycorax:—

"Who with age and envy
Was grown into a hoop."
—*Tempest* I. ii. 258.

And also in Duke Frederick in *As You Like It:* "Old Frederick" is of a "rough and envious disposition" (I. ii. 224),

a state of mind which appears to have been common to stage fathers since the time of Plautus, so we find Bacon remarking, "And therefore we see that Plautus maketh it a wonder to see an old manbeneficent." "*Benignitas hujus ut adolescentuli est.*"—*Advancement of Learning*, Book II., xxii., 4.

The word envy had not unfrequently, in Shakespeare's time, a somewhat stronger meaning than we now attach to it, and was used more in the sense of malice. Thus we find Shylock's cruelty attributed to envy :—

Ant.: "No lawful means can carry me
Out of his envy's reach."—Act iv. 1.

"No metal can,
No not the hangman's axe, bear half the keenness
Of his sharp envy."—Act ii. 1.

Thus we find that Sycorax, Frederick, and Shylock, who are all distinctly said to be old, are as plainly stated to be envious; for, although the cantankerous and generally unpleasant father was no longer a stage necessity as in the days of Terence and Plautus, the connection between old age and "crabbedness" is evidently strong in the poet's mind, and is dwelt on in the twelfth Sonnet in "The Passionate Pilgrim"—a Sonnet which Dr. Furnival "likes to think Shakspere's" :—

"Crabbed age and youth cannot live together.
Youth is full of pleasure, age is full of care ;
Youth like summer morn, age like winter weather ;
Youth like summer brave, age like winter bare ;
Youth is full of sport, age's breath is short ;
Youth is nimble, age is lame ;
Youth is hot and bold, age is weak and cold ;
Youth is wild, and age is tame."

It is odd to find Bacon noting the differences between youth and age in a very similar manner :—

"A young man's skin is even and smooth, an old man's dry and wrinkled, especially about the eyes and forehead ; a young man's flesh is soft and tender, an old man's hard ; youth hath strength and activity, old age decay and slowness of motion . . . in youth the body is erect, in old age bent into a curve ; a young man's limbs are firm, an old man's weak and trembling ; in youth the humours are bilious and the blood hot, in old age the humours are phlegmatic and melancholy, and the blood cold."—*History of Life and Death.*

"A man that is busy and inquisitive is commonly envious. For to know much of other men's matters cannot be because all that ado may concern his own estate."—*Essay.*

This idea is developed in the character of Lucio in *Measure for Measure.* Lucio is an impudent and profligate busybody, without any touch of honour or generosity, who takes a delight in maligning the Duke, in his supposed absence, merely for the pleasure of evil speaking:—

> *Lucio:* The greater file of the subject held the Duke to be wise.
> *Duke:* Wise? why, no question but he was.
> *Lucio:* A very superficial, ignorant, unweighing fellow.
> *Duke:* Either this is envy in you, folly, or mistaking.
> —*Measure for Measure* III. ii. 144.

"So there is no cure of envy but the cure of witchcraft; and that is to remove the lot (as they call it) and to lay it upon another. For which purpose the wiser sort of great persons bring in ever upon the stage somebody upon whom to derive the envy that would come upon themselves; sometimes upon ministers and servants, sometimes upon colleagues and associates, and the like."

This is just the use to which Anthony and Octavius Cæsar put their colleague Lepidus:—

> "Octavius, I have seen more days than you,
> And though we lay these honours on this man
> To ease ourselves of divers slanderous loads,
> He shall but bear them as the ass bears gold,
> To groan and sweat under the business,
> Either led or driven as we point the way,
> And, having brought our treasure where we will,
> Then take we down his load and turn him off,
> Like to the empty ass, to shake his ears
> And graze in commons."—*Julius Cæsar* iv. 1, 19.

"Envy is ever found with the comparing of man's self. Near kinsfolk and fellows in office, and those that are bred together, are more apt to envy their equals when they are raised. For it doth upbraid unto them their own fortunes, and pointeth at them, and cometh oftener into their remembrance, and incurreth likewise more into the note of others; and envy ever redoubleth from speech and fame."—*Of Envy.*

Compare with this the envy of Cassius to Cæsar and his comparison of Cæsar with himself:—

"I was born free as Cæsar; so were you:
We both have fed as well; and we can both
Endure the winter's cold as well as he;
For once upon a raw and gusty day,
The troubled Tiber chafing with her shores,
Cæsar said to me, 'Darest thou, Cassius, now
Leap in with me into this angry flood,
And swim to yonder point?' Upon the word,
Accoutred as I was, I plungèd in,
And bade him follow: so, indeed, he did.
The torrent roar'd; and we did buffet it
With lusty sinews, throwing it aside,
And stemming it, with hearts of controversy:
But ere we could arrive the point propos'd,
Cæsar cried, 'Help me, Cassius, or I sink!'
I, as Æneas, our great ancestor,
Did from the flames of Troy upon his shoulder
The old Anchises bear, so from the waves of Tiber
Did I the tired Cæsar: and this man
Is now become a god; and Cassius is
A wretched creature, and must bend his body,
If Cæsar carelessly but nod on him.
. . . . . . Ye gods, it doth amaze me,
A man of such a feeble temper should
So get the start of the majestic world,
And bear the palm alone."—*Julius Cæsar* I. ii. 97.

What the exact relationship between Bacon and Shakespeare was we cannot at present say, but I think that any unbiased reader will admit that the parallels adduced in this and many previous articles in BACONIANA, are too close to be wholly fortuitous. From their writings we learn that both pursued the same studies, held the same opinions, thought identical thoughts, and indulged in the same exercises, that their ideas on nearly all subjects coincided; but although they had a common friend in Ben Jonson, they never became acquainted. That two minds of such infinite capacity and such infinite similitude could have existed in London at the same time, and yet moved in totally different orbits, is wholly incredible.

E. S. ALDERSON.

"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 Shakspere'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 Shakspere," 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 Shakisperians, like Mr. John Fiske of the *Atlantic Monthly*, are always ready to suggest that similarities between the Plays and the 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 Shakspere'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 "*The 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 appear 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 latter passages having been added by the author at a much later 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 embarrasment. It recalls at every point the style of Fletcher, and nowhere that of Shakspere. 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 Shakspere." (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 fulness 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 Shakspere 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 Shakspere 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 Shakspere was unable to borrow from Bacon the similarities contained in twelve, because the letters, &c., containing them were written *after* Shakspere's death. Apart from this, the letters could by no reasonable possibility have been open to Shakspere's inspection.

As to the others, it is difficult to assume that Shakspere 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. Sydney Lee, nor the facts of Shakspere'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.

P. W.

TO THE MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES OF THE BACON SOCIETY.

(*September*, 1899).

Ladies and Gentlemen,—

I desire to make known to all who are interested in Baconian researches that I have mastered the method of deciphering works printed in the cipher specially described in the *De Augmentis*, and which is dependent upon the arrangement of two forms of italic type. This cipher the great inventor and author calls the "Biliteral," to distinguish it from five other kinds which he enumerates, and which, in the deciphered work produced from his books by Mrs. Gallup, are said all to have been used by him. You are probably all aware that for some years past Dr. Orville Owen has worked at what he calls the "Word Cipher," by means of which he has extracted from many books a quantity of matter so varied, and often so astounding as to appear at first sight incredible. The personal history of "Francis Bacon" himself, complete historical plays, and letters are strangely mixed up with translations in prose and verse of Homer and Virgil, and with incidental allusions to the men and "names" under whose "masks" or by whose means his vast and universal literature was produced.

Through periods of discouragement and disappointment this work of deciphering has been patiently and persistently carried on, although I believe that publication was for a time discontinued: not, however, until four or five small volumes and two large 8vo. volumes of the results had been published. Some two years ago, when Dr. Owen was absent from work, and when his former type-writer—now expert cryptographer—was filling his place, this lady came upon a passage which so distinctly described or pointed out the value of the "Biliteral Cipher" that she desisted from the other work in order to experiment upon this method. The result has been the production of a volume *deciphered solely according to the instructions given by Francis himself.*

I was honoured by being furnished with copies of portions of this work in all stages, from fragmentary MS. until the fragments were connected and formed into a considerable printed book. It is not for me to forestall the coming publication: I need only say that the historical particulars concerning Francis himself, first recorded in the "Word

Cipher," are repeated over and over again in the "Biliteral" deciphered by Mrs. Gallup. As to documentary proofs, I furnished to BACONIANA a long list of references to State Papers, the Hatfield MSS., and other collections in which I found proofs, plains and ample, of the truth of the story about Queen Elizabeth in the Word Cipher. With regard to these later histories concerning matters which the Queen wished to keep secret, it cannot be expected that they should be recorded in State Papers of the time. Still, we may hope to find that in private collections of MSS., such as the Cotton, the Pembroke, and the Verulam, the desired corroborative evidence may be found.

In respect of my own slight work upon the Biliteral Cipher, its value consists only in the fact that it confirms the statements of Dr. Owen and Mrs. Gallup. Ten years ago I attempted to extract the cipher from the Dedicatory Letter, signed "Hemminge and Condell," in the 1623 folio of "Shakespeare," being persuaded that the mixed type of that singular volume was not the result of chance or carelessness. I fancied that I was on the way to success, but as nearly every one to whom I pointed out the varieties of type disregarded their significance, as some even said that they could not perceive them, and threw cold water upon my observations, I desisted, being at the time much occupied with other things, and fearing to waste time in a vain pursuit. Still, however, I retained a firm conviction that "Our Francis" was not the man to waste *his* time, thought, and ingenuity in inventing, and in his chief scientific work, describing cipher systems *never to be used*. If, however, he did use ciphers "to conceal as well as to reveal," where are these to be looked for? Does no one know of their existence? Is it possible that such work by such a man for such purposes can have been lost? Ciphers are made that some one may be able to read them. Would these Baconian ciphers, of all others, have been inserted into innumerable books, with enormous expenditure of time and money, unless matters dark and dangerous, and elsewhere suppressed, were to be imparted to a large and widely-scattered secret society initiated in the art of reading them? Would such initiates allow the art of reading the ciphers, or the matter deciphered, to become lost in the dust of oblivion? Would they not rather take every possible means to ensure that these precious records should be preserved and handed down to future ages, as their inventor and writer undoubtedly intended?

Such questions as these must arise in any thoughtful mind; they must be answered, and I look to a solution of many puzzles and inexplicable hindrances by means of the recent cipher discoveries. Having returned to the charge, and, by dint of repeated trials, deciphered the Dedicatory Letter to the Shakespeare Folio, and *another piece in the same volume*, and, finding that my results agreed perfectly with those of Mrs. Gallup, I next tried the First Edition (1605) of *The Advancement of Learning*. With each attempt the work became easier, and having worked out sufficient to assure myself that that book also is full of cipher, I turned to a tiny volume which I have always reckoned "Baconian" "Wither's *Epithalamia*" (1620). Short pieces of the deciphering from both of these very dissimilar works will be found below; but until the American book is actually published, it seems unfair to enter into particulars or in any way to take the wind out of the sails of those who first and so bravely put forth on these troublesome seas. The apparition of words coming out, letter by letter, in single file, and forming themselves into battalions—compact and connected sentences, and often of the most unexpected kind—is intensely interesting and exciting; but we must not lose sight of the main point, the burning question: *Are these things true or untrue?* There is no other alternative. If true, what a world of wonders, what a reversal of authoritative statements and unsupported traditions must inevitably follow the deciphering of the Biliteral Cipher! We cannot be surprised that the literary world and the general reader shrink from entertaining such ideas, or from facing and examining into the matter—far easier to let things slide.

On the other hand, should the cipher readings be proved untrue? Such a result appears almost inconceivable. The idea would involve the tremendous assumption that two persons could, independently of each other, independent also of any mutual hints or instructions, work out precisely the same results from the same printed matter, although (according to this theory) the matter produced were false, and, the cipher by which it was supposed to be produced, non-existent. Further, were the statements made by Dr. Owen and his colleagues untrue, we must find some cause to account for their assiduous perseverance and devoted labours during a whole decade upon a subject as unpopular as it is unremunerative. I confess that my powers of credulity cannot stretch so far as would be required to grasp the "deception" or "delusion" theories.

But private beliefs and personal opinions are alike valueless in such a case; persistent trial and experiment can alone avail to reach the truth: and since we fail in obtaining authoritative help either in confirming or in refuting the statements made, I can only appeal to private individuals interested like myself, and who may be willing to aid in this slow but sure process of deciphering. Once mastered, the work is by no means difficult, and I shall be happy to afford all the help in my power to any one who will seriously devote time and attention to this revived art of deciphering.

I am, ladies and gentlemen, yours faithfully,

CONSTANCE M. POTT.

A VOICE FROM THE DEAD.

Deciphering of "George Withers' *Epithalamia*" (pub. John Beale and Thomas Walkley. 1620).

Descriptive Title-page and Dedication*:—

"A key to the ciphering work in letters, shewing my part in the fame of inventions.—F. B."

To the Christian readers:—

"Time trieth truth is a bad adage, a veil to hide a truth in an untrue storie, as well as to shew the debt we owe to historians."†

Epithalamion (1):—

"Find the key in the Table of Contents, to keepe in minde this cipher, to turn a leaf of use to a fair account of many keys to remind you of the many special difficult things to guide you in concealed cypher-keys, all a part of my designes,

* Here the page is termed a "key," in the first Poem it is called a "Table of Contents." The whole of the alphabet is included in the Title-page and Dedication excepting x, which, when met with in the Poems, is found to be a "null."

† In this short piece the drift of the Author in his cipher-work is suggested by the words, printed in conspicuous Roman type, ' Satyricall," "Cynicall," "Vaine," Villanie, Times, &c.

all invented in order to find precise particularities for fair deciphering work.

"Curiosly attend all the dreadful account of the execution of the great Earl of Essex, the last hateful tragedy, which tragedy keep ever in minde; the true tales, traditions, ni(gh) forgotten by this cruel land, a world too gross; hirelings, menial usurers, devouring our substance, liars; yes, everie merciles deede, lie, cruelty, strife to part friends, to ruin others; expecting treason, treachery, everywhere."

Epithalamion (2):—

"We kept the world in riotous mirth. My poetry, bryd songs, plaies, or a witty satyricall; epigrams, lyricks; a key to my word cipher—task cruell to you, it appears.

"You, I see, believe much use in my artifice. Try any of my eternal poetry, songs, satyres, plaies, ballads, dumb-shows, comedies."

* *Epigrams*:—

"A part of an easy-to you guide to my new inventions. Latterly part of my works were translated, past beyond the seas. I give each of my works as part of Love's Labours Lost.

"All my age at this time is one and twenty years; yet every one of my friendes tell all, a part of the secrets in my wonderfulll (*sic*) historie, concealed from Profani, busy in misguiding.

"My youthful helps (are) good fellow-officers, most ill-rewarded from a raging, aged world." †

* There are seven of these Epigrams, but the cipher-work runs through them regardless of breaks. Sometimes a word is halved between two Epigrams.

† Note "Bacon's" oft-repeated doctrine that the Present is the true antiquity of the world.

The following pieces are from a Rosicrucian Tract (in Latin and German) published in 1619. It will be seen that they dispose of any doubts as to whether or no "Francis" was connected with the "Venerable and glorious Society of the Rose Cross" to whom it is dedicated. The abrupt and incomplete ending of the cipher messages persuade us they are continued elsewhere :—

"PEGASUS FIRMAMENTI."

"A Josepho Stellato, Secretioris Philosophiæ Alumno," &c. *Title page, two Italic letters in the Epigram, and the Dedication "to the gracious and generous fraternity of the Rose Cross"* :—

> "No fear, pride of intellect in this worke, or love to my person's rank, youth, or my honour, can insure a place in Love's fair palaces of the new philosophy, made for a rare happinesse, gardens planted as a rival to the Garden of Eden, if we duly act.
>
> "I ask rare wits to wait for a new reformation, a palace not made with hammer, saw, or hard worke, admirable to purify these filthie times, when we, wearied out both in body and mind lack any guides to learne truth, efficient cure for sorrow everywhere."

"ROSE CROSS Fra."

Detached fragments from the tract itself :—

> "Steal houres to give to serious tasks, easy to you. Franc."
>
> "Time a sure trier of the minde of man scarce divine, minds full of mockery, brokers of my workes—another pr. . . . " (*proof?*)

From the marginal notes :—

> "F. Bacon, Prince of Wales" . . .* If I

* Here the printing is so much defaced and effaced that a fair reading is impossible ; the words "says" seem the probable reading.

faile in magneticall experiments, I looke to a future time in a earnest hope that good wits. . . ."

(Here the marginal readings break off.)

Headings of Chapters I to VII, the letters taken consecutively.

"'FRANCIS BACON ALBA.'"

The following fragmentary extracts are a few of many attempts which I have made to discover at what date the use of this biliteral cipher was discontinued. There are many who must know all the circumstances connected with this secret—a secret no longer. May we not hope that Truth will at last be allowed to claim her own. Time has surely sufficiently tried her.

As a suggestion to mathematicians I must add that I have suspicions that yet another cipher—a mathematical device of extreme subtlety may be wrapped up in these curious cryptograms. If so, they will probably prove to be connected with Mr. Donnelly's original and pioneer observations, many of which have been tested and found true by expert mathematicians :—

"LA PHILOSOPHIE DE DESCARTES," 1681 (4th edition).

Title-page and Dedication.

"The brave wish of the genius Prince Francis St. Alban made him will that a true affection for the authour or any of his delightful subjects, should cause to do his worke; yes, aid in the advance of Truth, but worke to recover for a dead world account of ceremonies secretly perform'd at the chapel, in that den of iniquitie, bloodie Towre, and again at a friendly Bishop's chapel in Arundel Castle in Sussex, at a ballet revel, trial at armes, runninge at a tilt, fencing in a maske, elegantly, and exceedingly fair and rich was a beauteous Prince—April, in decline of Spring out-rivalling Pallas until she dreading the grandeur while the gods (were) laughing revelling, devised that night a work well come. 'We expect prais for the least real efforts. In great distress cry, expecting help, or account the worke for my future reward. This await patiently, in a full assurance that 'Time trieth Truth' is true at all, and bravelie work in gay hope of the event, to gain crownes of glory, easie, sure, in working against the great of a degenerate age. . . ."

"MERCURY, OR THE SECRET AND SWIFT MESSENGER" (*anon*), 1641.

From the Title-page and Dedication.

"I thinke it my good fortune that my constant very earnest orisons to Almighty God in His goodness may have (en)lightened everie one."

"FRANCIS."

To the Reader.

"This was written by Francis St. Albane the true Prince of Wales, the lineal descendant of Elizabeth our Island Queen. The reign of ostentation, ignorance, rash liars, pigmies all; violent, thieving, or claiming that rare, original dramatical works, excellent witty plays, mockeries to delight, attract laggards. . . ."

"CLAVIS PANNAUTICI," OR MARINER'S GUIDE. By T. W. Printed 1734.

*Beginning on the Title-page, the cipher continues through the book.**

"A description of sundry means, all easy, in writing secret things to the completion of the ciphers invented by a man and a Prince of Wales who was the son of Queen Elizabeth, and heir to the throne of the Plantagenet by Robert Dudley Earl of Leicester, and truly married in the Tower of London, also at Arundel Castle in the presence of several eminent persons, yearning for a correct account of that ceremony of a concealed wedding, greatest event this world has seen for past centuries.

"Part of certain royal and princely devices were prepared, with a rare triumph, masks, till it tolled out the hour of two of an Easter morning. Earl Dudley, Elizabeth's partner, that night conceived me in full of that moon, a humble witness above, a fair prophesy of my true right to be called Prince of Wales, it my own . . ."

"THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS," London, 1760.

Title-page, Preface, and Apology.

"This allegory was written by Francis St. Alban, and edited by Henry Gibbon, his secretary, loving, and a long time deare partner in a secret Society to write, pay for keene spirits that they may secretly cypher . . ."

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

I AM rejoiced to see at last in a list of "Subjects for Research," that you notice some books which cannot fail to throw light upon our studies, especially "Leicester's Ghost" and "Leicester's Commonwealth." On reading these books some years ago, I was struck by their resemblance to some of Bacon's earlier works; but the reading of his "Holy War" should precede that of the "Commonwealth." It will be observed the "Ghost" appeared soon after the death of Elizabeth, and was suppressed by King James; but it reappeared bound up with the Commonwealth in 1641. In this same year were published the "History of Henry VII." and "Ben Jonson's *Discoveries*." The close study of all these works will be found

* *In my copy the last leaf of the Rules and examples is torn out, and the completion consequently for a time arrested.*

very useful. Shakespeare readers will surely notice certain resemblances between the character of Leicester as described in the Commonwealth, and the description of Richard III. who appears in many respects to be his prototype by his arts of dissimulation, his many crimes—poisonings, murders, cruelty, lust. Other characters in Shakespeare reflect his many-sided character, as in *Lear*, where Edmund, fascinating, crafty, treacherous aims like Leicester to secure the crown by marriage. We seem to see reflections of his luxury, his vanity, and his boundless ambition in many parts of the Plays—the deplorable state to which his army was reduced in the Netherlands, seems to be told in *Hen. V.* and in *Coriolanus*, where, in describing the sedition caused by poverty and want, the fable of the mutinous members is told by the belly much as the same parable is told in the "Ghost," which was first printed in 1603. Space does not admit of a true analysis but I may mention that the account given in the "Commonwealth" of the murder of Amy Robsart seems to be repeated in *Othello*, v., 2 and other places. We also find in the Tragedies the talk of the people and the priest on the subject of the murder, lines from the letters of Amy Robsart when she was sent away by Queen Elizabeth and Leicester, the speech of Leicester himself when he found that "Lady Leicester" had given him the potion which he intended for her. Part of this speech is in *King John*, the rest in *Hamlet*.

The plays assume an entirely new meaning in the light of this newly published literature of the Netherlands, and by the light thrown by the "Commonwealth" and the "Ghost," which include the description of the Low Countries up to the time of Leicester's death. Many quotations are to be found from these tracts, hidden here and there in the Plays, sometimes a line with no direct bearing on the matter but having a significance of their own. "Using the names of men instead of men," *i.e.*, using the name of *Shakespeare* instead of the name of the true author. In 1 *Hen. IV.* ii. 4 where Falstaff examines Prince Hal, you may recall Leicester's description given by Strada and Grotius. There is much more to be said, but real lovers of truth should see for themselves. The truth is coming with great and rapid strides. Thank heaven that it is so near, and that our hearts do not weary.

Yours, &c.,

El de Louie.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

Gentlemen,—I read in page 219 of Edwin Reed's "Bacon *versus* Shakspere:" "Every effort to find the slightest hint of foreign travel in the life of Shakspere, though made with great persistence, has thus far signally failed."

I read in "Shakspere and His Predecessors" (by F. S. Boas): "Shakspere is not likely to have visited Italy at *so early* a date."

Here Boas *coolly assumes* that Shakspere travelled about, and visited Italy; this assumption is on a par with all other Shaksperean assumptions, which are as numerous as they have been necessary for Shaksperean authorship. But it seems to me, that if Shakspere, as a matter of fact, did not travel in Italy, so as to become personally acquainted with Venice, Boas has given up the case as regards the Shaksperean authorship, for he says in page 111, "That even if we grant that imaginative genius alone enabled

him to throw around the *Merchant of Venice* and *Romeo and Juliet* so marvellously vivid an Italian atmosphere, no *power of intuition*, however transcendent, could impart to the poet a knowledge of *positive* facts." Surely, unless there is positive *proof* that Shakspere *might* have had a knowledge of these positive facts (and such *proof* certainly does not exist), he, Boas, has gone far to admit Baconian authorship; for we know that Bacon, either personally or through his brother, actually *had*, or might have had, that knowledge of positive fact, which was essential to true authorship, and which, so far as Shakspere is concerned, rests entirely on assumption. In other words, Boas himself admits that unless the author of the *Merchant of Venice* and *Romeo and Juliet* was personally acquainted with Venice, he could not have written those two plays. In this stage of *the contest*, therefore, between Bacon and Shakespeare, on which side does victory lie? With Bacon, as long as facts have greater weight than assumptions.

Yours truly,

F. RICE HENN.

8th August, 1899.

ROBERT BANKS AND SON, PRINTERS, LONDON.

2538